

THE USE OF *PUES* IN MORETO: A STYLOSTATISTICAL STUDY

John B. Wooldridge

Northern Virginia Community College

Stylostatistics, or statistical stylistics, is the utilization of statistics to determine an individual author's style. This method is based upon the hypothesis that every writer has a particular vocabulary and syntax, certain writing patterns peculiar to himself which he subconsciously follows. «This implies,» declares Gustav Herdan, «that linguistic expression is less a matter of deliberate choice of words than it would appear at first sight.»(1)

This theory that an author's work bears the imprint of his personality and that his imprint can be catalogued and compared to that of other writers dates from the middle of the last century.(2) Investigators in the field have examined the characteristic terms, the prose rhythm, the word, line, and sentence length, the monosyllabism, the imagery, the ratio of various parts of speech, the syntax, the alliteration, the assonance, and the word frequency of a host of writers, from ancient ones like Sophocles and Euripides to modern ones like Hemingway and Proust.(3)

Considering the massive corpus of seventeenth-century Spanish drama and the unanswered questions regarding authorship, it is not surprising that so many *comedia* scholars have also been preoccupied with the search for clues to detecting the style of individual writers. Such aspects of style as versification, dramatic technique, internal structure of the verse, rhyming techniques, social and moral ideology, etc. have been investigated. However, few have utilized statistics in their work. One of the few was S. Griswold Morley, who in a study published over seventy-five years ago called style «an absolute criterion of authorship.»(4) His contributions to our knowledge of the versification patterns of Golden Age playwrights have been invaluable, as have those of his predecessor M. A. Buchanan, his collaborator Courtney Bruerton, and several others. Interestingly enough, however, very little has been done in two areas mentioned by Morley in an article written some forty years ago: lexicon and syntax. At that time he stated that «the comparative vocabulary and syntax of the dramatists of the *siglo de oro* offers a practically untouched field of investigation.»(5) This is still true, in spite of a few works that treat these features of style in the *comedia*.(6) Not one, however, involves word-frequency, a part of stylostatistics that has been utilized by specialists in many literatures.(7) Among Hispanists this investigative tool has remained unused for comparative

study.

My own interest in word-frequency as a determinant of style began about two years ago, not as an effort to fill a void but simply out of curiosity, since at that time I knew virtually nothing about linguistic statistics. While rapidly skimming one of Calderón's plays, I was suddenly struck by how often the word *pues* was appearing. I decided to see if my impression was correct. First I counted the number of times the word is used in *La vida es sueño* and then in several plays by the major dramatists of the period.(8) The results are in the following table:

TABLE 1(9)

Lope de Vega (1562-1635)

Title of play	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>	Aver. these plays
1) <i>El remedio en la desdicha</i>	3017	88	34.3	35.3
2) <i>El príncipe despeñado</i>	3024	75	40.3	
3) <i>La batalla del honor</i>	3124	107	29.2	
4) <i>La buena guarda</i>	2896	76	38.1	
5) <i>El bastardo Mudarra</i>	3028	94	32.2	
6) <i>Fuente Ovejuna</i>	2455	66	37.2	
7) <i>El galán de la Membrilla</i>	3213	98	32.8	
8) <i>La niñez del Padre Rojas</i>	2480	72	34.4	
9) <i>El piadoso aragonés</i>	2996	84	35.7	
10) <i>El castigo sin venganza</i>	3021	79	38.2	
11) <i>El Amor enamorado</i>	2785	68	41.0	

Guillén de Castro (1569-1631)

1) <i>Los mal casados de Valencia</i>	3012	112	26.9	29.6
2) <i>Don Quijote de la Mancha</i>	3102	92	33.7	
3) <i>El Narciso en su opinión</i>	3029	100	30.3	
4) <i>Las mocedades del Cid, I</i>	3004	84	35.8	
5) <i>Las mocedades del Cid, II</i>	2863	91	31.5	
6) <i>La tragedia por los celos</i>	2737	109	25.1	
7) <i>Ingratitud por amor</i>	2564	98	26.2	

Tirso de Molina (1571?-1648)

1)	<i>El vergonzoso en palacio</i>	3953	139	28.4	33.7
2)	<i>Cómo han de ser los amigos</i>	2975	82	36.3	
3)	<i>La Santa Juana, I</i>	3809	106	35.9	
4)	<i>La Santa Juana, II</i>	2734	94	29.1	
5)	<i>La Santa Juana, III</i>	3016	101	29.9	
6)	<i>Marta la piadosa</i>	3044	90	33.8	
7)	<i>Don Gil de las calzas verdes</i>	3272	78	41.9	
8)	<i>La venganza de Tamar</i>	3019	77	39.2	
9)	<i>La prudencia en la mujer</i>	3679	95	38.7	
10)	<i>Privar contra su gusto</i>	3200	109	29.4	

Luis Vélez de Guevara (1579-1644)

1)	<i>La Luna de la Sierra</i>	3592	64	56.1	57.2
2)	<i>Reinar después de morir</i>	2468	63	39.2	
3)	<i>La Serrana de la Vera</i>	3305	69	47.9	
4)	<i>La niña de Gómez Arias</i>	2615	62	42.2	
5)	<i>El conde don Pero Vélez</i>	3185	60	53.1	
6)	<i>El rey en su imaginación</i>	2442	27	90.4	
7)	<i>El rey don Sebastián</i>	3006	31	97.0	
8)	<i>Los hijos de la Barbuda</i>	2832	34	83.3	

Juan Ruiz de Alarcón (1581?-1639)

1)	<i>El desdichado en fingir</i>	2825	84	33.6	30.8
2)	<i>Las paredes oyen</i>	2923	79	37.0	
3)	<i>El tejedor de Segovia, II</i>	2934	97	30.2	
4)	<i>La verdad sospechosa</i>	3112	93	33.5	
5)	<i>Ganar amigos</i>	2872	95	30.2	
6)	<i>Los pechos privilegiados</i>	2843	105	27.1	
7)	<i>Mudarse por mejorarse</i>	2873	93	30.9	
8)	<i>La prueba de las promesas</i>	2743	91	30.1	
9)	<i>El examen de maridos</i>	3009	120	25.1	

