

DISGUISE, IDENTITY, AND FEMALE CROSS-DRESSING IN
SELECTED WORKS OF TIRSO DE MOLINA

By

Robert L. Turner III

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Spanish

August, 2006

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Edward H. Friedman

Victoria A. Burrus

Earl E. Fitz

Terryl W. Hallquist

Copyright© 2006 by Robert L Turner III
All Rights Reserved

To Shell

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
Chapter	
I. TIRSO DE MOLINA: DISGUISE AND IDENTITY	1
II. REALITY AND ILLUSION IN <i>LA CELOSA DE SÍ MISMA</i> : THE DOUBLING OF IDENTITY	54
III. <i>EL CELOSO PRUDENTE</i> : THE DANGER OF DISGUISE	98
IV. <i>DON GIL DE LAS CALZAS VERDES</i> AND THE BATTLE FOR IDENTITY	144
V. LOSS OF SELF IN <i>EL AMOR MÉDICO</i> : UNRESTRAINED DISGUISE	187
CONCLUSION	223
BIBLIOGRAPHY	242

CHAPTER I

TIRSO DE MOLINA: DISGUISE AND IDENTITY

The gap between the real and the perceived has been a constant source of fascination and frustration for human beings. The nether land between what “is” and what we “think is” introduces vexing questions about the nature of reality itself, about identity, and about our ability to accurately and meaningfully name what we see. It is, in fact, a source of anxiety, since it introduces an element of chaos into our perceptions. The theatrical use of disguise, deception, and misidentification is a manifestation of this gap and is hardly a new invention. Its practice was as common in Spain’s early modern period as it is today: “With regard to the seventeenth-century in Spain, the themes of deception and illusion also gain particular significance, and their most manifest expression in theatre is in the disguise” (McDonald 58). I will examine how one playwright, Gabriel Téllez, better known as Tirso de Molina, manipulates reality and perception to examine and critique the role of women in the Spain of his era.

Tirso began writing *comedias* in the first decade of the seventeenth century, at a time when Lope de Vega was already well established, and Lope’s new invention, the *comedia nueva*, had already gained dominance on the Spanish stage. Lope’s new style, as explained in his *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*, was comprised of three-act plays, usually about 3000 lines long, written in various types of verse. Lope, and those who followed, focused on a unity of action. This action commonly included a secondary plot, which was frequently an echo or parody of the central theme. Tirso distinguished

himself, not through stylistic innovations, as did Lope, but in the depth that he gave his characters. He is especially noted for his development of female characters, the focus of this study.

In choosing to center my research on Tirso's women characters, specifically on disguise and cross-dressing, I follow in the steps of P. R. K. Halkhoree, who also sees Tirso's use of disguise and cross-dressing as a "means by which Tirso explores the problem of identity and personality" (39). Tirso de Molina exhibits the unique ability to explore the baroque concepts of reality and illusion while still creating vibrant and profound characters. Melveena McKendrick observes that

[h]uman vanity and gullibility, the capacity of human beings to deceive themselves and others, the lack of honesty and realism in the way man and society conduct their affairs, are all strongly predicated in Tirso's comedies, but the attractive thing about them is that they never preach and rarely judge.... His trump card was his ability to produce memorable characters. (*Theatre in Spain* 117)

I examine here how four of Tirso's female characters devise various forms of disguise in order to reach their goals, and what this tells us about self, identity, and the complex power relations of human society.

Despite Tirso de Molina's extensive use of female disguise and cross-dressing, his best known works do not make use of this technique. *El burlador de Sevilla* and *El condenado por desconfiado* are the two plays which are generally considered to be Tirso's masterworks. The first is acclaimed for its creation of the Don Juan myth, and the second for its consideration of the relationship between divine foreknowledge and free will. In fact, these two works, in some ways, have served to push Tirso's other plays into undeserved obscurity. At first, it may seem that since *El burlador de Sevilla* and *El condenado por desconfiado* are the subjects of significant study, Tirso's other plays

should benefit from this attention. Unfortunately this is not the case. One of the causes is the difficulty in assigning the origin of these two plays to Tirso, a subject with which I will deal in greater depth later. The other problem is that each play, in its own way, leads scholars away from Tirso rather than towards him.

In the case of *Burlador*, the play has frequently been studied in relation to other versions of the Don Juan myth, for example those of Molière, Zorrilla, or Byron. Since this approach requires multi-lingual research with texts crossing a number of centuries, it becomes easy to overlook other works by Tirso. In addition, as the foundational text, there may be a tendency to examine the evolution of the Don Juan myth itself rather than the text which brought him to life. The problem with *Condenado* is similar. The criticism has generally focused on the religious debate—the debate between free will and predetermination—which has been perceived as the heart of the play. The critical discussion of this play is mostly concerned with the concepts that Tirso addresses and, for the most part, does not examine this play in connection with other works by Tirso. Comparative studies which include this play tend to link it to other authors who also venture into the debate between predetermination and free will, and not to Tirso's other plays.

In comparison to the other two theatrical luminaries of the period, Tirso has been consistently understudied. While the MLA database lists more than thirteen hundred articles and books dealing with Lope de Vega and his works, and over two thousand entries for Calderón de la Barca, a search for Tirso on December 2005 returns only six hundred seventy-nine entries, a fraction of the other two. Of these entries, more than a quarter deal with either *El burlador de Sevilla* or *El condenado por desconfiado*. The

question of why Tirso has received so much less critical attention than either Lope de Vega or Calderón de la Barca is a difficult one and is, of course, impossible to answer completely. However, there are a number of elements which I believe have contributed to Tirso's relative under representation within the field of *comedia* studies.

Lope de Vega, as the originator of the *comedia nueva*, along with his high profile life and copious production, has long been the subject of interest. His genius and creativity place him as the founding father of Spain's greatest era of theatrical production. As such, he clearly merits the attention, critical and popular, which is no more than his due. In a similar vein, Calderón has the renown of being the last great playwright of the period. His elaborate creations capped the baroque era. In addition, the privilege of being able to write almost exclusively for the palace after he entered the priesthood in 1651 (McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 140) gave him a great advantage over his contemporaries.

Tirso falls as a middle point between the originator Lope and the culminating work of Calderón de la Barca, and despite his talents, he has often been perceived as either an imitator of Lope (McKendrick places him in the school of Lope, *Theatre in Spain* 115, despite her admiration for his work), or as part of a progression of playwrights who led to the apogee of the art in the works of Calderón. In the second instance, he is considered to be a stepping-stone leading to greater works (E. Wilson 86-87). In addition, while Tirso was popular, he never received the acclaim that Lope and Calderón did. Although McKendrick points out that he ruled the stage with Lope in the early 1620s (*Theatre in Spain* 115), for various reasons, which we will examine shortly, he did not enjoy the long-term dominance of the stage which Lope and Calderón did.

A second factor to consider, when we ponder Tirso's lack of critical attention, is his relatively limited production when compared to Lope and Calderón. Lope de Vega produced an astounding number of plays. According to McKendrick, Lope's production was claimed to be over 1500 plays, although she believes that eight hundred is a more accurate estimate (*Theatre in Spain* 72). Of those, roughly four hundred have survived. Calderón wrote somewhere in the neighborhood of one hundred eighty *comedias*. Tirso claimed four hundred plays, but the actual number of his surviving plays is in dispute: fifty-five, according to Xavier Fernández (2); sixty by the count of Urzáiz Tortajada (625); eighty according to McKendrick (*Theatre in Spain* 72); eighty-eight by the count of Blanca de los Ríos; and eighty-six via Henry Sullivan ("Tirso de Molina" 811). Even the higher figure of remaining texts presented by Ríos only gives Tirso twenty percent of Lope's production. This simple disparity in numbers can account, in part, for the lack of attention that Tirso has received. Even so, this is certainly not the only factor, since Calderón has actually been the subject of more studies than has Lope in this decade (one hundred thirty-three versus one hundred twenty-three; Tirso has had only twenty-four), according to the MLA database.

This disparity in actual production by the playwrights is partially linked to the political circumstances of Tirso's life. In 1625, Tirso ran afoul of powerful government ministers, including the Count-Duke Olivares.¹ As a result, he was banished from Madrid and ordered not to write any more *comedias*. From this point on, he wrote few plays until his death in 1648. He did continue writing, however, notably a history of the Mercedarian Order; it also appears that these political roadblocks effectively kept his production off

¹ See McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 115, Penado Rey 44-46, Wade 214, and Hernández García 97 for more details.

the stage (Galoppe 49-57). With the active antagonism of powerful figures and his physical absence from Madrid for more than a decade (he did return for four years before he was once again exiled), it is not surprising that Tirso did not produce more, or that what he did produce did not receive due recognition. In addition, we learn from José Carlos de Macedo Soares that, after his death, Tirso was virtually forgotten for the next one hundred and fifty years (671). Germán Vega seconds this argument (180-82). It was, in fact, not until 1834 that Agustín Durán printed a critical edition of Tirso's works, after *El burlador de Sevilla* was discovered by other European countries (Macedo Soares 672-73). This lack of exposure means that Tirso had to be "recovered" and justified in the face of the canonical stature of Lope and Calderón. For this reason, Esmeralda Gijón states, rather defensively, in 1949: "A los autores que pudiéramos llamar de segunda línea los abarca, contiene y supera con mucho, adelantándose a las innovaciones de todos y condensando todos sus matices con un proteísmo desconcertante" (489). Even more than a century after his rediscovery, Tirso lacked the stature of Lope or Calderón and needed justification to be counted among the great writers of his time.

Furthermore, the lack of accurate biographical information, as well as a number of difficulties in attribution, makes it difficult to speak with certainty when attempting to relate historical/biographical details to literary content. The debate concerning the birth of Tirso, some of his biographical data, and the attribution of his plays remains a bone of contention. One of the latest studies places his birth in Madrid, on or about the March 24, 1579 (Vázquez Fernández 13), contradicting Blanca de los Ríos, who argues that he was born in 1584 (Vázquez Fernández 26), and Manuel Penado, who places his birth in 1581 (Vázquez Fernández 27). Even in studies as recent as Galoppe's (2001) and

McKendrick's (1992), we still see disagreements on Tirso's year of birth: 1579 and 1584, respectively. In fact, this debate has not really progressed much in the past fifty years. Little is known about his parentage, although we know that he had a sister who became a nun (Solà-Solé 11-13). Tirso likewise entered the Mercedarian order as a young man, being ordained a priest in 1606 (Urzáiz Tortajada 625), and his works reflect his strong moral/religious sensibilities.

The same problem occurs with attribution. As recently as 1997, James Parr has published an article that discusses the authorship of certain Tirso plays. The fact that Tirso's two best-known plays have been the source of debate concerning authorship has, of course, not helped increase interest in other works by Tirso. We know that he entered the Order of Mercy in 1600 or 1601 and wrote his first play, *El vergonzoso en palacio*, in 1605 or 1606 (Wade 213). In 1606, he was ordained a priest and was exiled to Aragon in 1614 (Urzáiz Tortajada 625). He spent some time in Santo Domingo, in the present day Dominican Republic, probably in 1616, for a period of two years (E. Wilson 86), although there is some uncertainty about the exact dates. He was expelled from Madrid in 1625, returning in 1634, and made Prior of the Order in Trujillo in 1626 and then Prior in Soria in 1647 (Wade 220), dying in February 1648 (Penado 47).

Finally, Tirso's theater has some areas of weakness. There are a number of problems with versification and rhyme, although Fernández blames this on the versions we have, rather than faulting Tirso himself (1-9). In addition, his plots tend to be very complex (e.g., *El vergonzoso en palacio* or *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*), and while this can lead to masterpieces, when he fails the plays seem too full and hyperkinetic (McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 117-18). Other difficulties appear in his plots, especially

lack of verisimilitude, awkward endings, and a tendency to place too much trust in the audience to understand his plot structure (Vossler 40). When this is the case, the plays become difficult to follow and the extraneous characters act as distractions. Furthermore, his characters frequently inhabit a world that is exotic (McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 115) rather than Lope's more prosaic world. While this is often a strength, Tirso creates situations that at times seem strange and unrealistic; e.g., *El melancólico*—where both the protagonist and his love interest are secretly nobles of the highest rank, or *El pretendiente al revés*—where the duke and duchess use the two lead characters as virtual puppets. This reliance on odd twists of fate at times distracts from the theme of the play.

Despite these problems, there are a number of aspects in the *comedia* in which Tirso is unsurpassed. The general consensus is that Tirso's use of humor, especially irony, is the best of all *comedia* authors. He is especially noted for the strength and incredible power of his female characters. Carmela Hernández García states that “Sus mujeres no son enternecedoras como las de Lope, ni orgullosas como las de Calderón, sino mucho más naturales, atrevidas, apasionadas, y resueltas” (97). Sofía Eiroa Rodríguez notes: “destacan las heroínas tirsianas en sus capacidades enredadoras y proteicas” (27). Tirso is also admired for his more liberal presentation of women in his theater (Hernández García 80), a tendency which may have led to the previous lack of interest in his works (Forbes 111). Furthermore, he is known for the directness and strength of his political commentaries, which is what likely led to his exile (Forbes 113). Gerald Wade (208), José Soares (671), and Raúl Galoppe (57) compare his styling and deftness in creating believable characters to that of Shakespeare, while Karl Vossler praises his psychological insights: “Lo cierto es que en ningún otro dramático español

hallamos un tan sutil y profundo conocimiento de almas como en el gran mercedario” (42). In addition, a number of his plays are considered to be extraordinary works; including *El burlador de Sevilla* (Hesse 86), *El condenado por desconfiado* (E. Wilson 88), *La prudencia en la mujer* (McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 118), *El vergonzoso en palacio* (Casalduero 198), *Habládme en entrando* (Sullivan 263), and *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (E. Wilson 88).