Antonio Mira de Amescua (1574?-1644)

1)	<i>La rueda de la fortuna</i>	3548	52	66.5	51.8
2)	<i>El arpa de David</i>	3517	65	54.1	

3)	<i>El esclavo del demonio</i>	3224	81	39.8
4)	<i>La casa del tahur</i>	3195	66	48.4
5)	<i>El ejemplo mayor de la desdicha</i>	2826	50	56.5
6)	<i>No hay dicha ni desdicha hasta la muerte</i>	2741	54	50.8
7)	<i>Galán, valiente y discreto</i>	2450	52	47.1

Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-81)

1)	<i>La cisma de Inglaterra</i>	2905	125	23.2	21.8
2)	<i>Casa con dos puertas ...</i>	3188	163	19.6	
3)	<i>Los cabellos de Absalón</i> (Acts I and III)	2296	111	20.7	
4)	<i>El mayor monstruo los celos</i>	3632	189	19.2	
5)	<i>La vida es sueño</i>	3319	159	20.7	
6)	<i>El médico de su honra</i>	2953	103	28.7	
7)	<i>El alcalde de Zalamea</i>	2767	120	23.1	
8)	<i>En la vida todo es verdad y todo mentira</i>	3841	184	20.9	
9)	<i>El hijo del Sol, Faetón</i>	3604	160	22.5	
10)	<i>La estatua de Prometeo</i>	2795	124	22.5	

Francisco de Rojas (1607-48)

1)	<i>Donde hay agravios no hay celos</i>	3190	156	20.4	30.4
2)	<i>Obligados y ofendidos</i>	3446	170	20.3	
3)	<i>Del rey abajo, ninguno</i> (10)	2574	70	36.8	
4)	<i>Numancia cercada</i>	2923	60	48.7	
5)	<i>Numancia destruida</i>	2664	59	45.2	
6)	<i>Peligrar en los remedios</i>	3208	95	33.8	
7)	<i>Entre bobos anda el juego</i>	2768	114	24.3	
8)	<i>Nuestra Señora de Atocha</i>	3666	125	29.3	
9)	<i>Lucrecia y Tarquino</i>	2165	48	45.1	
10)	<i>Los trabajos de Tobías</i>	3413	90	37.9	

Agustín Moreto (1618-69)

1)	<i>El desdén, con el desdén</i>	2931	184	15.9	18.2
2)	<i>Antíoco y Seleuco</i>	2620	123	21.3	

3) <i>El lego del Carmen (San Franco de Sena)</i>	2908	164	17.7
4) <i>El lindo don Diego</i>	3090	189	16.3
5) <i>El licenciado Vidriera</i>	3060	155	19.7
6) <i>El mejor amigo el rey</i>	2903	129	22.5
7) <i>Yo por vos, y vos por otro</i>	2709	169	16.0

Based on the statistics in the above table and subsequent word-counts of more than 400 works by 40-odd *comediógrafos*, I have classified those that I have studied into frequent users of *pues* (like Calderón and Moreto), average users (like Lope, Castro, Tirso, Alarcón, and Rojas), and infrequent users (like L. Vélez and Mira). In a play by a frequent user *pues* occurs on an average of once every 15-24 verses or more (note that a low figure means a high frequency of usage); in an average user *pues* occurs every 25-39 verses; in an infrequent user every 40 verses or less. There is obviously some overlapping (the classification is for convenience of reference only). For example, Calderón, a frequent user of *pues*, has a number of early plays that have a frequency figure well over 30, and both Vélez and Mira have at least one play in the upper range of average users.

The spectrum of usage in the playwrights studied varies from 13.4 (Leiva Ramírez de Arellano's *Cuando no se aguarda*) to 108.4 (Hurtado de Mendoza's *Los empeños del mentir*). However, most of the poets included in the survey show a range of about 15-25.

Because Moreto's use of *pues* seemed unique in its high frequency, and therefore might be used to establish authenticity, I resolved to do a word-count study of *pues* in all of his plays that were accessible to me. For this task I utilized the *Comedias escogidas de D. Agustín Moreto y Cabaña*, selected by D. Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe.(11) This collection contains thirty-three plays, many of them erroneously attributed to the author of *El desdén, con el desdén*. For this reason I chose for my initial study only those *comedias* which appear in the *Primera parte de comedias de D. Agustín Moreto y Cabaña* (Madrid: Diego Díaz de la Carrera, 1654), the only collection of Moreto's plays published during his lifetime. This volume contains a *dedicatoria* by the poet himself and includes one play (*El poder de la amistad*) based on the autograph manuscript.(12) Although Fernández-Guerra has harsh words for the accuracy of the plays in this volume,(13) Ruth Lee Kennedy, in her comprehensive study of Moreto's *comedias*, concludes that those in the *Primera parte* «have little doubt attached to them.»(14)

Eleven of the twelve plays in the *Primera parte* appear in F-G. For the remaining play, *Hasta el fin nadie es dichoso*, I have used a microfilm copy of the 1676 edition of the *Primera parte* (Valencia: Benito Macé). The results of my word-count of *pues* in these twelve authentic plays are given below.

TABLE 2

Title of play	No. of verses	No. Times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1) <i>El desdén, con el desdén</i>	2929	184	15.9
2) <i>El poder de la amistad</i>	2799* [2]	189	14.8
3) <i>Antíoco y Seleuco</i>	2619	124	21.1
4) <i>De fuera vendrá</i>	3047* [1]	175	17.4
5) <i>La fuerza de la ley</i>	2922	164	17.8
6) <i>La misma conciencia acusa</i>	2980	179	16.6
7) <i>El lego del Carmen (San Franco de Sena)</i>	2908	164	17.7
8) <i>Trampa adelante</i>	3151	207	15.2
9) <i>Lo que puede la aprehensión</i>	3031	169	17.9
10) <i>Los jueces de Castilla</i>	3178* [1]	143	22.2
11) <i>El mejor amigo el rey</i>	2903	129	22.5
12) <i>Hasta el fin nadie es dichoso</i>	3017	178	16.9

The frequency range for these plays is 14.8 to 22.5, with an average of 17.7.