In the criticism of Tirso, there is universal agreement, at least among Tirso scholars, as to his quality and status as one of the best writers of his time: “entre los autores de comedias del teatro nacional es, en mi gusto, Tirso de Molina uno de los que ofrecen una obra más cercana al sentido dramático de nuestros días” (López Estrada 305). Vossler comments: “Según Manuel de Montoliú, Tirso es el único dramaturgo español a quien pueda calificarse de hombre del Renacimiento en virtud de su profunda psicología realista e individualista” (113). Yet this praise is, at times, defensive, e.g., in the commentaries of Esmeralda Gijón (see “Concepto del honor”). Others, such as Edward Wilson, consider Tirso’s work inferior to that of Lope and Calderón, although Wilson does admit that some critics consider him better than either (87). Despite the general consensus that Tirso was a dramatist of great skill, the criticism is surprisingly sparse. The quantitative aspect of this lack has been addressed, but beyond the numerical lack, there is also a deficiency in depth and breadth:

Gran parte de la confusión radica en el hecho de que todavía no ha surgido una obra definitiva que explore la visión dramática de Tirso de Molina. Esfuerzos aislados como el de Esmeralda Gijón Zapata han resaltado el fabuloso sentido del humor de nuestro autor; otros han ido encaminados a reconstruir el árbol genealógico desconocido de Tirso de Molina, como la crítica de Blanca de los Ríos o del Padre Luis Vázquez, pero excepto crítica acertadísima sobre obras o temas sueltos, no ha aparecido esa visión de conjunto tan esperada. (Hernández García 99)

Until mid-century, Tirso criticism was focused on bio-bibliographic aspects. Perhaps the best known of this group is Blanca de los Ríos, who was a tireless advocate of Tirso and is responsible for presenting a complete edition of Tirso's works.

When we consider Tirso de Molina's *comedias*, we see clear divergences from Lope de Vega's style. While Lope's enormous production and wide selection of subjects make it difficult to narrowly characterize his work, Melveena McKendrick is certainly correct when she stresses the commonplace prosaic nature of Lope's plays (*Theatre in Spain* 114). In general, we can say that Lope's plays occupy a realistic, mundane, world in which the personages must resolve problems common to life.² That is not to say that the situations are always believable, for example, Finea's transformation in *La dama boba*, but the characters and events are at least plausible. In contrast, Tirso de Molina seemed to delight in creating complex plots and then pushing the resulting confusion to extremes. McKendrick states that, in comparison to Lope, Tirso's plays inhabit a "bizarre" (*Theatre in Spain* 115) world. Certainly the presence of the ghostly *Comendador* in *El burlador de Sevilla* has no place in Lope's world. Similarly, the climax of *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, in which four versions of Don Gil compete for the love of Doña Inés, is uniquely Tirsian.

Perhaps the most important distinction between Tirso de Molina's theater and that of Lope de Vega is Tirso's tendency to create extraordinarily memorable characters who defy convention. Edward Wilson comments that "[w]isdom, subtlety of mind, and sympathetic comprehension of humanity are the greatest qualities of Tirso as a dramatist"

² We, of course, need to exclude plays such as *El caballero de Olmedo* in this characterization. This play, based on an existing *romance*, makes use of mystical/supernatural elements as part of a literary meta-narrative in which the protagonist, Don Alonso, is caught up in the telling of a story with a pre-determined ending, which he cannot avoid.

(88). He later observes that Tirso would deliberately present stock characters with unexpected traits “in order to make, more forcefully than he could otherwise do, points of moral, social, and political criticism” (95). William Forbes contends that

more than any other dramatist of his age did Tirso focus on the male/female distinction, with an eye toward questioning its most severe and rigid demarcation. This was done through multiple examples of transvestitism and supposedly «abnormal» psychological types; ... these characterizations evoke a picture of an author very much in an androgynous frame of mind, seeking to integrate his own socio-cultural expectations with a more genuine sense of moral impartiality. (116)

McKendrick states: “Indeed Tirso often strikes one as a dramatist interested above all in characterization but trapped by historical accident within what was primarily a theatre of action” (*Theatre in Spain* 118). In Tirso’s plays, then, we are presented with a greater emphasis on the personal, the individual, and the various desires and obsessions which make us individuals. McKendrick presents it this way: “Tirso brought to the Golden-Age stage an intellectual turn of mind and a psychological range and penetration absent in Lope. He was interested in the extraordinary and possessed a greater tolerance and understanding of human oddity and variety than the other dramatists” (*Theatre in Spain* 116). For example, in *La celosa de sí misma*, not only do we see the fetishistic tendencies of Don Melchor, but Tirso uses this motif to open a discussion on Golden Age marriage priorities and the problems of short sightedness.

As was previously mentioned, there is a longstanding debate over the number and chronological order of Tirso’s works. Part of this difficulty comes as the result of the lack of autograph manuscripts: there are only two, the first and third parts of *Santa Juana* (Oteiza, “Conocemos los textos” 100). Furthermore, there has been a serious lack of historical research on the texts themselves:

Las comedias de Tirso, casi en su totalidad, se leen hoy en el texto fijado por EUGENIO HARTZENBUSCH y EMILIO COTARELO hace 140 y 80 años respectivamente. Ambos editores sometieron los textos de las ediciones príncipe a un estudio minucioso y profundo, e introdujeron en ellos numerosas enmiendas. Las pocas ediciones modernas en que se acrisoló la labor crítica de Hartzenbusch y Cotarelo son casi inasequibles, y algunas de ellas albergan juicios y soluciones de dudoso valor. Nos quedan, por lo tanto, para el estudio literario y lingüístico, además de los textos fijados en las ediciones sobredichas, las dos ediciones masivas de BLANCA DE LOS RIOS en Aguilar (1946-1958) y MARIA DEL PILAR PALOMO en la B.A.E. (1970-1971). Por desgracia, ambas ediciones no se basan en una lectura directa de la príncipe, sino que reproducen los textos de Hartzenbusch y Cotarelo. Añádase a ello el hecho lamentable de que las numerosas erratas que afean el texto de Cotarelo pasaron a la edición de Blanca, que añadió las suyas, y el acervo total desembocó en la edición de Palomo, que también es bastante mendosa. (Fernández 1)

As a result, “Los textos, pues, de las comedias de Tirso se hallan en un estado de sospechosa autenticidad” (Fernández 1). In many cases, the best information available comes through the five *partes*, published versions of the plays. This provides its own difficulties, since dating the original time of composition becomes problematic. Furthermore, the second *parte* has led to a great deal of confusion since Tirso only claimed four of the twelve plays, but neglected to specify which ones were his (Bushee 97). Fernández states that *Amor y celos hacen discretos* and *Por el sótano y el torno* are universally considered to be Tirso’s (417). He adds *Esto si que es negociar* and *El condenado por desconfiado* as the other two works in the *segunda parte* written by Tirso, thus siding with Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Karl Vossler, and Donald Cruickshank (438-39), among others. Blanca Oteiza concludes: “Aunque la mayor parte del *corpus* de comedias de Tirso en las cinco partes son del Mercedario queda todavía mucho por dilucidar y, probablemente, sin solución segura en algunos casos” (“Conocemos los textos” 113).

Alice Bushee gives the following dates for the publication of the various *Partes*. *Primera Parte* (1627), *Segunda Parte* (1635), *Tercera Parte* (1634), *Cuarta Parte* (1635), and *Quinta Parte* (1636), although she believes the dates of the second and third *Partes* to be the result of a mistake on the title page (93). The tables at the end of the introduction give the believed dates of composition for the various works.

There are two major elements which I wish to consider: disguise in general and cross-dressing. The division between these two comes as a result of my focus. Rather than simply presenting the latter as a subcategory of the former, it must be viewed independently in order to address issues specific to cross-dressing. Since the protagonists in each of the plays under consideration are women, at a time when women were only allowed a limited role in society, two types of questions must be answered. The first concerns questions relating to disguise in and of itself, such as, “How does disguise function within the plot” and “What advantages does it bestow on the protagonist?” The second set asks “Why would a woman choose to disguise herself as a man?” and “What does such behavior tell us about gender identity?” I will treat each of these categories separately, starting with disguise.

To better understand how disguise functions, it is helpful to discuss the use of the differing aspects of disguise, since it is these various levels of disguise which not only allow the heroine to direct the situation to her advantage, but also to have an opportunity to act. In the plays included here, Tirso uses the misunderstandings and confusion that disguise engenders to explore such concepts as reality and illusion, personal freedom, and responsibility. He also provides insight into the constructed nature of societal roles. In

each case, the discussion stems from disguises' ability to disrupt the normal certainty that is needed to maintain societal norms.

The obvious purpose of disguise is to hide one's identity, thus freeing the individual from the identifying pattern of power: the "normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 184). However, beyond this seemingly simple answer, we see that there are a number of degrees of disguise as well as multiple permutations in its use. Commenting on this complexity, Raúl Galoppe distinguishes between mask and disguise:

Convienes en este momento discernir entre máscara y disfraz, términos que, aunque a veces relacionados y hasta superpuestos, inscriben diferentes niveles de significación. Siguiendo el razonamiento de John Lechte se puede decir que la máscara, otra instancia del velo, es capaz de ocultar una identidad pero lo hace de manera explícita. Por el contrario, el disfraz cumple con su cometido sólo en la medida que pasa inadvertido. La máscara corresponde a una ilusión del arte, por la que llegamos a sorprendernos por la similitud y la diferencia de la cosa misma; el disfraz, en cambio, nos engaña al hacernos pensar que la representación del objeto es el objeto mismo. (143)

Susan Baker echoes Galoppe:

It will be useful to distinguish among four broad classes of disguise that appear in Shakespearean drama and the relations to which each answers. In choosing a disguise, characters may do any of the following: hide their own identities without asserting any other; substitute another, already existing identity for their own; invent a specific role or persona for a specific and limited purpose; or, finally, adopt a role-personate an invented, particular identity-to be played in multiple circumstances and for multiple audience. (305)

We can further refine this by adding the category identity to the division suggested above. In the system I propose here, we will see various levels of disguise that progress in accordance to the amount of deception intended and the degree of identification of the person playing the role with the disguise.

The first level is that of a simple erasure of identity. This was a very common practice in Spain as Melveena McKendrick notes (*Women and Society* 34), and “provided women with considerable moral freedom” (Halkhoree 82; see also Perry 49n1.). The most basic example of this category is exemplified by the covering worn by Magdalena, in *La celosa de sí misma*, as she attends mass. The cloth which disguises her features and physical details is not intended to deceive, but only to avoid naming and identification. Such a covering broadcasts to the world that there is something beneath the façade to be uncovered. It is not intended to provide any sort of substitute for the person underneath. This usage does not include any assumption of new or feigned characteristics. Likewise, this erasure provides nothing to replace that which it has concealed. There is no creation of a new identity of any sort.

The following category has to be considered one of transition between that of erasure and disguise. Let us call this role-play. At this level, elements of a new role or identity are added to the previous erasure or concealment. What distinguishes this from disguise is that the elements added are obviously false and in no way eliminate the knowledge that what is being presented is not the true person. Within this category, we can include such things as stage roles, or the use of an obvious masquerade. The viewer is presented with a blatant falsehood. In Galoppe’s terms, this falls within the realm of the mask. The person underneath is still obscured, but, in this case, it is done through the imposition of other characteristics or markers that replace or obscure those which would identify the person who makes use of the role-play. At this point, we pass from enigma to misdirection. Instead of erasing identifiers and leaving the viewer with a blank slate, we are given patently false characteristics which do not lead to an identification.

Disguise introduces a new level of deception into the equation. While the first two categories are efforts to obscure the identity of the person making use of the façade, disguise is a different matter altogether. I must make clear at this point that there is a distinction between disguise in general and disguise as defined here. Disguise in general refers to all attempts to blur the identification of a person and encompasses all the specific forms of disguise mentioned here. Disguise in the more specific sense is limited to the presentation of a false face to the world. In such a case, the focus moves from the person underneath the surface covering to the face presented to the world. This focus on the exterior subscribes to a different set of criteria and goals. Disguise's primary object is to replace the original identity with a second, exterior *persona*, which has a different set of characteristics and traits. Not only does disguise obscure the person underneath, but it presents a new identity to the world, thus redefining the person or at least luring society to redefine the person. As Susan Baker observes, "to alter one's relations to other people is to alter oneself as a person" (307). This is what disguise allows, a new set of relationships. In contrast to erasure or role-play, disguise redirects the signifier-signified chain rather than breaking it. Jonathan Thacker highlights the power of disguise saying,

Self-expression ... occurs through imaginative role-play, metatheatre, which becomes a strategy for refusing to play the appropriate social role, and by extension, in a "real" world dependent on role-play for its sense of order, a means by which patriarchy's demands can be at least modified. Attempts to frustrate the dominant ideology by removing the former certainty from social role-play are the key to the forging of a new and separate selfhood. The subject position of the "I" becomes shifting and inconsistent. (47)

It is this uncertainty which stands at the center of disguise. The particular use that Thacker imagines, "imaginative role-play," involves the maintenance of a *persona* or *personae* that frees the person underneath from the naming and identifying that marks

society and maintains stability. This disruption of the order of society can be a powerful route to greater freedom for the character.

As we have seen, disguise, just like the previous two categories, has its uses and dangers. One of the problems that can arise with the use of disguise is that it is intrinsically deceptive. In contrast to erasure and role-play, which proclaim the fact that something is being hidden, disguise is not intended to be revealed. Consequently, the revelation of disguise can lead to adverse reactions or even punishment. Also important are the consequences of a partial revelation of the disguise. In such a case, the façade is broken, but the personality underneath remains obscured. In fact, we could characterize such a situation as a regression to role-play. The central difference is that, in the case of a partial revelation of disguise, there is a sense of betrayal in the discovery that the *persona* presented is a false one. This sense of betrayal is absent from role-play since the obscuring of the person beneath the mask is made explicit.

I have used the term *persona* in describing the use of disguise. In so doing, I deliberately refer to this term in the Jungian sense of the word. A disguise is the adaptation of a false face. Jung postulates that the use of *personae* is a practice that is almost universal, and he considers this to be a necessity for the smooth functioning of the human psyche. He explains this requirement in the following terms:

To present an unequivocal face to the world is a matter of practical importance: the average man— the only kind society knows anything about — must keep his nose to one thing in order to achieve anything worthwhile, two would be too much. Our society is undoubtedly set on such an ideal. It is therefore not surprising that everyone who wants to get on must take these expectations into account. Obviously no one could completely submerge his individuality in these expectations; hence the construction of an artificial personality becomes an unavoidable necessity. (*Essential Jung* 94)

In his view, the use of a *persona* is necessary in order to reduce the complexity of the human mind into a single comprehensible identity which is acceptable to the rest of society. Jung argues that only through the presentation of a complete and unbroken façade can one interact effectively with the world at large. Ira Progoff adds, “By the Persona Jung means the mask that the individual must wear in his daily intercourse in society. In this sense, life is always a masquerade to some degree” (71). Jung further refines this idea in stating: “The persona is thus a functional complex that comes into existence for reasons of adaptation or personal convenience, but is by no means identical with the individuality. The persona is exclusively concerned with the relation to objects” (*Essential Jung* 99). As Jung stresses, the *persona* is not the individual, nor is it even a faithful, if simplified, reflection of the psyche. Instead, the *persona* acts as a protective barrier that is used to present an acceptable face to the world and is formed in response to the expectations of the society in which the person lives. Progoff elaborates this concept by explaining that “[w]hat is most important about the Persona is that it represents the conscious attitude, and as such it is placed in the psyche as an opposite to the unconscious” (73). From this, we see that the *persona* is the disguise that almost all individuals use in order to be able to fit into society and to accommodate the inescapable conflicts between the demands of a society which calls for clarity and definition, and the unresolved complexities and conflicts inherent in the human mind. The *persona* provides for a private space in which the individual can exist without being exposed to society at large.

However, there are cases in which the *persona* fails to function as intended. In normal psychological situations, it acts to shield the self from the demands of society

which reject the complexities of the individual. However, when the *persona* is placed in conflict with the unconsciousness, rather than working in tandem with it, it becomes unstable. In this case, the result can be the dissolution of the façade which the individual presents to the world at large. We read in Progovff:

As it personifies the conscious attitude, the Persona must rest solidly on the unconscious, or else it will not be secure, and it may easily come into a condition in which it is particularly vulnerable to the conflict of opposites within the psyche. In such a situation, “an opposite is forced up from within; it is exactly as though the unconscious suppressed the Ego with a force equal to that which drew the Ego into the Persona.” We are then brought to the problem of the collapse of the Persona and the conditions of its re-establishment. (73)

When this occurs, the person making use of disguise is faced with either the reduction of disguise to role-play, along with the attendant difficulties associated with this change, or even the complete revelation of that which they are attempting to hide. It is important to note that, within the scope of this study, my concern is with the dissolution of the façade presented to the other characters in a play, rather than the psychological consequences that such an event would have on a real person. Consequently, when I discuss such occurrences within the works of Tirso, I will focus on the external consequences of the revelation of disguise and not of the psychic effect that said revelation might have.

The final category is that of identity. Although the distinction between disguise and identity is somewhat difficult to define, I believe that an attempt must be made.

Robert Weiman’s analysis helps explain the fine differences when he defines the split between disguise—as a tool—and identity:

[C]ross-dressed images of women as well as disguised characters at large can all be seen to submit to the play of two major contestatory forces. They can be torn between, on the one hand, the forces of representational closure, where the garb of disguise remains a meaningful extension of character, and, on the other hand, the forces of disclosure, where the

performed act of disguise gains the upper hand of the image of character. The former is marked by continuity with strategies of characterization, in that this type of disguise effectively helps to serve and/or conceal characteristic images of a literally given, pre-inscribed type of subjectivity. But the dramatic function and structure of disguise can equally be marked by discontinuity, as when-in the latter case-the game of masking tends to become relatively self sufficient- even to the degree that the counterfeiting agency can disturb the primary role's design, which then ceases to shine through the disguise. (800-01)

He makes a distinction between disguise as a service to the character and the development of some degree of autonomy by the *persona* employed. This usurpation of the primary role by the disguise is something that will be viewed in more depth as we examine *El amor médico*.

Identity, the last of the levels of disguise, is the result of the identification of the individual with a *persona*. Just as problems arise with the dissolution of the *persona* due to unresolved conflicts between it and the subconscious, the shadow, or over-identification with the *persona*, causes its own set of problems:

The construction of a collectively suitable persona means a formidable concession to the external world, a genuine self-sacrifice which drives the ego straight into identification with the persona, so that people really do exist who believe they are what they pretend to be. The "soullessness" of such an attitude is, however, only apparent, for under no circumstances will the unconscious tolerate this shifting of the centre of gravity. ... A man cannot get rid of himself in favour of an artificial personality without punishment. Even the attempt to do so brings on, in all ordinary cases, unconscious reactions in the form of bad moods, affects, phobias, compulsive ideas, backslidings, vices, etc. The socially "strong man" is in his private life often a mere child where his own states of feeling are concerned; his public discipline (which he demands quite particularly of others) goes miserably to pieces in private. His "happiness in his work" assumes a woeful countenance at home; his "spotless" public morality looks strange indeed behind the mask. (Jung, *Aspects of the Feminine* 82-83)

This rebellion of the subconscious leads to a fragmentation of the psyche due to the imbalance between the *persona* and the unconscious. The importance of identity is twofold.

First, the assumption of a new, theatrical, identity must be considered within the terms of these varying levels of disguise. In each case, it is important to judge whether the character is making use of disguise, or whether they have passed into the realm of identity. The key element to consider is whether the character maintains an awareness of the theatrical and artificial nature of disguise, or whether he or she begins to believe him or herself to actually embody the identity that he or she has assumed. Secondly, if the use of disguise is actually, or even potentially, a case of identity, then it is only logical to look for the internal conflicts that Jung has described:

We are, therefore, fully justified in treating personality dissociation as a problem of normal psychology. In my view the answer to the above question should be that such a man has no real character at all: he is not *individual* but *collective*, the plaything of circumstance and general expectations. Were he individual, he would have the same character despite the variation of attitude. He would not be identical with the attitude of the moment, and he neither would nor could prevent his *individuality* from expressing itself just as clearly in one state as in another. Naturally he is individual, like every living being, but unconsciously so. Because of his more or less complete identification with the attitude of the moment, he deceives others, and often himself, as to his real character. He puts on a *mask*, which he knows is in keeping with his conscious intentions, while it also meets the requirements and fits the opinions of society, first one motive and then the other gaining the upper hand. (*Essential Jung* 98)

In terms of a literary or stage character, this may manifest itself in such ways as the assumed identity taking actions which make little or no sense, or a tendency to continue with the assumed identity even when it becomes counter-productive to the aims of the character making use of disguise. The already complex nature of disguise, with its

multiple levels of manifestation is further complicated when the woman crosses the gender barrier, as is the case in two of the plays examined here.

In *Victor Victoria* (1982), Julie Andrews portrays a woman playing a female impersonator. This same motif was recently (2004) reprised in *Connie and Carla*. Despite the seemingly recent popularity of this phenomenon, cross-dressing in the theatre is not an invention of the twentieth-century mind. Anxieties about gender classification, and humor based upon this anxiety, are a centuries-old tradition. Tirso de Molina in *El amor médico*, which was written in approximately 1620, presents a situation similar to that posed in contemporary films, where, at one point in the play, Jerónima, dressed as a doctor, pretends to be the doctor's sister (3497-503).³ Concern about correctly identifying the body and gender is certainly not a new phenomenon. The desire to make an object, including the gendered body, fit a preconceived pattern which is comprehensible to the viewer or reader, is a natural urge. There is a fear of the unknown, the doubtful, and the indefinable. This becomes especially true when we consider the stakes involved in interpreting the human body. Judith Butler tells us:

Indeed, the sight of a transvestite onstage can compel pleasure and applause while the sight of the same transvestite on the seat next to us on the bus can compel fear, rage, even violence . . . the disquieting effect of the act [on the bus] is that there are no conventions that facilitate making this separation . . . the act is not contrasted with the real, but *constitutes* a reality that is in some sense new, a modality of gender that cannot readily be assimilated into the preexisting categories that regulate gender reality. From the point of view of those established categories, one may want to claim, but oh, this is *really* a girl or a woman, or this is *really* a boy or a man, and further that the *appearance* contradicts the *reality* of the gender, that the discrete and familiar reality must be there, nascent, temporarily unrealized, perhaps realized at other times or other places. ("Performative Acts" 410-11; emphasis in the original)

³ I use the Blanca Oteiza edition for purposes of citation.

However, cross-dressing does more than simply create a sense of uncertainty or anxiety. While on one hand it can be a cause of anxiety, it can also, on the other, serve as a means to create opportunities to act, as is the case for disguise in general.

Historically, female-to-male cross-dressing should be read as more, or perhaps other, than an expression of gender preference and/or sexual orientation. Cross-dressing, especially in a society in which gender roles are strictly regimented and enforced, can provide a number of benefits. During the European early modern period, the accepted roles for women were limited, and cross-dressing provided an outlet for those women who wished to act outside of the accepted behavior provided by society. As William Blue notes, “Certain roles—son, daughter, student, soldier, husband, wife, bureaucrat, *mayorazgo*, *segundón*, preexist the subject. What we see ... is a conflict, then, between the assigned, limited, and limiting social role and the individual who often, chafingly and frustratedly, occupies that role” (“Effects of the Baroque” 21). Although Blue is referring specifically to subject formation in baroque literature, he also notes a similar phenomenon in the historical period (“Effects of the Baroque” 21-22).

One of the greatest causes of historical cross-dressing during the early modern period was economic. In their study of cross-dressing, Rudolf Dekker and Lotte van de Pol conclude that the primary motivation for cross-dressing, in many cases, was the greater range of employment opportunities open to men, as well as the greater earning potential for men in jobs which accepted both men and women (2, 32). In fact, the majority of the women evaluated were from the lower classes (99). Employment, of course, was not the only reason for cross-dressing. Dekker and Pol also cite romantic motives (27-30), patriotic feelings (30-32), a desire to facilitate criminal acts (35-39), and

religious convictions (44-46) as causes. Furthermore, they conclude that the choice to cross-dress was, at times, a means to retain honor: “Simply and generally stated, those who became prostitutes followed the female, passive, sexual path, while those who ‘became men’ followed the male, active and sexless path, at the same time preserving their sexual honour” (39).

While the recorded instances of European cross-dressing are limited, it appears that this phenomenon was most prominent in Holland and England. Dekker and Pol attribute this fact to the late age at which women married (the twenties rather than the teenage years); relatively greater freedom afforded to women in these countries; and the demand for soldiers and sailors, which provided a constantly recurring source of employment (102). In England the practice was common enough to act as source material for at least one play and two books (Hull 186). Although cross-dressing in Spain was apparently much less common than in Holland or England, it did still occur, and its practice was a source of anxiety for many. Even as a limited practice, it led to calls for control. Romero-Navarro cites Padre Juan Ferrer’s statement: “Otro daño es también el atrevimiento y desvergüenza que en nuestros tiempos [1613] se ha visto en muchas, y es andar algunas mujeres disimuladas en hábito de hombre por las calles y por las casas” (281).