To the remaining twenty-two plays I have added six considered authentic by RLK (pp. 14-16): 1) *Amor y obligación*; 2) *La cena del rey Baltasar*; 3) *Fingir y amar*; 4) *Los más dichosos hermanos (Los siete durmientes)*; 5) *El más ilustre francés, San Bernardo*; and 6) *La vida de San Alejo* (all appear in the *Comedias escogidas*.) However, I have subtracted two collaborative plays, *La fuerza del natural* and *Caer para levantar*, which will not be treated. This gives a total of twenty-six plays, which I have divided into two groups. Those in Table 3 fall within the frequency range of the twelve authentic plays in Table 2; those in Table 4 do not.

TABLE 3

Title of play	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1) <i>No puede ser</i>	2984	145	20.6
2) <i>Primero es la honra</i>	2926	167	17.5
3) <i>El licenciado Vidriera</i>	3060	155	19.7
4) <i>Industrias contra finezas</i>	2930* [5]	171	17.1
5) <i>El Caballero</i>	3053* [2]	188	16.2
6) <i>El parecido en la corte</i>	2860	184	15.5
7) <i>El valiente justiciero</i>	2746	141	19.5
8) <i>El lindo don Diego</i>	3200	191	16.8
9) <i>Yo por vos, y vos por otro</i>	2709* [2]	169	16.0

10)	<i>El defensor de su agravio</i>	3043	137	22.2
11)	<i>Los engaños de un engaño</i>	2622* [11]	121	21.7
12)	<i>El secreto entre dos amigos</i>	2342* [10]	142	16.5
13)	<i>Amor y obligación</i>	2944	168	17.5
14)	<i>La cena del rey Baltasar</i>	3019	172	17.6
15)	<i>Fingir y amar</i>	3021	193	15.7
16)	<i>Los más dichosos hermanos</i>	2575	164	15.7
17)	<i>La vida de San Alejo</i>	2562	143	17.9

TABLE 4

	Title of play	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1)	<i>Las travesuras de Pantoja</i>	2110	81	26.0
2)	<i>La ocasión hace al ladrón</i>	2901* [2]	89	32.6
3)	<i>Cómo se vengan los nobles</i>	2456* [2]	73	33.6
4)	<i>Todo es enredos amor</i>	3107	103	30.2
5)	<i>La confusión de un jardín</i>	2515	70	35.9
6)	<i>La milagrosa elección de San Pío V</i>	2547* [4]	75	32.8
7)	<i>En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza</i>	2492* [1]	54	46.1
8)	<i>La traición vengada</i>	2520	84	30.0
9)	<i>El más ilustre francés, San Bernardo</i>	2956	97	30.5

Out of seventeen plays in Table 3 (those that fall within the frequency range of the plays in Table 2) the authenticity of only two (*Los engaños de un engaño*, y *confusión de un papel* and *El secreto entre dos amigos*) has been questioned. Let's take a look at what the critics have said about their authorship.

Even though Fernández-Guerra includes *Los engaños de un engaño* in his list of plays that are exclusively Moreto's (p. xlvi), he indicates some doubts that the play is exclusively his, declaring that in some parts of the work, especially the hendecasyllables, «se desconoce su pluma» (p. xxxii). Cotarelo (p. 26) classifies the work as «dudosa,» without specifying why. RLK (p. 145) finds the vocabulary similar to Moreto's «and the first scene of Act I slightly reminiscent of *El Caballero*.» Though she does not exclude the possibility of a collaborative effort («the interest in the situation in Portugal could point to Matos Fragoso»), she does not think it improbable that the work is from the pen of a youthful Moreto. Nevertheless, she includes it in the doubtful category (p. 15).

Editions of this play are limited to two undated *sueltas* of the eighteenth century, one of which was utilized for F-G. This *comedia* is among the fourteen listed by RLK (pp. 67-68) which have one or more acts that do not end

in *romance*. Professor Kennedy adds that «of this group, all except *El Caballero* are either doubtful or written in collaboration. So invariably did Moreto observe this practice of ending his acts in *romances*, that I feel that the closing of Acts I and II in *El Caballero* must be explained by a collaborating hand or else by the shears of the censor.» That Act II of *Los engaños de un engaño* ends in *silvas* (type 4 in Morley's classification, the type most used in those plays which have not been questioned) might be similarly explained, since the work has only 2342 verses, the smallest number of any of the *comedias* in Tables 2, 3, and 4 after *Las travesuras de Pantoja* (which has only 2110); and Act II, which end in *silvas*, has the smallest number (787).

The data in Table 3 show that a frequent user of *pues* wrote *Los engaños de un engaño*. Since the play has not been attributed to anyone other than Moreto, there is little justification for excluding it from his canon.

El secreto entre dos amigos first appeared in the *Parte XXXIV* of the *Comedias escogidas* (Madrid, 1670) with the title *El galán secreto* and credited to Mira de Amescua. It is for this reason that Cotarelo (p. 42) ascribes the work to the author of *El esclavo del demonio*. However, the play is listed as Moreto's in the *Tercera parte* of his works (Madrid: Zafra, 1681), admittedly an unreliable source, and also bears his name in an undated *suelta* of the eighteenth century (Barcelona: Juan Serra). La Barrera (p. 268) also lists an undated *suelta* of the play with the title *Cállate y callemos* ascribed to Montalván. F-G (p.xlii) does not doubt the work is Moreto's, in spite of the fact that the *Tercera parte* edition was printed from a «manuscrito bárbaramente mutilado y lleno de erratas.» RLK (pp. 8-9) accepts the play as Mira's.