Some examples of cross-dressing Spanish women survive from the period. B. B. Ashcom presents a number of instances in which women of the period made use of men’s disguise. Among those mentioned are María la Bailadora, who supposedly fought in the battle of Lepanto (60). He concludes, “in the light of the long history of transvestism, innocent or compulsive, a temporary expedient or a settled habit, one cannot consider the

theme merely ‘una creación literaria.’ It is doubtful if real-life cases have ever been lacking from a society in which male costume differs from female” (62). Esteban Ángel, in the introduction to his edition of the autobiography of Catalina de Erauso adds: “Rafaela Ángela, al estilo de los primeros trabajos de Catalina de Erauso, y siguiendo la tradición picaresca, sirvió durante muchos años como paje al duque de Medinaceli; María Leocadia Álvarez, por su parte, vivió innumerables y curiosas aventuras bajo el disfraz de Antonio Ita” (50). Melveena McKendrick adds a few other instances of historical female cross-dressing, such as is mentioned in the history of Alonso Fajardo de Tenza, Governor of the Philippines, who killed his wife “while she was in a visit in male disguise to the house of a clerk the Governor apparently suspected of being her lover (*Woman and Society* 38). She also mentions that “Lope in his *Laurel de Apolo* asserts that Catalina, Lope de Rueda’s actress wife, served the Duke of Medinaceli dressed as a page. The Duchess of Lorena fled from Spain with her husband, dressed as a charcoal-burner” (*Woman and Society* 40), and that the actress Bárbara Coronel wore masculine dress exclusively (*Woman and Society* 41). A justification for this behavior can perhaps be seen in Sherry Velasco’s statement, “Regardless of whether the cross-dressed women are depicted as murderesses or heroines, the male disguise provides many advantages and almost always empowers the women in men’s clothing” (116).

Of the historical instances of early modern cross-dressing in Spain, the most famous is that of Catalina de Erauso. Although the exact details of her life are somewhat unclear and the textual chain of evidence is marred by the lack of an original manuscript version of her autobiography, there is a substantial collection of verifiable facts about her

and her life.⁴ Catalina was born a younger daughter of a noble family in San Sebastián in 1592, although the autobiography states 1585, and as a young girl she was sent to a convent. In 1600, she decided to abandon the convent. The first thing she did was to make a set of male clothes from her bodice and petticoats and to cut her hair in order to pass for a boy (Erauso, *Lieutenant Nun* 4). After wandering around Spain for a couple of years, she took passage to America in 1603. In the New World, she led the life of a wandering *pícaro*, living by her wits and deception as often as by any other means. She also spent a substantial amount of time in the army, where she rose to the rank of lieutenant. Finally, in 1620, after her criminal past caught up with her, she revealed to the bishop of Guamanga that she was actually a woman (Erauso, *Lieutenant Nun* 64).⁵ Upon her return to Spain, Catalina met both King Philip IV and Pope Urban VIII, who granted her the right to continue dressing as a man. Sometime after 1626, she returned to Mexico where the last notice of her, from 1645, mentions that she had become a mule driver.

Catalina's life differs in a fundamental way from those histories collected by Dekker and Pol. While they characterized the women in their study as belonging to the lower classes (11), Catalina was a noble and spent a great amount of her time associating with men of at least moderate wealth and power. Her motivations seem to be much more clearly related to the greater freedom afforded to men than to economic necessity. In this, her actions seem to echo the literary tradition of female cross-dressing. This was a tradition firmly established in England, where "Of more than three hundred plays first performed in London between 1660 and 1700, eighty-nine contained roles in which

⁴ For a detailed description of the textual history of Catalina de Erauso, see Esteban Ángel's *Historia de la Monja Alférez* 26-39.

⁵ The revelation scene is portrayed differently in the various texts. However, it is clear that it was at this point that Catalina abandoned the pretext of being male.

actresses donned male clothes” (Dekker and Pol 94). Despite claims to the contrary (Jones and Stallybrass 89), the practice was also firmly in place in Spain.

In his 1609 “defense” of the *comedia*, *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*, Lope de Vega, its creator, offers a lighthearted explanation of how to put together a successful play. Included in the advice he offers is the following: “Las damas no desdigan de su nombre, / y, si mudaren traje, sea de modo / que pueda perdonarse, porque suele / el disfraz varonil agrandar mucho” (280-83). When we consider this statement in the light of Anita K. Stoll’s observation that “[o]f 460 plays by Lope de Vega, 113 include the use of the *disfraz varonil* [woman dressed as a man], almost 1/4 of his production that remains to us” (“Cross-dressing” 86), it seems clear that Lope was not above using cross-dressing as an attention-getter. Furthermore, as Thomas O’Connor argues, the phenomenon of cross-dressing acted as an important symbol, and, as a result, “[t]he theatrical use of this cultural phenomenon, in which women dressed as men for various reasons ... had real currency, not to mention appeal, relating thereby its frequent appearance in plays to deeper social and psychological issues” (*Love in the Corral* 96).

Carmen Bravo-Villasante argues that the original model of the cross-dressing woman is that of the female soldier, and that it is an Italian import (29-30): “Existe una gran cantidad de comedias de Lope donde una dama o dos se disfrazan de soldados para seguir a su amante y entrar junta a él en duros combates y batallas, acompañándole en su suerte ... ya que el amar las obliga a ellas, son muy femeninas y desempeñan su papel de hombre sin perder por eso ninguna cualidad de su sexo” (38). However, she credits Lope with the invention of “toda clase de variaciones, incluso las menos imaginables, desde la mujer que se hace estudiante por amor y sigue las clases de la Universidad (*La*

Escolástica celosa), hasta la que ocupa cargos de tanta importancia, como ser alcalde mayor (*El Alcalde Mayor*)” (43-44). When we consider Lope’s tendency towards astute observations of his society, and his focus on the popular stage, this is not surprising. As B. B. Ashcom notes, not only is disguise an effective dramatic effect which complicates the plot as well as allowing for its resolution, but, at the time, cross-dressing was also an excuse to show off the female body to a predominantly male audience (51). Then, as now, sex sells. In fact, the practice was so common that efforts were made to regulate its usage:

[A]sí, en la real Orden del 1 de enero de 1653, tras ordenar absolutamente que “ninguna mujer pueda salir al teatro en hábito de hombre,” se agrega, como comprendiendo su imposibilidad, “que si hubiese de ser precio para la representación que hagan estos papeles, sea con traje tan ajustado y modesto que de ninguna manera se les descubran las piernas ni los pies, sino que esto esté siempre cubierto con los vestidos o trajes que ordinariamente usan, o con alguna sotana, de manera que sólo se diferencie el traje de la cintura arriba. (Romera-Navarro 272)

Like a similar statute passed in 1644, which also forbade female cross-dressing on stage (McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain* 205) as well as previous ones in 1587, 1615, and 1641 (O’Connor, *Love in the Corral* 95), this law is demonstrative of the conflict surrounding on-stage cross-dressing. The popularity of the practice was such that McKendrick credits theatrical representations with influencing real life cross-dressing in Spain (*Women and Society* 43), citing the example of the actress Bárbara Coronel (*Women and Society* 41), among others. At the same time, the practice produced fears related to both gender identity and societal stability in general (see O’Connor, *Love in the Corral* 87-99).

This second issue, specifically that of woman’s role in society, is a theme that occurs frequently in the works of Tirso de Molina since, “If women were ‘supposed’ to be meek and subservient to men but were allowed to play the roles of men on stage, then

the stage could become the arena for fundamental challenges to the sex/gender system” (Ramet 6). Like Lope, Tirso made extensive use of cross-dressing, employing it in twenty-one of his eighty-four surviving works (Stoll, “Cross-dressing” 86). However, unlike Lope, the use of cross-dressing in Tirso’s works tends to be part of a deeper questioning of society and the roles expected of men and women. In this work, I will examine how various uses of disguise, culminating in cross-dressing, are used by Tirso. The four plays studied— *La celosa de sí misma*, *El celoso prudente*, *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, and *El amor médico*— are each structured around a heroine who makes use of disguise. In the first two cases, there is no instance of cross-dressing; instead the women make use of the erasure of their identity, or the assumption of a new female identity. In the latter two plays, the protagonists make use of both male and female roles. It is in the chapters dealing with these plays that a more complete investigation of the use of cross-dressing and its implications will be made.

As I undertook this study there were three main concepts that I wished to address. These are, firstly, the use of disguise: specifically, the way in which disguise allows actions which would be otherwise proscribed. The second is a logical continuation of the first. In the texts covered here, I perceive the motivation for disguise to be ultimately related to issues of power and its use. Others see the use of disguise in these plays as a feminist or psychosexual issue, I, however, disagree.⁶ While those elements may indeed be present, they are secondary to the desire of the various female characters to have control over their own destinies, which is clearly a power issue. The third element I wished to consider is the consequences of disguise. I am not only interested in the mechanics and motivations for disguise but the resulting effects on the character who

⁶ See Lindauer 27-42 and Felman for opposing points of view.

disguises herself. As a result of the way in which I choose to approach these plays, I have found it necessary to make use of a number of theoretical models, but there are three that play a significant role in the direction of the investigation.

The first of these is the use of terminology taken from Jungian psychology. This model is used in order to provide a vocabulary for the various versions of disguise that present themselves in Tirso. Although Tirso did not specifically write a psychological theater, the use of Jungian terms, especially when discussing the way in which the character and her disguise interact, provides a useful lexicon. In choosing to use Jungian terms, I am not attempting to create a psychological portrait of the characters. That is, there will be no attempt to view the character as a complete person and to provide a psychoanalytic analysis.

The central question, for me, in deciding to use a psychological vocabulary is to what degree can one attempt to analyze literary characters, and what relationship this may or may not have with the author. This presents a bit of a Catch-22. Even if we assume that the text is complete in and of itself, that is, independent from any external influence or contextual space, it is still necessary to deal with the characters as more than just isolated words. Literary characters inhabit a sort of limbo in which they are less than real yet often more than just the sum of the words connected to them. One common solution to this problem has been to consider literary characters as whole beings, and based on this point of departure, analyze their actions and psyche. We can see this approach in recent works by such critics as Anita Stoll as she deals with issues of gender, Raúl Galoppe with his Lacanian approach to Tirso, Meghan and Judy McInnis's Freudian look at Don Juan, and other studies. Alan Sinfield explains the justification for such an approach:

A persuasive account of how *dramatis personae* may be written so as to produce character effects is offered by William Nigel Dodd. He holds that in such dramatic texts “the audience demands and receives 'information about' something conventionally agreed to be 'happening', coincidentally with this information, here and now on the stage.” The actors are, in fact, transmitting messages to the audience, but they are scripted to behave as if they are transmitting messages to each other. . . . Further indicators of subjectivity might be self-reference and self-questioning (including soliloquy), indecision, lying. To be sure, such features do not amount to a modern conception of character. Rather, Dodd suggests, this semantic strategy is the means through which “authors operating in the period when the modern conception of the individual person was only just beginning to acquire its present contours (roughly from the mid-16th century on in England) were, and still are in many cases, able to communicate this sense of depth in spite of the fact that the formal psychology upon which they often drew (typically that of the 'humours') offers an inadequate account of man 's inner nature (even by Renaissance standards)” (p. 146). So some early modern texts produce a sufficient impression of interaction between simulated selves to enable modern character criticism. This could be coincidence (the signals encoded in an alien culture affording an alternative pattern of significance to modern readers); more likely it is because there is a sufficient continuity—by no means an identity—between early modern ideas of subjectivity and what later critics apprehend as character. (59-60)

While this is certainly a viable option, it still requires the critic to cross the barrier between the stage and his or her own world in order to apply the analysis. Limited as this study is to the functional uses of disguise and how it affects the world contained within the stage, it is not necessary to add this additional layer of complexity to what is an inherently difficult subject

Furthermore, the difficulty in attempting to apply psychological models of behavior to literary characters is that they are, in and of themselves, constructions of an author, whose intent and level of identification with his creations is impossible to accurately gauge. In the case of staged events, this becomes even more problematic when we include the real person who performs the role-play in our calculations. Matthew Stroud considers this problem, when he writes “one simply cannot analyze a literary text

in the same way that a psychoanalyst deals with a client. This is a real stumbling block to the applicability of psychoanalysis to literature, because these characters are not real people, and even if they were, they cannot speak outside the roles given to them by their authors; they have no unconscious” (22). This is indeed a dilemma, one which I avoid by using Jungian terminology, not in an attempt to provide an analysis of the psychology of the character as if she were a real person, but rather, to provide a working vocabulary to describe the creation of onstage disguises. Therefore, I prefer to use psychology as a source of terminology rather than a complete system which can be adopted whole into literary analysis.

This use becomes especially important when we consider Paul Figure’s observation that “el disfraz masculino en las mujeres de Tirso es una forma de desdoblamiento de la personalidad, que permite al personaje moverse en diferentes niveles de la realidad” (142). Because there is a fragmentation in the identity of these characters that is similar to psychological phenomena, a vocabulary to help describe these observed actions is essential. A Jungian vocabulary is especially useful because Jung derived much of his psychological terminology from the theater. Stroud himself observes that “a Jungian approach to study myths and archetypes [is] of enormous benefit to literary study” (22).