If we compare the frequency figure for *El secreto entre dos amigos* (16.5) with the other thirty-seven plays in Tables 2, 3, and 4, we see that not only does it fall within the frequency range of the authentic plays in Table 2 but it is among the highest of all thirty-seven in its frequency of use. The author of the play is a frequent user of *pues* (like Moreto and Calderón); Mira is an infrequent user. This later statement is tentative, based on only twelve plays and three *autos*. In addition to the seven *comedias* included in Table 1, I have done word-counts on the following works by Mira:

TABLE 5

Title of the play	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1) <i>La mesonera del cielo</i>	3701	85	43.5
2) <i>La fénix de Salamanca</i>	3369	66	51.0
3) <i>La segunda de don Alvaro</i>	3065	38	80.7
4) <i>El palacio confuso</i>	3112	54	57.6
5) <i>La jura del príncipe (auto)</i>	1245	28	44.5

6) <i>La tercera de sí misma</i>	3388	63	53.8
7) <i>Nuestra Señora de los Remedios</i> (auto)	1182	24	49.2
8) <i>Pedro Telonario</i> (auto)	1028	27	38.1

The frequency range of the fifteen works of Mira is 38.1 to 80.7, with an average of 51.6. Thus, in spite of the limited number of plays, the extremely high frequency of the use of *pues* in *El secreto entre dos amigos* (16.5) seems incompatible with the relatively infrequent use by Mira in the works studied.

Six of the nine plays in Table 4 (those that fall outside the frequency range of the twelve authentic plays in Table 2) have previously been classified as apocryphal by various critics, as described below.

La ocasión hace al ladrón (*El trueque de las maletas*), a revision of Tirso's *La villana de Vallecas*, was first published in the *Parte XXVII* of the *Comedias escogidas* (Madrid, 1667), where it bears the name of Juan de Matos Fragoso. As Cotarelo points out (pp. 41-42), this was the only printing made in the seventeenth century. Not until the next century was the play published under Moreto's name, and then it was in the spurious *Verdadera tercera parte*, a collection of *sueltas* bearing a falsified title page which gave the impression of being the original *Tercera parte* printed in 1676 but which contained only one play (*La confusión de un jardín*) which had appeared in the original. As for *La ocasión hace al ladrón*, Cotarelo adds that «la razón de preferir el tardío nombre de Moreto al antiguo, como autor de la comedia, fue el verlo en las ediciones de la *Tercera parte*, que llevaban la fecha falsa de 1676, que hasta hoy se creía auténtica.» This is undoubtedly why F-G (pp. xxxviii-xxxix) did not question its authenticity. Although Morley («Studies,» p. 172) notes that N. Alonso Cortés did not believe Moreto wrote the play, he himself found the versification «perfectly characteristic of Moreto.» However, RLK (pp. 136.37) points out that in an analysis of the metrical structure those verses taken directly from Tirso's *La villana de Vallecas* must be excluded and concludes that if this is done the versification is characteristic of Matos. She further singles out internal evidence that induces her to excluded the play from Moreto's canon.

I have completed word-counts of the following plays by Matos:

TABLE 6

Title of play	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1) <i>Callar siempre es lo mejor</i>	2410	77	31.3
2) <i>La dicha por el desprecio</i>	2752	84	32.8
3) <i>El galán de su mujer</i>	3175	120	26.5
4) <i>El imposible más fácil</i>	2441	102	23.9

5) <i>Lorenzo me llamo, y carbonero de Toledo</i>	3352	102	32.9
6) <i>El sabio en su retiro y villano en su rincón</i>	3290	99	33.2
7) <i>Ver y creer</i>	3165	94	33.7
8) <i>El yerro del entendido</i>	3519	108	32.6

With a norm of 30.7 in these eight plays, Matos appears to be an average user of *pues*. If we subtract from the 2930 verses of *La ocasión hace al ladrón* the 839 verses taken verbatim from *La villana de Vallecas*, the remaining 2964 verses show 64 uses of *pues* for an average of 32.2.(15) This figure is far closer to the average for Matos than to the average for Moreto. The data on *pues*, then, seem to substantiate the attribution of the play to Matos and support its exclusion from Moreto's canon.

Todo es enredos amor was first published in the *Parte XXXVII* of the *Comedias escogidas* (Madrid, 1671) and credited to Diego de Figueroa y Córdoba. As with *La ocasión hace al ladrón*, the play was not attributed to Moreto until the following century when it was included in the same edition of the fraudulent *Verdadera tercera parte*. La Barrera (p. 160) notes that the work was subsequently published a number of times in *sueeltas*, sometimes under Figueroa's name, sometimes under Moreto's. F-G (pp. xxi-xxii, note a) seems convinced that the play is Moreto's, although he admits the possibility of a collaborative effort and subsequently classifies the play as doubtful (p. xlvi). Morley («Studies,» p. 171) notes that although the evidence against Moreto's authorship «is far from conclusive,» the play is unusual in that it has «1) a larger proportion of *romance* and a smaller proportion of *redondillas* than any other of his *comedias*, and 2) less variety of meters than any other of his. On the other hand, it corresponds well enough to the style of the Figueroas [the brother Figueroa y Córdoba]. *Todo es enredos amor* has the versification of the very end of the *Siglo de oro*, and Moreto in no way belongs to that period.» Cotarelo (p. 43) includes the play among the «Comedias apócrifas o falsamente atribuidas a Moreto» and refers the reader to an earlier study in which he presents his reason for crediting the work to Figueroa.(16) Ada M. Coe records a number of performances of the play in Madrid between 1785 and 1791, where the piece was assigned to Figueroa.(17) I have been unable to examine any plays by don Diego alone.

La confusión de un jardín first appeared in the *Tercera parte* of Moreto's *comedias*, not the spurious one mentioned above but the real one published in Madrid in 1681 by Antonio Zafra, although really less reliable from the viewpoint of authenticity, since every one of the twelve plays included in the volume has either been placed in the doubtful category or is considered a collaborative effort. In the case of *La confusión de un jardín* F-G (p. xxxi) declares: «Hay mucha diferencia en el estilo de la primera jornada y de las dos siguientes; ... Sospecho en los dos actos, segundo y tercero, entrometimiento de otra pluma, quizá la de Figueroa.» RLK (pp. 142-43) agrees that the work may have been a collaborative one (she sees traces of Moreto's

hand in Acts II and III) but feels «the evidence is conflicting.»

Obviously, the statistics on *pues* are meaningless in collaborative works unless it is known how the collaborating *ingenios* divided up their labor.

La milagrosa elección de San Pío V, first published as Moreto's in the *Parte XXXIX* of the *Comedias escogidas* (Madrid, 1673), is attributed to Montalván in an undated *suelta* with the title *El cardenal Morón*. However, George William Bacon is convinced that this *suelta* «is nothing but a revision, by an unknown hand, of Moreto's *La milagrosa elección*.» Furthermore, Bacon feels that *El cardenal Morón* «does not read like our author's work, in spite of the fact that the reviser has inserted lines concerning King Felipe II, which bear a striking resemblance to passages in both parts of Montalván's *El segundo Séneca de España* and *Don Juan de Austria*.(18) F-G (p. xxxvii) calls the attribution to Montalván a «necia superchería de los libreros.» But RLK (p. 135) considers the play uncharacteristic of Moreto and in a later study excludes the play categorically from his canon.(19) She also notes (RLK, p. 135, no. 9) that *La milagrosa elección de San Pío V* and *El cardenal Morón* «are not identical.» She does not agree with Bacon that the latter work is a revision of the former.

A play with the title *La milagrosa elección de Pío V* was performed before the queen by Juan de Morales between October 5, 1622 and February 5, 1623 and was listed among the plays in the possession of Jerónimo Amella, a stage manager in Valencia, in 1628.(20) If this reference is to our play, as seems likely, then it cannot be Moreto's since he was born in 1618.

Besides the edition credited to Montalván, La Barrera (p. 172) lists a *suelta* by Felipe Godínez with the title *La milagrosa elección*. Both Montalván and Godínez appear, on the basis of word-counts of available plays, to be average users of *pues*, the former having an average frequency of 25.5 in eight plays and the latter, 27.8 in three plays:

TABLE 7

Godínez

	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
1) <i>Aun de noche alumbra el sol</i>	2583	112	23.1
2) <i>La traición contra su dueño</i>	2607	87	30.0
3) <i>Amán y Mardoquec</i>	2228	68	32.8

Montalván

1) <i>Ser prudente y ser sufrido</i>	2443	67	36.5
--------------------------------------	------	----	------

2) <i>La más constante mujer</i>	2821	105	26.9
3) <i>El segundo Séneca de España, I</i>	2479	82	30.2
4) <i>No hay vida como la honra</i>	2675	110	24.3
5) <i>La toquera vizcaína</i>	2886	118	24.5
6) <i>Como padre y como rey</i>	2648	127	20.9
7) <i>La doncella de labor</i>	2735	122	22.4
8) <i>Cumplir con su obligación</i>	2946	118	25.0

Based on the data for *pues*, either Godínez or Montalván seems more likely to have been the author of *La milagrosa elección de San Pío V* than Moreto.

En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza was also included in four of the five versions of the *Verdadera tercera parte*, the apocryphal eighteenth-century collection composed of *suestras* with the false date 1676. However, the play is credited to Juan de Lemus in a seventeenth-century manuscript with the title *Nadie pierda la esperanza*. Unfortunately, no one has been able to determine the identity of Lemus. At any rate, RLK (p. 127) finds that the plot and characters of the *comedia* are not at all typical of the author of *El desdén, con el desdén* and unequivocally rejects the play as Moreto's in a subsequent study.(21) The statistics for *pues* (I: 46.8; II: 51.1; III:40.1) show that in all likelihood an infrequent user of *pues* wrote this play.

La traición vengada is listed among the plays exclusively by Moreto in F-G (p. xlvii), but Cotarelo (p. 43) affirms the work is Lope's *Tanto hagas cuanto pagues*. Angel González Palencia, in his introduction to the Academy edition of *Tanto hagas*, believes that Moreto did no more than modify Lope's play a little.(22) A play with the title *Tanto hagas cuanto pagues* was performed before Philip IV before November 18, 1625(23) and published in the *Parte XXV* of Lope (Barcelona, 1631). This play, which appeared in the aforementioned real (but unreliable) *Tercera parte* (1681) with the title *La traición vengada*, cannot be Moreto's since the play was represented when he was only seven years old.(24) However, it is uncertain who has legitimate claim to the play. With the title *No hay plazo que no llegue ni deuda que no se pague* it is credited to Jacinto Cordero, who was only nineteen when the play was staged in 1625. Whether Cordero was writing plays at that tender age I do not know.

According to La Barrera (p. 280) the play is attributed to Rojas Zorrilla by Hartzenbusch, but it is not mentioned by either Cotarelo(25) or Mac-Curdy(26) in their bibliographical works on Rojas.

MB (pp. 563-64) do not believe the extant text is Lope's. At this stage there is no way of knowing who wrote the work. The data on *pues* tell us that an average user probably wrote it.

The remaining three plays in Table 4 (*Las travesuras de Pantoja, Cómo se vengan los nobles*, and *El más ilustre francés, San Bernardo*) have not, to my knowledge, been questioned. However, at least one act of each play is suspect, in my opinion, because of an unusually low frequency for *pues* (remember that infrequent users show high figures for *pues*). Let's look at

the statistic for these three plays by acts:

<i>Las travesuras de Pantoja</i> <i>Cómo se vengan los nobles</i> <i>El más ilustre francés</i>								
No. of verses			No times <i> pues</i> used			Freq. of use of <i> pues</i>		
III	II	I	I	II	III	I	II	III
692	696	721	28	33	20	24.7	21.1	36.0
793	882	783	29	28	16	27.3	31.5	48.9
1098	985	873	31	48	18	35.4	20.5	48.5

The twenty-seven unquestioned Moretian plays in Tables 3 and 4 show a frequency range of 14.8 to 22.5. By acts they range from 12.7 (Act II of *El poder de la amistad*) to 29.4 (Act I of *De fuera vendrá*). The third act of the three plays above (especially of the last two) seems abnormally low in comparison with these twenty-seven. However, until a more detailed study can be made of them they will have to be considered Moreto's. In the meantime I have some comments on two of them.

First, in *El más ilustre francés* appears a stylistic device that I have not seen in any of Moreto's comedias: a lexical enjambement of the kind used by Fray Luis de León in his «Canción de la vida solitaria:» «Y mientras miserable-/ mente se están los otros abrasando ...»(27) The author of Act III of *El más ilustre francés* also divides an adverb ending in *-mente* at the end of a line:

Ya el cochero el tiento toma
a la rueda, que extremada-
mente usa de su oficio,

(Parte XI, Comedias escogidas, p. 154v)

My other comments concern *Cómo se vengan los nobles*, which no one has directly challenged. But RLK (p. 157), discussing the poetic inferiority of the work, states: «The few flights of fancy that he [Moreto] attempted are more gongoristic than is usual in his work» and adds that «these sound more like Matos Fragoso than Moreto.»