As I discuss how the various characters put on a variety of masks and disguises in an attempt to reach their goals, there is a clear connection to Jung’s concept of the *persona*, which he views as the mask that we all wear in order to function in a socially acceptable manner (*Essential Jung* 94). However, I am making use of psychological terminology and concepts to describe fictional beings which arguably cannot ever be

considered real persons and must perform remain masks, the literal *personae* that give name to Jung's terminology. This reversal and inversion of Jung's ideas, applying the concepts of performance in society and within one's self, to a literal performance, requires that I explain how I redefine Jung's terminology to suit my needs. For that reason, as I examine the various characters in the plays that I consider here, I intend to make use of Jungian terminology as a means of providing a vocabulary to describe observed behaviors and results, especially the use of disguise where the conflict between the characters' actions while disguised and their original, central, identity is reminiscent of Jung's theories on the *anima* and can be applied in an attempt to better describe the actions on stage.

Consequently, I find Jungian terminology to be most useful as a descriptor, not as a method of analysis. In practical terms, this means that the use of Jungian terminology will be part of an effort to describe the way in which disguise, in its various forms, is used within the play and how this use of disguise enables the character act. When the actions of a *persona* slip into the realm of identification, specifically when the *persona's* actions are counterproductive for the character, it will be necessary to take note of how the *persona* behaves, as a descriptive elaboration of the differences between the actions of the character and her *persona*. The use of psychological terms, then, becomes valuable as a means to characterize the ways in which disguise and power interact, since certain *personae* are allowed more freedom than others.

Because I understand the use of female disguise in these works to be the result of a power struggle, my use of Michel Foucault's theories on power is a logical move. Specifically, I choose to filter these ideas through the prism of the New Historicism.

However, the incorporation of elements of New Historicism is not without its difficulties. In approaching a text, I must agree with Richard Strier that “I am wary of the totalizing impulse that tempts interpretive and explanatory hypotheses” (4). This is one of the criticisms that New Historicism has been subject to, that in the end; it reads all narratives in the same way. As a result, I intend to only use those aspects which I find appropriate and illuminating for the specific text. If the text does not fit other approaches I would like to include, I do not wish to impose them.

Therefore, as I approach the New Historicism, I do so with caution. John Brannigan suggests four characteristics of the New Historicism. These are:

- 1) An examination of a wide range of texts to show how they play a role in mediating power relations within the state.
- 2) That literary texts are seen as inseparable from other texts and forms and their social and political contexts.
- 3) Literature raises the possibility of subversion only to later contain and make safe that subversion.
- 4) The study of a wide range of texts in an epoch and the assumption that each epoch has its own mode of power. (422).

By this rubric, my approach is not truly new historicist, but the points of contact are considerable. Because I am focusing specifically on the work of Tirso de Molina, I may not employ as full a range of texts as I otherwise would be interested in doing. However, it is necessary to juxtapose some historical documents and events with the texts of the plays in order to demonstrate the shaping assumptions of the period and the situation in which the author lived.

Additionally, I am only in partial agreement with the second assumption. I believe that literary texts are indeed inseparable from other texts, yet I do see them as distinct. That is, while texts may have historicity, and histories are certainly textual (to misquote Louis Montrose), they are not equivalent. Literary texts, in my view, occupy a different imaginary space than do historical texts. They cannot be read in the same way, nor can we draw the same conclusions from similar content. The world of the stage, even for realist drama, is a consciously fictional world that, like it or not, is aware of its representational nature. Trying to equate the two without recognizing the dangers of doing so leads to self-fulfilling historicism, where the facts one finds are the facts which one wishes to find. The reason for the use of non-literary texts is that they can further explicate and illuminate a text, thus clarifying motivation, action, or choice within the text. For example, knowing that the use of veils and the seclusion of women was a remnant of Moorish culture, and furthermore that the use of veils eventually came to be a means of disguise (Elliott 309), helps to explain why the use of disguise is so common on the Spanish stage. It reflected a social reality, as well as provided fodder for a discussion on the way in which veiling had been appropriated from a patriarchal control mechanism to a means of freedom for women.

Neither do I believe that literature exists solely for the purpose of containment, an idea based on the belief that power justifies itself through a visible resistance to that power. Nor do I agree that subversive elements, once introduced, are really possible to contain. Let me explain these two views. The interconnectivity of society and literature is a complex web where neither acts as a true mirror to the other, yet each retains at least some aspects that link it to the other. Where these points of contact are exact, literature

reflects culture; where they are close, it is possible that culture may grow to reflect literature. By proposing possibilities, literature may nudge culture into certain actions. This being so, subversive elements in literature always have the possibility to effect the reader and create change. This influence could just as easily be an argument for the sustaining of the current system, but points of release, points where there is similarity but not congruence between the world and literature, are openings to other possibilities and cannot be completely closed off.

Although there is not sufficient time or space to fully develop this argument, I do wish to present one example. Both Jonathan Thacker (39-40) and Melveena McKendrick (*Women and Society* 43) suggest that the theatrical female to male cross-dressing, e.g., *Don Gil*, *El amor médico*, etc., may have actually been the cause of imitation in Spanish society. This then, is a clear example in which a fiction from literature has moved into the realm of the real. This idea that women dress as men is a clearly subversive act for the era. Subversion, in this case, has succeeded in creating a new reality which undermines the stability of the established pattern. While this is an unusually clear example, the containment of subversion is, in and of itself, impossible. Even after repairing the hole in the wall of orthodoxy, the patch remains. Subversion can only be truly contained if the subversive idea is forgotten, a difficult task, when the text continues to be read.

As is obvious from the litany of points of departure between the New Historicism and my view of literature, I am not actually a new historicist. However, there are many valuable elements of this approach which fit well with this study. This can be demonstrated by a brief comparison to a work by Stephan Greenblatt. In his 1980 book, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Greenblatt makes the

observation that literature is part of a historic moment, and as a result shares basic societal patterns with the culture in which it was conceived. He continues to argue that within a world of power structures, the individual is constrained by various forces which work within and throughout society. Self-fashioning must be done in concert with and reaction to these forces. In Greenblatt's opinion, this is only possible in the presence of the Other, which must be a threatening or hostile Other, and is done by self-definition as the known and whole, and then by attacking the dangers of the Other (9). It is this concept which is central to my study, since the use of disguise is, in part, an attempt to self-fashion. The women examined all make use of disguise to free themselves from the pre-defined roles that have been assigned them by society. With the exception of Jerónima in *El amor médico*, each, before entering the world of disguise, is subject to the demands of society and the control of a father. Even Jerónima is nominally controlled by her brother, although he is an absent and ineffectual figure in practice. By moving into the realm of the Other, that of disguise, these women are able to redefine themselves (with varying degrees of success) as they attempt to gain their objective: marriage. An example of this is presented in Marlowe's theater, where Greenblatt sees in it the "renewal of existence through repetition of the self-constituting act" (201). This statement applies directly to Tirso's theater and this project, since the various heroines create their new identities by performing them. Their disguises obtain form and validity precisely because they are occupied and performed.

The tendency of New Historicism to believe that subversion is always a failure, according to Richard Wilson, is an outgrowth of the political events of the formative period in the critics' lives (7). In contrast, he argues that to British historicists, the

cultural materialists, “Renaissance texts were sites of conflict, not containment” (13). In this respect, I align myself with the cultural materialists, though I feel no urge to enter into debates of contemporary politics as an extension to my studies. Therefore, my approach cannot be labeled New Historicism or Cultural Materialist without the caveat that I am eclectic in what elements I find useful and desirable in each. I consider the focus on power and role-play that New Historicism investigates vital to my studies, since the use of disguise is intricately interconnected with these elements. However, the way in which I consider containment of subversion problematic fits more with the tenets of Cultural Materialism. In either case, I am committed to the proposition that by understanding the background of the text and its cultural referents, we can better understand how the text manipulates society in order to create a new reality.

This study’s last major theoretical influence is Feminism. My approach to Tirso de Molina can be considered feminist primarily for two reasons. The first is that it generally fits within the definition of feminist criticism that Ruth Robbins gives in her introduction to feminist theory, since it assumes a connection between words and the real world, is based in power relationships, and has a focus on women and the structures of patriarchal oppression (49-51). However, I do not explicitly agree with Robbins’s belief that there must be a political aspect to this criticism (51). While I believe inequalities should be exposed, I prefer to focus on the ways in which power is negotiated rather than on challenging existing structures. If my analysis demonstrates that certain strategies seem to bring about change, or at the least, bring success to the woman involved, so much the better, but I will leave politics to another critic.

Furthermore, my approach belongs to the Images of Women School which is concerned with the portrayal of women (Donovan 211-12). Despite this, I do not conceive of my approach as a passive examination of how women are portrayed. This is because I wish to consider women who are active and assertive beings, rather than those who are silenced and cast to the margins. In this way, my view coincides well with what Hélène Cixous says when she argues for avoiding the perception of sex and gender as binary opposites and conflicting camps (225-28). I find the following statement to be key: “We work on the mystery of human being, including the fact that humans are sexed beings, that there is sexual difference, and that these differences manifest themselves, write themselves in texts” (Cixous 228). I see my role as a user of feminist theory as this: to look at how sex and gender are portrayed within the text, while keeping in mind that the playwright was a man. Further, I shall try to understand how he saw women dealing with the constraints of society. As Thacker reminds us, feminist theory should not be limited to only female-authored texts (38).

Yet, there are some aspects of Tirso’s theater which make a feminist reading difficult. Since the period was clearly one in which women were afforded a secondary role in society, the plays tend to end with the subversion created by the disguised woman being reinscribed into the dominant pattern, as Jeanie Forte worries may be the case (21-22). This is the same fear that faces New Historicists. I believe, however, that this reinscription is always incomplete, and therefore is closer to what Helene Keyssar terms scenes of transformation rather than revelation (119). Furthermore, Paul Figure contends that “[p]or su gran penetración psicológica y aguda percepción emocional, se puede considerar a Tirso como un precursor del feminismo” (141), as does McKendrick

(*Women and Society* 105). If this is the case, then the choice of Tirso as a subject of study will help to alleviate some of the problems inherent in studying works from this period. Furthermore, as Catherine Connor argues, it is unrealistic to believe that the the society of the time would permit more than a limited feminism of any sort:

[T]he married state in early modern Spain, in all its particular variations, was the most commonly desired one for most women because it was the legal structure offering the greatest potential for economic, socio-cultural, and political security. It still was, in short, the only social medium, although a traditional and patriarchal one, in which they might have hoped to improve their lives and, eventually, those of their daughters. (36)

However, within the context of the society of the time, it is possible to discuss how Tirso advocates for a re-evaluation of the common assumptions about a woman's role and place in society.

Part of the problem in looking at these texts is the challenge to avoid the polar opposition between the sexes that Hélène Cixous warns of, and that Barbara Freedman seconds (81). To do so, I will look at the female character's assumption of disguise, not as an escape to a different gender or as the performance of a gender, but rather, as the assumption of a mask which provides new opportunities for action. I realize that to do this and still provide the requisite attention to the fact that it is a woman who occupies these roles is, in effect, walking a tightrope. In order to carry this off, I will rely on my interpretation of Michel Foucault, a theorist attractive to some feminist critics (Hunt 81), to provide a vocabulary which is adequate to the task. I realize that making this choice may well open me to the criticism that I appropriate feminist techniques and practices without actually performing feminist criticism. If this is the case, I can only defend myself by saying that this work is about women who perform male roles without

becoming men, and if they can play a part and use the tools needed to do a job, how can I do any less?

As I address the actual application of these ideas to the works I have selected, I wish to do two things. First, I wish to address some difficulties that Barbara Freedman has raised as I consider the *comedia* from a feminist point of view. Thereafter, I wish to comment on some of the observations of Susana Pendzik in her feminist reading of *El burlador de Sevilla*. The first is necessary because she raises some points that require consideration if I hope to actually provide a feminist reading of the texts; the second, because I wish to show the possibilities of a feminist reading of Tirso. By dealing with the criticism of these two women, I hope to define how what I do with the texts will be different from previous examinations. Finally, I will provide an example of how a feminist reading will fit into my analysis of Tirso's plays.

Freedman directs her attention to the problem of the male gaze in theater and film. She sees the representation of women in theater as a "fetished spectacle of woman and the narrative of her domination and punishment" (85). This is linked to the fact that "theatre is always staging the desire to own the purloined place of one's look" (101). That is, theater is designed to be viewed and for a knowledge of that viewing to be present in the actors, who, in turn, control the gaze and redirect and appropriate it. This is, as she sees it, a problem with construction of subjectivity (87). Applying these ideas to Tirso we see a number of difficulties with her view. First, although the women in the plays I will study return to the patriarchal order at the end of the play (*Don Gil*, *El amor médico*, or *La celosa de sí misma*), they do so only once they have obtained their goals. While the abrupt ending of *El amor médico* does seem to imply a reassertion of order through

patriarchy, the actual imposition of order comes through Quiteria, and is related to the death of her brother (3603-14). The uncle remains an authority figure, and could be considered to have the effect of imposing order, but the fact remains that he stays off stage. I think it is valid to read this ending as a validation of Jerónima's actions. She has accomplished all she desired, manipulated everyone else to her liking, and at the end, she has no father or brother to impose a punishment. With this in mind, I do not think we can see these texts as the narratives of dominion and punishment that Freedman suggests them to be.

The question of the gaze, the *agon* "the mirror image whereby person and persona, body and ego as supplement, confront one another and exchange places" (Freedman 85-86), on the other hand, is important, and to my mind, problematic. First, the gaze is only fully operative while the play is being performed. The textual version is not the same. The gaze is, I feel, more involved and therefore more susceptible to appropriation in the production. If we turn to the concept of the *agon*, we find that the masks are certainly revealed, but the generation of difference which is claimed is more problematic. In my opinion, there are times in which the masks become so interchangeable that it is debatable whether they still hold. After Juana, in the identity of Doña Elvira, speaks with Doña Inés, Juana states: "Ya soy hombre, ya mujer, / ya don Gil, ya doña Elvira; / mas si amo, / qué no seré?" (1439-41). I see two possibilities present in this quotation. The first implies a loss of subjectivity, and thus Juana can play these roles since her own self has disappeared. From other elements in the text, I tend to discredit this premise. The other possibility is that her use of masks has made her fully incorporate the distinct roles. Rather than becoming lost within her roles, she has gained

such a degree of control that she feels capable of being, not just playing, the people she represents. I realize that this is somewhat of a deliberate misreading of Freedman's argument. She endeavors to demonstrate a polarization and self-definition through the Other, but I feel it is justified in presenting my view as an alternative to the need to read everything in terms of contrast. Within a complex society and structure, there is no absolute requirement that the various personas be opposites, rather by showing possible permutations, I see the chance to propose the availability of more than one right relationship.

In 1995, Susana Pendzik published an article in which she presents a feminist reading of *El burlador de Sevilla*. While I do not plan to use the *Burlador* as one of my texts, I would like to look at one example of how feminist criticism is used in this piece and then employ it to contrast with what I see as my approach. As I do so, I wish to stress that although I will undertake a different reading than Pendzik, I am not attempting to invalidate her work, just differentiate it from what I propose to do. One of her primary contentions is that by reading from the margins we see that female presence is "the most powerful source of dramatic energy" (166). While this conclusion is debatable, I certainly applaud the effort to recover forgotten voices. The author states that "[t]he use of women for specific purposes and their sudden discharge when no longer needed is a common practice in patriarchal cultures" (168). In her view, the women in this play are little more than set pieces which are used to further define the character of Don Juan. This harkens back to Freedman's argument of the use of agon as a way to define the other and invoke correct relationships.

The difficulty arises when the center of the play becomes the female character, such as in *Don Gil* or *El amor médico*. What are we to make of this role reversal?

Pendzik quotes Adrienne Munich in saying “when women speak . . . , they cannot help but enter male-dominated discourse” (172). The author concludes that the speaking woman, in this case Tisbea, “defies her womanly place by refusing to remain silent. This behavior may be acceptable as long as she colludes with the Symbolic Order, that is, as long as she does not allow the woman-inside-her to emerge, and keeps the identification with the father clear of *jouissance*” (172-73). This is an important question. Because the word in the Symbolic Order is considered to belong to the man as holder of the phallic signifier, while the woman, lacking this symbol is also symbolically deprived of speech (Ebert 24). From this the question arises, when Juana, Jerónima, or any of the other heroines in the plays I examine, takes control of the word, is this a betrayal of herself as a woman?

Furthermore, since disguise and cross-dressing are such common techniques in these plays, can this be read as a subversion of the Symbolic Order and an appropriation of the patriarchal right of speech, or is it a symbolic acceptance of that order and an acknowledgement that woman-as-woman has no room for speech? Although this issue is not dealt with explicitly here, the question certainly underlies my argument regarding the use of disguise as a means to greater freedom. If we accept the proposition that the woman is somehow silenced by the Symbolic Order, and this certainly seems to be the case in these plays, then, by stepping out of her-self-as-woman, the female character has the opportunity to free herself from some of the constraints of the Symbolic Order. This is especially the case for Doña Juana and Doña Jerónima, in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* and *El amor médico*, respectively.

A further complication is that the use of disguise is, in and of itself, problematic. In some cases, it seems that the woman has complete control of her use of disguise, e.g., *El celoso prudente*, and in other cases the woman falls prey to her own disguise, e.g., Serafina in *El vergonzoso en palacio*, another work by Tirso. The use of disguise is an attempt to subvert the Symbolic Order and to make use of cracks in the structure of society in order to create a situation in which action is possible. Whether their actions truly subvert the Symbolic Order of patriarchy or are a de facto recognition that it is necessary to imitate the male in order to function within the Symbolic Order remains to be resolved. As we examine the use of disguise in Tirso de Molina, each of these theoretical models will help shape the way in which the play, the characters, and the various identities created are read and interpreted. Taken together, it is my hope that I can elaborate a new way of perceiving disguise in the *comedia* as a path to greater freedom.

As we look at each of the plays in this study, we see a different aspect of disguise. From the most tentative dabbling in deception, as Magdalena tries to reconcile Melchor's image of her with the reality, to Doña Jerónima's creation of a complete other self in *El amor médico*, Tirso de Molina portrays how women are able to take advantage of misunderstanding, misidentification, and erasure to act in ways that society would otherwise prohibit. In a society that rigidly controlled the place and the power of women, the space created by disguise acts as an invaluable tool which allows the heroine to step outside of the bounds of expected behavior and rewrite the script which society has prepared for her.

Las Partes

Many of the plays known to be written by Tirso were published in the *partes*. Because there are only two known Tirsian manuscripts, the *partes* are as close to primary sources as are available for much of Tirso's work. The following table contains a list of the *Comedias* published in the *Partes*, the majority of which are considered to be Tirso's. It should be reiterated that the attributions of the plays in the second *Parte* have been the subject of longstanding debate.

<i>Primera Parte</i>	<i>Palabras y Plumas</i> <i>El Pretendiente al revés</i> <i>El Árbol del mejor fruto</i> <i>La Villana de Vallecas</i> <i>El Melancólico</i> <i>El Mayor Desengaño</i> <i>El Castigo del Penséque</i> <i>Segunda parte del Penséque</i> <i>La Gallega Mari-Hernández</i> <i>Tanto es lo de más como lo de menos</i> <i>La Zelosa de sí misma</i> <i>Amar por razón de Estado</i>
<i>Segunda Parte</i>	<i>Siempre ayuda la verdad</i> <i>Los amantes de Teruel</i> <i>Por el sótano, y el torno</i> <i>Cautela contra cautela</i> <i>La muger por fuerza</i> <i>El condenado por desconfiado</i> <i>Primera parte de don Álvaro de Luna</i> <i>Segunda parte de don Álvaro de Luna</i> <i>Eso sí que es negociar</i>
<i>Tercera Parte</i>	<i>La Reina de los Reyes</i> <i>Amor y zelos hazen discretos</i> <i>Quien habló pagó</i> <i>Del enemigo el primer consejo</i> <i>No ay peor sordo</i> <i>La mejor espigadera</i> <i>Averígüelo Vargas</i> <i>La elección por la virtud</i> <i>Ventura te dé Dios hijo</i>

	<i>La prudencia en la muger</i> <i>La vengança de Tamar</i> <i>La villana de la Sagra</i> <i>El amor y el amistad</i> <i>La fingida Arcadia</i> <i>La huerta de Juan Hernández</i>
Cuarta Parte	<i>Privar contra su gusto</i> <i>Zelos con zelos se curan</i> <i>La muger que manda en casa</i> <i>Antonia García</i> <i>El amor Médico</i> <i>Doña Beatriz de Silva</i> <i>Todo es dar en una cosa</i> <i>Amazonas en las Indias</i> <i>La lealtad contra la embidia</i> <i>La Peña de Francia</i> <i>Santo y Sastre</i> <i>Don Gil de las calças verdes</i>
Quinta Parte	<i>Amar por arte mayor</i> <i>Escarmientos para el cuerdo</i> <i>Los Lagos de san Vicente</i> <i>El Aquiles</i> <i>Marta la piadosa</i> <i>Quien no cae, no se levanta</i> <i>La Republica al revés</i> <i>La vida y muerte de Herodes</i> <i>La Dama del Olivar</i> <i>Primera parte de Santa Juana</i> <i>Segunda parte de Santa Juana</i>

Comedias

Although there is no true agreement as to the authorship of many of the works attributed to Tirso de Molina, the following is a list of plays commonly ascribed to him with dates of composition as given by Blanca de los Ríos and Héctor Urzáiz Tortajada. Date of

publication, where known, is given as well as alternate titles, and comments on attribution. A “~” indicates approximate date of composition.

Play	De los Ríos	Urzáiz Tortajada	Printed	Other names	Comments
<i>Los amantes de Teruel</i>	1615	~1614	1635		
<i>Amar por arte mayor</i>	1635		1636		
<i>Amor por razón de estado</i>	1621		1631	<i>Sutilezas de amor y el marqués del Camarín</i>	
<i>Amar por señas</i>	1615		1667		
<i>Las amazonas en las Indias</i>	1629-32		1635		
<i>El amor médico</i>	1621		1635		
<i>Amor y celos hacen discretos</i>	1615	1615	1635		
<i>El amor y la amistad</i>	1622-24, revised 1632-33	1621			
<i>Antona García</i>	1622	1621	1635	<i>El asombro de Portugal</i>	
<i>El Aquiles</i>	1611-12	~1612	1636		
<i>El árbol del mejor fruto</i>	1621 or earlier		1631		
<i>Averígüelo Vargas</i>	1619-21	~1619-21		<i>Del mal, el menos</i>	
<i>Los balcones de Madrid</i>	1632, 1634				
<i>Bellaco sois, Gómez</i>	1641-43		1642		
<i>El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra</i>	1616, 1619-20 (revisión)			<i>Tan largo me lo fiáis (Variant)</i>	Cruikshank claims 1627 as date of composition

<i>El caballero de Gracia</i>	~1620		1669		Urzáiz Tortajada believes it to be the work of Enríquez Gómez
<i>Los cabellos de Absalón</i>				<i>Las lágrimas de David</i>	Doubtful attribution.
<i>Cásate y sabrás lo que es</i>		No later than 1623			Doubtful attribution.
<i>El castigo del penséque.</i>	1613-14	~1613	1627		
<i>Cautela contra cautela</i>	1618-20		1635		Doubtful attribution Could be Ruiz de Alarcón
<i>La celosa de sí misma</i>	1621-22	1621	1631		
<i>Celos con celos se curan</i>	1621	~1621-25			
<i>El celoso prudente</i>	1614-15	1615	1624	<i>Al buen callar llaman Sancho</i>	
<i>El cobarde más valiente</i>	1610-12				Doubtful attribution.
<i>Cómo han de ser los amigos</i>	1612	1612	1624		
<i>El condenado por desconfiado</i>	1614-15		1635		Some argument over attribution
<i>La conquista de Valencia por el Cid</i>					Doubtful attribution.
<i>La dama del olivar</i>	1614-15	1615	1636		
<i>Del enemigo, el primer consejo</i>	1621, 1632 (revision)		1634		
<i>Desde Toledo a Madrid</i>	1627-31	~1625	1666		

<i>Don Gil de las calzas verdes</i>	1615	1615	1635		
<i>Doña Beatriz de Silva</i>	1619-21		1635	<i>Favorecer a todos y no amor a ninguno</i>	
<i>La elección por la virtud</i>	1612	1612	1634	<i>Sixto V</i>	
<i>Esto sí es negociar</i>	1618			Revision of <i>El melancólico</i>	
<i>En Madrid y en una casa</i>	1637, 1641		1671	<i>Lo que hace un manto en Madrid</i>	Debated attribution.
<i>Escarmientos para el cuerdo</i>	1614-22		1636		
<i>Esto sí que es negociar</i>			1635		
<i>La fingida Arcadia</i>	1621	~1622-23	1634		
<i>La Firmeza en la Hermosura</i>	1644		1646		
<i>La gallega Mari-Hernández</i>	1610-11		1631		
<i>La guerra de los dioses</i>					
<i>Habladme en entrando</i>	1635-1636			<i>Celos de amor y de honor ni aun a su padre perdona.</i>	
<i>El honroso atrevimiento</i>	1620-22				
<i>La huerta de Juan Fernández</i>	1626, revised 1630		1634		
<i>La joya de las montañas. Santa Orosia</i>	1606-07				Doubtful attribution

<i>Los lagos de San Vicente</i>	1606-07		1636		
<i>La lealtad contra la envidia</i>	1626-30		1635		
<i>Marta la piadosa</i>	1615		1636		
<i>El mayor desengaño</i>	1621		1627		
<i>La mejor espigadera, Ruth</i>	1614	~1614	1634	<i>Las espigas de Ruth and La nuera más leal</i>	
<i>El melancólico</i>	1611	1623	1627		
<i>El milagro por los celos y don Lázaro</i>					Believed to be Lope's or Blas Fernández de Mesa
<i>La mujer por fuerza</i>	1612-13	~1613	1635		Oteiza doubts attribution
<i>La mujer que manda en casa. Jezabel</i>	1611-12	~1612	1635	<i>La impía Jezabel, mujer del infeliz Acab, y triunfo, de Elías.</i>	
<i>La ninfa del cielo</i>	1613	~1613		<i>Condesa bandolero y obligaciones de honor</i>	Argued attribution
<i>No hay peor sordo que el que no quiere oír</i>	1632		1634		
<i>Palabras y plumas</i>	1614-15	~1614	1627		
<i>La Peña de Francia</i>	1611-12	~1612	1635		
<i>Por el sótano y el torno</i>	¿1624	After Jan 1623	1635		
<i>El pretendiente al revés</i>	1612		1627		