Another unusual aspect of *Cómo se vengan los nobles* is the use of *silva de consonantes* (aA, bB, cC, etc.), which Morley («Studies,» p. 141) classifies as type 1. This type of *silva*, according to RLK (p. 67) is quite rare in Moreto, appearing in only five plays: *La negra por el honor*, *Sin honra no hay valentía*, *En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza*, *La confusión de un jardín*, and *Cómo se vengan los nobles* (The first two are not included in F-G). Professor Kennedy adds that «the first three are, in all probability, not Moreto's; the fourth, in Fernández-Guerra's opinion is a collaboration;

and the last contains only ten lines.» However, these ten lines in *silvas* could be the vestige of a longer passage. Ramiro is left alone on stage after the king's departure (their dialogue is in *décimas*), and the scene following Ramiro's monologue in *silvas* is in *romances*.

The low frequency of the use of *pues* in the play (33.6), especially in Act III (48.9), does not seem characteristic of Moreto. This, plus the use of *silva* type 1 in Act II and the gongorism noted by Kennedy, does, in my opinion, cast a shadow of doubt on the authenticity of this play. Finally, it is perhaps worth noting that the frequency for *pues*, while unlike Moreto's authentic plays, corresponds perfectly to those of Matos Fragoso (see Table 6).

In addition to the plays in Table 2, 3, and 4, I have done a word-count of *Santa Rosa del Perú*, (28) which first appeared in the *Parte XXXVI* of the *Comedias escogidas* (Madrid, 1671) and later in the *Parte segunda* of Moreto's plays (Valencia: Macé, 1676). RLK (pp. 151-52) notes that the reader of the *Parte XXXVI* is advised by the editor that Moreto had completed the first two acts before he died in October of 1669 and that don Pedro Francisco de Lanini y Sagredo wrote the third act to complete the work. Professor Kennedy adds that «in versification there is nothing to distinguish the third act from the other two, but it is more gangling in construction than those which precede.» She also adduces internal evidence that does not correspond to Moreto's ethical outlook. James A. Castañeda also sees the work of another hand in Act II and feels that «the flamboyance and desultory nature of the principal action are also atypical.»(29)

Just as with the versification, there is nothing about the use of *pues* that distinguishes Act III from the other two. In fact, the three acts are remarkably similar in this respect, as the following figures show:

No. of verses			No. times <i>pues</i> used			Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>		
I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III
981	1006	1136	50	53	58	19.6	19.0	19.6

The only works by Lanini that I have been able to examine (*La batalla de las Navas* and Act III of *Antonio Roca*(30) indicate a high frequency for *pues* similar to Moreto's:

	No. of verses	No. times <i>pues</i> used	Freq. of use of <i>pues</i>
<i>La batalla de la navas</i>	3465	140	24.7
<i>Antonio Roca</i> (Act III)	<u>964</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>17.5</u>
Total	4429	195	22.7

SUMMARY

In this study I have dealt with thirty-nine plays associated with the name of Agustín Moreto (twelve in Table 2, seventeen in Table 3, nine in Table 4 and *Santa Rosa del Perú*). Five of these have been definitively removed from his theater:

Play	Author
1) <i>La ocasión hace al ladrón</i>	Matos Fragoso
2) <i>Todo es enredos amor</i>	D. Figueroa
3) <i>La milagrosa elección de San Pío V</i>	Montalván? (Godínez?)
4) <i>En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza</i>	Lemus?
5) <i>La traición vengada</i>	Cordero?

Moreto is credited with the first two acts of *Santa Rosa del Perú* and an undetermined part of *La confusión de un jardín*.

Of the remaining thirty-two plays, twelve (those in the *Primera parte* of 1654) form what Castañeda calls «the nucleus for his canon.» These twelve works show a frequency range for *pues* of 14.8 to 22.5 (see Table 2). By acts they range from 12.7 (Act II of *El poder de la amistad*) to 29.4 (Act I of *De fuera vendrá*).

Of the balance of the plays, twenty in number, fifteen not only fall within the frequency range of the twelve authentic plays in Table 2 but are also considered to be Moreto's.

Two plays (*Los engaños de un engaño* and *El secreto entre dos amigos*) fall well within the frequency range of the *comedias* in Table 2, but the first has been rejected as uncharacteristic of Moreto and the second has been removed to the theater of Mira de Amescua. Moreto's claim to both should, in my opinion, be reexamined in the light of the data on *pues*, the first because of its uncommonly high frequency for *pues* and the second because only Moreto's name has been linked to it and the reasons heretofore given for rejecting it seem a bit vague.

Three plays (*Las travesuras de Pantoja*, *Cómo se vengan los nobles*, and *El más ilustre francés*), all considered authentic by RLK, fall outside the frequency range of the plays in Table 2. The third acts of *Cómo se vengan los nobles* and *El más ilustre francés*, with low frequencies of 48.9 and 48.5, respectively, are the most atypical.

Professor Kennedy lists thirty-three plays exclusively by Moreto.(31) Three of these (*El Eneas de Dios*, *El hijo obediente* and *No puede mentir el cielo*) were not accessible for this study. Twenty-seven of the remaining thirty (twelve in Table 2 and fifteen in Table 3) have a frequency range of 14.8 to 22.5.