<i>El privar contra su gusto</i>	1632, 1634		1635		
<i>Próspera fortuna de don Álvaro de Luna y adversa de Ruy López Dávalos</i>	1615-21	1616 or earlier	1635		
<i>La prudencia en la mujer</i>	1630-33		1634		
<i>Quien calla, otorga</i>	1615	1615	1627		Argued attribution
<i>Quien da luego da dos veces</i>	1612, 1614				
<i>Quien habló, pagó</i>	1615-22	~1615-20	1635		Argued attribution
<i>Quien no cae no se levanta</i>	1628		1636		
<i>La quinas de Portugal</i>	1638				Manuscript from 1638
<i>La reina de los reyes</i>	1616 or 1618	1624 or earlier	1635	<i>La Virgen de los Reyes</i>	Doubtful origin
<i>La reina penitente</i>					Doubtful origin
<i>La república al revés</i>	1611	~1611	1636		
<i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	1616, revised 1626			<i>El infanzón de Illescas</i>	Appears to be by Claramonte
<i>La romera de Santiago</i>	1622 or earlier	1623 or earlier	1670		
<i>El saber guardar la hacienda</i>		~1612			Lost version of <i>Tanto es lo de más como lo de menos</i>
<i>Santa Juana (Three parts)</i>	1613-14	1613 or earlier	1636		
<i>Santo y sastre</i>	1614-15, revised after 1627		1635		

<i>Siempre ayuda la verdad</i>	1622-23				
<i>Tanto es lo de más como lo de menos, y rico avariento</i>	1614	1620 (Kennedy)	1627		
<i>Todo es dar en una cosa y hazañas de los Pizarros</i>	1626-30		1635		
<i>Tres maridos burlados</i>					1621 Vázquez Fernández, (37).
<i>La venganza de Tamar</i>	1621	~1622	1634		
<i>La ventura con el nombre</i>	1632 or later	~1625 (Kennedy)	1667		
<i>Ventura te dé Dios, hijo</i>	1615	1615	1634		
<i>El vergonzoso en Palacio</i>	1611-12	~1612, rewritten 1621	1624		
<i>La vida y muerte de Herodes</i>	1612-15	~1612-15	1636		
<i>La villana de la Sagra</i>	1612	~1606-08	1634		
<i>La villana de Vallecas</i>	1620	1620	1627		

CHAPTER II

REALITY AND ILLUSION IN *LA CELOSA DE SÍ MISMA*: THE DOUBLING OF IDENTITY

As is the case for many of Tirso's plays, there is scant critical commentary on *La celosa de sí misma*. Perhaps the most recent comes from Barbara Simerka. In her 2003 book, *Discourses of Empire: Counter-Epic Literature in Early Modern Spain*, she discusses the play in the light of the character types of the *villano*, *indiano*, and *cortesano* figures. In this reading, Melchor is presented as a virtuous, yet foolish, *villano* who is contrasted with his rival, the courtier Sebastian. However, the focus of Simerka's analysis is not on the play, but rather the presentation of these figures in a variety of plays.

Anthony Cascardi also briefly considers the play in the context of his work on Calderón de la Barca. He presents Magdalena's actions as ultimately unproductive acts, and dismisses the play as lacking the quality of *El burlador de Sevilla* or *La dama duende*. Antita K. Stoll also comments on this text in her study of gender presentation in Tirso. In "Do Clothes Make the Man? Gender and Identity Fluidity in Tirso's Plays," she focuses on the confusion caused by the cloak that Magdalena wears to pass. Her argument is that Tirso, through his characters and language "suggests a confusing multiplicity of visual realities and identities" (833). Unfortunately, since this is a multi-work study, she does not further develop this concept. There are other works which refer to the play, yet there is very little in the way of discussion or analysis.

There are even fewer works that deal specifically with the text. In 1998, Nancy D'Antuono authored an influence study connecting the play to an Italian text written by Arcangelo Spanga, and first published in 1689. D'Antuono mentions that this play is an adaptation of the original text, recast as a drama and written in the form of an opera libretto. In this work, *La gelosa di se stessa*, the number of characters is reduced and another masquerading character, that of Batocco, is added. However, the article is not focused on Tirso's work, but rather its successor. Gerald Wade also has worked with this text. In 1982 he published an article that explores the presentation of erotic love in the *comedia* in *Romance Quarterly*, using *La celosa de sí misma* as an example. However, the focus of the article is the concept of love, rather than the play specifically. As a result, Wade provides little information pertinent to the present effort. Dawn Smith's article, "*La celosa de sí misma: A Comedy in Spite of Itself*," provides the information most pertinent to my focus. Smith begins her article with an explanation of the characteristics of Tirso's *comedias de enredo* and an elaboration of the plot. As Smith reviews the action of the play, she elaborates on the elements that make this play a *comedia de enredo*. She concludes that the play, in addition to being a *comedia de enredo*, is full of "pervasive irony" (831), as well as astute observations about the foibles of humanity.

Unfortunately, none of these commentaries specifically concerns itself with the production and use of disguise. Despite a lack of critical attention and some occasional weaknesses, this is a fascinating play. Tirso de Molina presents a woman who is forcibly split into secondary, and later, tertiary identities, and the result is a battle for control of the self. As we examine the play in depth, it will become apparent that the heroine, Magdalena, lives as the victim of disguise, and assumes a fairly passive role throughout

the play. The title itself indicates as much, as Magdalena becomes her own competitor for the love of Don Melchor. The cause of Magdalena's woes is connected to the question of who really creates and controls disguise within the play. Furthermore, since her disguise is inadvertently thrust upon her, she is faced with a phantom self, an idealized version that she can neither control nor surpass.

In the opening scenes, Don Melchor, a poor young noble who has come to Madrid in order to marry the daughter of his father's longtime friend, comes out of mass and proclaims to his servant, Ventura, his love for, and devotion to, a woman he espied during the service:

Devoto salgo, Ventura,
pero a lo humano. ¡Ay, qué bella
imagen vi, si es imagen
quien a sí se representa!
¡Ay si de la Soledad
esta hermosa imagen fuera,
y no de la compañía,
porque ninguna tuviera! (289-96)

Ventura replies mockingly to this impassioned speech. The final image that he presents, as he criticizes his master, is that of a hand holding a rosary. Melchor replies that, in fact, all he saw of the woman was her hand, and continues by giving an overly baroque description of the hand that is the cause of his passion. The *gracioso's* response is a well deserved deconstruction of courtly love and baroque figures:

Ay qué uñas aguileñas!
¡Ay qué bello *rapio*, *rapis*!
¡Ay qué garras monederas!
¡Ay qué tonto moscatel!
¡Ay qué bobuna leonesa!
...
¿De una mano te enamoras,
por el sebo portuguesa,
dulce por la virgen miel,

y amarga por las almendras,
sin un adarme de cara,
sin ver un ojo, una ceja,
un asomo de nariz,
una pestaña siquiera? (334-38, 353-60)

In Ventura's description, Don Melchor is painted as a foolish adherent to a standard of love that only exists in a literary world, as his statement: "yo no tengo de casarme, / si no fuere con belleza / y virtud" (104-06), indicates. He, although poor, is willing to abandon a dowry of sixty thousand ducats (97) rather than marry a woman he does not want.

Ventura, his practical counterpart, sees only the advantage to be gained by such a marriage (94-98). Thus, from the beginning, the reader/spectator is treated to the presentation of two opposing views of love and marriage. The first, embodied by Don Melchor, as the typical *galán*, is a romantic and idealized view of love, where beauty is the ultimate goal. The second is the practical, perhaps cynical, viewpoint, which Ventura espouses.

This duality is also linked to the unknown woman who becomes Melchor's object of desire. Melchor characterizes her as an image of herself. As we will shortly see, this becomes the case when Magdalena becomes her own competitor for the love of Don Melchor. This contrast between reality and image is the central theme of the play and acts as the primary motivation for the various *enredos* and conflicts within the work. It is within this context, that of the conflict between reality and image, that disguise and identity come into play.

Don Melchor's statement, that the woman he saw was so beautiful that she "es imagen quien a sí se representa" (291-92), is designed as praise for a woman who

approaches the platonic ideal of beauty.⁷ Hidden within this hyperbole, however, are the seeds of the conflict that drive the plot of the play. While Melchor intends his words to portray a unity between reality and ideal, they simultaneously highlight the conflict between the two. Melchor has no evidence to back his claim. His reasoning is that if the hand is beautiful, then the rest of the woman must be so as well (370-76). He bases his praise solely on what his imagination creates. As Anita K. Stoll observes: “it is the costume identity which counts rather than that of the person within” (“Do Clothes Make the Man?” 832). Because of this, when he does meet the owner of this glorious hand, she fails to measure up to his expectations. This tendency becomes the object of Ventura’s ridicule as he complains that Melchor is rejecting Magdalena’s reality for a mental construct:

¿Es posible que haya amor
que la hermosura divina
de tal dama menosprecie
por una mujer enigma,
...
¿Sin haberla visto un ojo,
sin saber si es vieja o niña,
nari-judaizante o chata,
desdentada o boquichica?
¡Que en cáscara te enamores! (1329-32, 1337-41)

His insistence that Melchor is rejecting a beautiful woman in favor of an unknown shell strikes at the heart of Melchor’s fascination. Melchor is completely absorbed by his own idealism and by his obsession with the potential for beauty. He is unwilling to distinguish between reality and his desires.

Melchor’s fascination with a half-glimpsed hand unwittingly creates a new identity. This perfect woman is only identifiable by her hand and by the bag that a

⁷ See Halkhoree 90-93 and Sullivan “Love Matrimony and Desire” 88 for similar arguments.

cutpurse stole and Melchor recovered (312-37). To this imaginary identity, Melchor ascribes all the attributes of the perfect beauty that he desires. Despite Ventura's warnings that this imaginative creation is just that—a creation—Melchor is impervious to any attempt to bring him to reason (421-23). While the fascination with an ideal is, in itself, not necessarily problematic, it soon becomes an obsession which prevents him from participating in real life. This created image is a fantasy and is only accessible through a world of fictionality.

Doña Magdalena is thrown into Don Melchor's world of imagination when he accosts her as she leaves the church. Once Magdalena rebuffs Melchor's various attempts to woo her, he decides to try a different tactic. He tells her that he has caught the thief who stole her purse and has come to return it:

No intento yo que me deis,
habiéndome acreditado,
nombre de necio y pesado,
sino de restaurador
de una prenda de valor
que os han del cordón cortado.
Mirad lo que os falta de él;
cobraldo, y luego partíos,
puesto que mis desvaríos
os den nombre de crüel. (502-12)

However, to Ventura's dismay, he presents her with his own purse. When she tells him that the object is not hers, he convinces her to take it "mientras parece / el dueño" (566-67). As a result, Magdalena finally is forced to agree to return to the church the following day to see if the owner of the purse has come to claim it. She agrees to this arrangement in order to keep Melchor from following her, since he will have to wait by the church to see if the owner comes searching for his lost pouch (583-88). Because she wants no part of Don Melchor, she is forced to play his game in order to maintain anonymity.

Once Magdalena makes her escape, Melchor and Ventura argue over the decision to give away Melchor's purse with all their funds. Melchor's response reflects the dichotomy of the entire work. He tells Ventura: "¿no sabes / que me está aguardando un suegro / con sesenta mil ducados?" (623-25). He justifies throwing away money on a mystery woman because he will soon have a rich father-in-law. This statement, on its surface a non-sequitur, does more than reflect the double standard which permits a man to pursue multiple women and still maintain his honor. It also reveals a fundamental split in Melchor's mind. He is simultaneously chasing the image of the perfect woman, created from the briefly seen hand, and the marriage that has been arranged for him. In so doing, he seems to be internalizing the conflict that was earlier represented as an external debate between Ventura and himself.

This conflict can be characterized as a struggle between duty and desire, or as one between practicality and idealism. The *mujer tapada* represents his desire, an ephemeral representation without any connection to his real situation. Melchor's idealism and seemingly irrational behavior concerning this idealized woman seems linked to Jung's comments on such love-at-first-sight relationships. Jung writes:

Wherever an impassioned, almost magical, relationship exists between the sexes, it is invariably a question of a projected soul-image. Since these relationships are very common, the soul must be unconscious just as frequently — that is, vast numbers of people must be quite unaware of the way they are related to their inner psychic processes. Because this unconsciousness is always coupled with complete identification with the persona, it follows that this identification must be very frequent too. And in actual fact very many people are wholly identified with their outer attitude and therefore have no conscious relation to their inner processes. (*Essential Jung* 104)

In this case, it seems clear that the *tapada*, which has captivated Melchor, is nothing more than a blank canvas upon which Melchor has imprinted his "projected soul-image."