NOTES

1. *Language as Choice and Chance* (Groningen: P. Noordhoff, 1956), p. 12.
2. Richard W. Bailey, «Statistics and Style: A Historical Survey,» included in *Statistics and Style*, edited by Richard W. Bailey and Lubomír Dolezel (New York: American Elsevier, 1969), pp. 217-36, discusses the key works by Western scholars in the field of statistical stylistics.
3. For an extensive bibliography see Louis T. Milic, *Stylistics: A Preliminary Bibliography* (New York: Columbia University, 1965); Richard W. Bailey and Lubomír Dolezel, *An Annotated Bibliography of Statistical Stylistics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1968); and the bibliography included in Nils Erik Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics* (The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1973), pp. 149-76.
4. «The Detection of Personality in Literature,» *PMLA*, 20 (1905), 315.
5. «Objective Criteria for Judging Authorship and Chronology in the *Comedia*,» *Hispanic Review*, 5 (1937), 282.
6. There are several lexical inventories, two on Alarcón by Serge Denis: *La langue de J. R. de Alarcón. Contribution à l'étude du langage dramatique de la comedia espagnole* and *Lexique du théâtre de J. R. de Alarcón* (both published in Paris: E. Droz, 1943); and one on Lope by Carlos Fernández Gómez, *Vocabulario completo de Lope de Vega*, 3 vols. (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1971). A lexical inventory of Calderón's works is being prepared, according to Karl-Hermann Körner, «El uso de los tiempos verbales en *La vida es sueño* (auto),» in *Hacia Calderón. Coloquio angloamericano. Exeter 1969* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), p. 105. Hans Flasche has contributed a number of studies on the lexicon and the syntax of Calderón (see *Calderón de la Barca Studies*, Jack H. Parker and Arthur M. Fox, General Editors, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971, pp. 87-88, 217-218). More recent articles by Professor Flasche include «Consideraciones sobre la sintaxis condicional en el lenguaje poético de Calderón (a + infinito) (Contribución descriptiva a la Gramática Histórica),» in *Hacia Calderón. Coloquio angloamericano. Exeter 1969*, pp. 93-103; «La sintaxis pronominal y la forma dramática en las obras de Calderón,» in *Hacia Calderón. Segundo coloquio angloamericano. Hamburgo 1970* (Berlin-New York, 1973), pp. 201-15; «Conjunción y contexto: Contenido semántico y valor estructural de 'con que,' 'conque' en el lenguaje de Calderón,» *Hispanic Review*, 41 (1973), 231-43; «Key Words in Calderón's Tragedy,» *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 25 (1974), 294-306. Also in *Hacia Calderón. Coloquio angloamericano. Exeter 1969* are two articles, the previously cited study by Körner and one by Manfred Engelbert, «Etimologías calderonianas,» pp. 113-22.
7. For information on studies of word frequency applied to literary stylistics see Gustav Herdan, *The Advanced Theory of Language as Choice and Chance* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1966); C. B. Williams, *Style and Vocabulary: Numerical Studies* (New York: Hafner, 1970); and the bibliography cited in note 3, particularly the second item, Section V: «Problems in Chronology and Disputed Authorship.» There is at least one word-frequency concordance although it is not a comparative study. It is an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Andrew L. Romeo (Tulane, 1950): «Don Juan Manuel's 'Los enxiemplos del conde Lucanor e de Patronio' together with a Total Word-frequency Concordance.»
8. Throughout this study only the frequency of the use of *pues* concerns me. It might be of value in another study to determine whether there is a significant variation in the use of *pues* at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of a verse. For example, Calderón uses *pues* to end verses far more than Moreto even though his total average frequency is less. How frequently

various dramatists use the different meanings of *pues* might also prove worthwhile. Serge Denis, *Lexique du théâtre de J. R. de Alarcón*, p. 575, divides Alarcón's use of *pues* into the following categories: 1) Narrative, 2) Interrogative («Renforce une affirmation, après interrog,» and «comme mot de liaison et marquant la surprise»), 3) Introduces a conclusion, 4) Causal («sans *que* conj.»), and 5) «dans les monologues un des éléments de liaison essentiels du raisonnement intérieur.»

9. As with all the statistics on *pues* in this study, prose letters have been excluded from the word counts. Songs are included but not incomplete verses nor verses entirely in another language. The frequency of use in the final column is determined by dividing the total number of verses in a particular play by the number of times *pues* is used. For example, under the first listing in Table I (*El remedio en la desdicha* of Lope), the figure 35.3 means that the *Fénix* employs *pues* an average of once every 35.3 verses. For the sake of brevity I have omitted an enumeration of the editions of all the plays used to compile the various tables in this study.

10. Raymond R. MacCurdy, «Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla,» *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 9 (1974), 7-9, argues against the attribution of this play to Rojas, basing his opinion on various aspects of language, style, versification, and dramaturgy. The plays listed here and others credited to Rojas which I have been able to study reveal an extremely wide variation in the use of *pues*. I plan to investigate this problem in a future study.

11. *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, 39 (Madrid: Sucesores de Hernando, 1922). This is a reprint (Fernández-Guerra's «Discurso preliminar» is dated November 30, 1856). All references to this reprint will appear in the text and will be cited as F-G. An asterisk indicates that verses supplied by Fernández-Guerra and also those entirely in another language have been excluded from the word-counts (the number of excluded verses appears in parentheses). This is one of the reasons why the total number of verses I give for a particular play may differ from the number given by Morley, «Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the *Siglo de Oro*. Alarcón and Moreto,» *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, 7 (1918), 131-73. Other reasons are Morley's custom of excluding from his analyses songs that are repeated and counting incomplete verse forms as complete. In some cases the difference between the totals I give and those given by Morley is due to printing errors. But in others, such as *El desdén, con el desdén*, *Industrias contra finezas*, *El lindo don Diego*, etc., I can only conclude that there was a simple error in counting. Future references to Morley's article will be included in the text and will be cited as «Studies.» For five of the plays in F-G the following critical editions have been substituted: 1) *El desdén, con el desdén*, ed. Francisco Rico (Madrid: Castalia, 1971); 2) *El lego del Carmen (San Franco de Sena)*, ed. Florian Smieja (Salamanca: Anaya, 1970); 3) *El parecido en la corte*, ed. Juana de José Prades (Salamanca: Anaya, 1965); 4) *El valiente justiciero*, ed. Frank P. Casa (Salamanca: Anaya, 1971); 5) *El lindo don Diego*, ed. Frank P. Casa and Berislav Primorac (Madrid: Cátedra, 1977).

12. The autograph manuscript of a second play in the *Primera parte*, *El parecido en la corte*, was believed by La Barrera and Fernández-Guerra to be in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. The former, in his *Catálogo del teatro antiguo español* (Madrid, 1860), pp. 276-77, states that both this play and *Oponerse a las estrellas* (a collaborative effort with Matos Frago and Martínez) appeared to be autographs. F-G (p. xxxix) declares simply that one of the five manuscripts of *El parecido en la corte* (all with the shortened title *El parecido*) which are in the Biblioteca Nacional is the autograph. However, Kennedy, «Manuscripts Attributed to Moreto,» *Hispanic Review*, 4 (1936), 324 and 330, after a careful examination of the manuscripts concerned, concludes that the only plays in Moreto's hand are *El poder de la amistad* and *El príncipe perseguido* (written in collaboration with Belmonte and Martínez). Future references to La Barrera's

Catálogo will be cited in the text as La Barrera.

13. He finds all the plays «plagadas de erratas indescifrables, de supresiones que truncan el sentido, de absurdos increíbles» (p. xxviii).

14. *The Dramatic Art of Moreto* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1932), p. 9. Henceforth, references to this work will appear in the text and will be cited as RLK.

With regard to the authenticity of the plays in the *Primera parte*, it should be noted that Menéndez Pelayo considered *Los jueces de Castilla* sufficiently close to the lost play by Lope of the same title (mentioned in the second *Peregrino* list) that he included it in Vol. 7 of the *Obras de Lope de Vega*. In his «Estudio preliminar» to this volume (pp. clxxvii-clxxxix) he presents his reasons for including Moreto's work in the *Obras* of Lope. Pedro Henríquez Ureña, «*Los jueces de Castilla*,» *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 6 (1944), 285-86, supports Menéndez Pelayo's views. However, Américo Castro and Hugo Rennert, *Vida de Lope de Vega* (New York: Las Américas, 1968), p. 470, state: «La comedia original de Lope no existe; la que se publica en Academia, VII, es la bella comedia de Moreto.» Cotarelo, *La bibliografía de Moreto* (Madrid: Tip. de la *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 1927), p. 30, declares: «No es de creer que Moreto llevase su atrevimiento al extremo de apropiarse casi íntegra una comedia ajena. La comedia de Lope, hoy perdida, sería quizás el modelo de la de Moreto; pero no parece seguro dudar que el texto por el impreso no sea suyo.» RLK (p. 114, note 2) calls attention to the unusually high percentage of *redondillas* (67%) and the presence of sixty verses of *arte mayor* in Act II, which «finds no parallel in Moreto's entire theater.» Professor Kennedy also notes «that the comic element is not fused with the main plot as ordinarily happens in his theater.» S. G. Morley and C. Bruerton, *Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega* (Madrid: Gredos, 1968), p. 487, conclude that Moreto adapted Lope's play slightly, and this could explain why the versification does not agree with either Lope's or Moreto's. Interestingly enough, verses of *arte mayor*, mentioned by Kennedy as absent from Moreto's works, are also absent from Lope's, according to Morley and Bruerton, p. 184. As for the unusually high percentage of *redondillas* (and the correspondingly small percentage of *romance*), Morley («*Studies*,» p. 162) feels that the former reflect «some special effort» by Moreto that has to do with «the archaic nature» of the play.

In the other authentic plays in Tables 2 and 3 the number of uses of *pues* to end verses varies from zero (*Hasta el fin nadie es dichoso*, *El lindo don Diego*, and *Amor y obligación*) to six (*El parecido en la corte*) with an average of a little over two per play. The only strophes that contain such end uses are *redondillas* and *romances*, the former outnumbering the latter by more than two to one. If Moreto made «some special effort» to use *redondillas*, as Morley suggests, one might expect a corresponding increase in the end uses of *pues*. The eight such uses in *Los jueces de Castilla* are the largest number of any of Moreto's plays. Lope, on the other hand, does not often use *pues* to end verses. In thirty-five plays representative of his long literary productivity he does not use *pues* more than twice to end verses (in four plays). Seven of the thirty-five plays have only one such use while the great majority (twenty-four plays) have no end uses at all. The fact that *Los jueces de Castilla* has eight verses that end in *pues* seems to indicate a pattern of usage at odds with Lope's.

Future references to the works mentioned above of Castro and Rennert, Cotarelo, and Morley and Bruerton will be given in the text and will be cited as Castro and Rennert, Cotarelo, and MB, respectively.

15. Tirso is also an average user of *pues* (see Table 1). *La villana de Vallecas* has 127 uses of *pues* in 3969 verses for an average of 31.3. This figure is remarkably close to the average for *La ocasión hace al ladrón*, both before and after subtracting almost 30% of the verses (those

taken word for word from *La villana*).

16. «Dramáticos españoles del siglo XVII: Los hermanos Figueroa y Córdova,» *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 6 (1919), 183-87.
17. *Catálogo bibliográfico y crítico de las comedias anunciadas en los periódicos de Madrid desde 1661 hasta 1819* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935), p. 217.
18. «The Life and Dramatic Works of doctor Juan Pérez de Montalván (1602-1638),» *Revue Hispanique*, 26 (1912), 437-38.
19. «La milagrosa elección de San Pío V,» *The Modern Language Review*, 31 (1936), 405-08.
20. Hugo A. Rennert, «Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama,» *The Modern Language Review*, 3 (1907-08), 47.
21. «Manuscripts Attributed to Moreto,» pp. 317-18.
22. *Obras de Lope de Vega, publicadas por la Real Academia Española (nueva edición)* (Madrid, 1930), p. lvii.
23. Rennert, «Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama,» p. 54.
24. See Vern G. Williamsen, «Lope de Vega: A 'Missing' Parte and Two 'Lost' Comedias,» *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 25 (1973), 44.
25. *Don Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla, noticias biográficas y bibliográficas* (Madrid, 1911).
26. Raymond R. MacCurdy, *Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla: Bibliografía crítica, Cuadernos bibliográficos*, 18 (Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1965).
27. *La poesía de Fray Luis de León*, ed. Oreste Macrí (Salamanca: Anaya, 1970), p. 223.
28. I have used a microfilm copy of a *suelta* (Valladolid: Alonso del Riego, 17 ?).
29. *Agustín Moreto* (New York: Twayne, 1974), pp. 48-49.
30. MB (p. 422) state: «El tercer acto es definitivamente de Lanini y Sagredo.
31. Castañeda, p. 35, summarizes the stages in the refinement of Moreto's canon by Professor Kennedy.