“Melchor falls for a veiled woman, thus for an idealized image, for a person he literally cannot see” (Blue, *Spanish Comedies* 36). He has no information concerning the woman herself; rather all his desire and love is focused on the projection / creation of the ideal woman that he has superimposed on the formless shape that he has seen. This projection is obviously problematic. Jung explains

This is where the fallacy of the *enkekalymmenos* (“the veiled one”) comes in. If one includes in the psychological equation X’s picture of his father, which he takes for the real father, the equation will not work out, because the unknown quantity he has introduced does not tally with reality. X has overlooked the fact that his idea of a person consists, in the first place, of the possibly very incomplete picture he has received of the real person and, in the second place, of the subjective modifications he has imposed upon this picture. X’s idea of his father is a complex quantity for which the real father is only in part responsible, an indefinitely larger share falling to the son. (*Essential Jung* 115)

Even though Jung’s example deals specifically with the father image, the principle holds for Melchor’s case as well. The characteristics that he ascribes to his mystery woman are purely ones he has imposed upon her. This gap, between Magdalena and the image he has constructed, becomes the central illustration of the reality-illusion theme within the play.

Although the actions of Don Melchor can be well described in terms of Jungian psychology, I must stress that this analysis is not meant to be a full psychological evaluation, as if the character were a real person. Instead, it functions to describe behaviors that the author has associated with his creation. In using Jungian terminology, especially that of the persona as it applies to literary constructions, I am inverting the analysis pattern. Instead of using theatrical references to describe the cracks in the supposed wholeness of self, I am describing theatrical representations as if they were complete persons. I do so because, despite the artificial nature of the represented characters, they are intended to be viewed as complete beings rather than as

constructions. This is a tool of convenience, but it does allow us a vocabulary with which to describe how Tirso's creations interact one with another. Melchor can be characterized by the duality of his character. This duality, a conflict between the idealistic lover and the practical man of the period, which is first expressed in his initial exchange with his servant Ventura, has since been internalized as he recognizes the practical aspects of his arranged marriage while simultaneously pursuing an anonymous woman who represents a fantasy.

The creation of this fantasy woman has, up to this point, had no input from Magdalena. She has served as nothing more than the physical object upon which Melchor has imposed his idealistic vision. The original purpose of Magdalena's cloak was to serve as a covering, an erasure of her identity that would allow her to perform her religious devotions while still being symbolically enclosed. Her covering initially acts as an extension of the household which protected and restrained the women of the period. By presenting no face to the world, she is theoretically able to avoid the temptations that could lead to loss of honor. In reality, the use of such coverings was problematic; Mary Elizabeth Perry mentions that disguised women were seen as a source of disorder (*Gender and Disorder* 7). However, at the beginning of the play, the purpose of Magdalena's covering is as a protection and not as a form of escape or disobedience to societal norms.

By imposing his imaginary vision upon the canvas that is Magdalena's unmarked and unknown body, Melchor has produced a doubling of the signs presented by Magdalena's cloak. Whereas the cloak once represented anonymity, chastity, and inaccessibility, in Melchor's mind that same cloak now represents perfect beauty and the

ideal woman. This doubling is a further echo of the division previously seen in the conflict between Melchor's desire for the perfect woman and the reality of his situation. Furthermore, this doubling provides the means for the introduction of metatheater into the play. This term, coined by Lionel Able in his similarly titled 1963 work, is based on "the view that life has already been theatricalized, even before the dramatist's imagination begins to act on the raw material of life" (O'Connor, *Is the Spanish Comedia a Metatheater* 275). Metatheater, links illusion and the unreal to life (Able, 78) and highlights the uncertain and illusive nature of life. Richard Hornby later expands upon this concept in *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception*, arguing that all theater is in some way about drama itself (31) and interacts with it, rather than simply acting as a mirror (17). Although there has been some discussion on to what degree the term metatheater can be used with the comedia, it is clear that the use of disguise, as we see here and as will be illuminated in the other works, clearly contain meta-theatrical elements as the use of disguise explicitly raises these very questions.

It is Melchor who scripts for the imaginary. In what could be described as quixotic behavior, he prefers to believe what he wishes to see rather than what is presented to him, which William R. Blue views as an attempt to escape his own pre-existing role as dutiful son and future spouse (*Spanish Comedies* 215). This tendency will both cause the conflicts within the play as well as provide a means for their solution.⁸ Once Magdalena learns of Melchor's obsession, she will be able to take advantage of the image he has created to guide him to the resolution that she desires.

In order to bring this resolution about, Tirso needs to provide a sign that will prove to be a true indicator of identity. This marker is, seemingly, the stone that Melchor

⁸ See the entire chapter on the Self in Blue (193-236), for a further discussion on the subject.

and Ventura find as they open Magdalena's purse (680-97). As the use of disguise, and the amount of confusion, multiplies within the play, the viewer could easily assume that the purse and stone will serve as an identifier that will bring an end to the ambiguity initiated by Don Melchor's desire. However, this exchange of purses will instead become a straying identifier, which breaks the chain of meaning [object-true owner], just as the thief cuts the purse strings, and replaces it with a false signified, as Melchor replaces Magdalena's purse with his own. At the end of the play, when Magdalena proves her dual identity by showing her hand, a sign that Melchor has already seen but which is more stable than that of the purse, we will see how difficult it is to read a sign without assigning ancillary or contradictory meanings.

The introduction of Magdalena as herself begins when Melchor meets with his cousin Don Luis and Magdalena's brother, Don Jerónimo. At this point, he learns from his cousin that Magdalena is beautiful as well as rich, but that Don Luis is in love with her. In contrast to Melchor's idealism, Luis tells him that he will not interfere with Melchor's courting. He explains that he is rich (816), and that his duty and honor compel him to cede place to Melchor. Furthermore, he affirms that Magdalena has no idea of his interest (857-58). This leads to an odd inversion of the typical struggle between suitors, one in which Luis and Melchor attempt to outdo each other in courtesy, each declaring that he is unwilling to disrupt the other's desires. While Luis echoes the ideals of a faithful friend and companion, declining to put his interests ahead of his cousin's, Melchor uses the situation as an excuse to distance himself from his commitment. His comment highlights the emphasis that Tirso has placed on vision, viewing, and sight:

Ni yo a quien amáis he visto,
ni en viéndola me prometo

tanto, que pueda mudar
las memorias que conservo.
¿Qué sé yo si agradaré
a esa dama, que habrá hecho
ausente retratos míos
allá en el entendimiento,
y por no corresponder
el original con ellos,
me aborrezca, pues no iguala
la verdad a los deseos? (881-92)

His argument is that it is sight that provides truth and knowledge, whereas representations only present images that may or may not be accurate reflections of the original. This argument is similar to his previous statement to Luis: “No sé yo por qué al Amor / le llaman y pintan ciego, / pues lo que no ve no estima” (805-07). The irony is that Melchor is in the process of negating the validity of these statements. He has fallen in love with a woman that he has not really seen, and he will spurn Magdalena for the illusion of the perfect woman that he creates from the barely glimpsed hand of his mystery woman. This blind love that he scorns is the very thing for which Ventura has already chided him (334-60).

Magdalena finds herself in similar straits. As she prepares herself to meet her fiancé, she confides to her servant Quiñones that she found “aquel extranjero” (907) attractive. She fears that her intended husband will not be the equal of her hopes. Her statement: “Sin ver, / ¿he de amar a quien aguarda?” (924-25) is a close repetition to the sentiments expressed previously by Melchor. She blames this infelicitous state of events on the social constructions of the time, saying she is constrained by “la obediencia y el honor” (922). This is a statement that we see reinforced later by Don Sebastián, her neighbor, who states: “El honor no se enamora; / que solas las leyes guarda / de la opinión, y hasta en esto / mostráis vuestra discreción” (1007-10).

This complaint, as we will see later on, is one that is a common thread in many of the plays of Tirso de Molina. Although this one example is insufficient to establish a pattern, we will see this same sentiment repeated time and time again. There seems to be a very real concern on the part of the author about the social constructions of his epoch. The restrictions placed upon women are one of the primary expressions of this concern, although there is also some discussion of the effect of social expectations on men, as well. While Tirso does not propose a solution to the problems he perceives, it will become apparent, as this study develops, that he presents disguise as one way in which to circumscribe the restrictions of society.

Magdalena's vision of Don Melchor is similar to his view of her. She is smitten by the unknown stranger whom she met and then complains:

MAGDALENA: ¡Quién pudiera compralle,
ya que mis penas escuchas,
una de las partes muchas
que tiene: la gracia, el talle
con que hacer a don Melchor
como él...! Si no tan perfeto,
tan amante o tan discreto.

QUIÑONES: Podrá ser que sea mejor.

MAGDALENA: ¿Cómo será eso posible? (929-36)

The key difference between the two is that Don Melchor has created an image of a complete woman from seeing no more than her hand. Doña Magdalena, at least, is basing her impression on a more complete vision of her suitor. Yet, they both share the ironic dismissal of their intended as being unable to compete with the ideal that they have already encountered.

This dismissal, which Tirso uses as one of the key motivators for the plot, obliquely addresses a serious social problem that Magdalena had alluded to earlier. She is

not free to follow her heart and, without the fortunate chance that she falls for the very man who is her intended husband, she would be placed in an unenviable situation. While this play does not treat the problems inherent in this conflict, we will see that in *El celoso prudente*, Tirso addresses this issue without presenting a resolution. In the following chapter, we will be presented with an example of how the use of disguise is motivated by this conflict, as well as by some of the consequences of the heroine's attempts to win the right to marry the man she has chosen.

As Don Melchor is presented to Doña Magdalena, Tirso reinforces his repeated leitmotif of image versus reality. Magdalena's father, Don Alonso, tells his daughter that Melchor is the very image of his father, Don Juan, and it is because of his friendship with Don Juan that he has chosen Melchor as her spouse. He furthermore exalts the physical qualities of Don Melchor by proclaiming: "No pudo tu pensamiento, / por más que encarecedor / galán te le haya pintado, / ser más que un tosco traslado / del talle de don Melchor" (1032-36). In Melchor, Don Alonso sees the image of his friend and the continuation of that friendship into the next generation. At the same time, Magdalena's image of the gallant stranger collapses into the undefined image of her husband to be, as she realizes that they are one and the same (1057-63). In fact, her image of the perfect *galán* turns out to be reflected in the form in front of her.

In this scene, we are presented with disparate versions of image and reality, as the desires of the father and daughter are reflected through Melchor. For Don Alonso, Melchor is simultaneously the image of his friend and a reality superior to the image of the suitor that he assumes that his daughter has imagined. In Magdalena's case, Melchor's presence replaces the image of an unknown, and feared, spouse with that of

the desirable stranger briefly met after mass. In the first instance, Melchor represents a bond with the past and a hope that this link will continue in the future. Thus, he transfers his link with Melchor's father to his daughter. In the second, the potential conflict between desire and obedience is averted through a twist of fate. For Magdalena, Melchor's presence provides a solution to her anxieties regarding the nature of her husband to be. However, this anxiety about who her husband will be is immediately replaced by a new anxiety caused by Melchor's preference for his imaginary beauty.

Melchor's predilection for his idealized image is made explicit as he and Ventura argue over the identity of Melchor's mystery woman. Ventura, ever the practical observer, tells his master that he is certain that the hand they saw earlier belongs to the lady now presented to them (1068-85). Melchor violently rejects this idea, asserting that Magdalena in no way compares to the woman he met that afternoon. Melchor's refusal to even consider Ventura's assertion that Magdalena is the woman he saw earlier paints him both as an idealist, who is only interested in the woman he himself has created, and as a bit of a fool, since he is unwilling to search for the truth. In fact, "seeing incorrectly is precisely Melchor's greatest problem" (Blue, *Spanish Comedies* 31). This is what Halkhoree dubs "creating an obstacle in his own imagination" (71). Melchor has divorced himself from the real world and has chosen to follow his ideals.

The strength of the identity that he has mentally created is such that the unknown has become his primary ideal of beauty. When Ventura later forces him to deal with the possible consequences of his choice (should his mystery woman turn out to be ugly, poor, or of mixed blood), Melchor replies that he will marry Magdalena if the other woman is ugly, "que si [Magdalena] no es hermosa, es rica" (1384). If she is poor, he claims that he

will return home to León and, in an echo of Antonio de Guevara's *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea*, will live a "quieta vida, / al yugo de amor atado, / daré dueño a mi familia, / señora a mi herencia corta, / y a mi padre nuera e hija" (1392-96). When faced with the final question, that of birth, he only replies, "Tendrán respuesta / todas tus bachillerías / en viéndola" (1405-07). Melchor's first priority is the physical beauty of his spouse; should that not be an option, then wealth is a sufficient substitute. He, however, is unable to present an acceptable solution to social or religious differences and is forced to deny the problem rather than face the choice of abandonment of his love or rejection by his family and society. Melchor's response indicates that he is not prepared to handle social realities. Instead, he is firmly entrenched in a fictional world in which nobility, in and of itself, is a guarantee of a happy ending. It is this idealistic view of love and the realities of life that makes Melchor so subject to the manipulations of those who take a more pragmatic approach to life. The similarity to *Don Quijote* is evident, when we compare Melchor and those around him with Don Quijote's stay in the palace of the duke and duchess.

As the first act concludes, we find that Doña Magdalena is concerned about her husband to be. When Quiñones congratulates her, saying "¿Hay suerte como la tuya? / ¡Que el primer hombre que vieres / sea tu esposo! ¡Dichosa eres!" (1165-67), Magdalena, who has read Melchor more accurately, replies that she is unsure that her situation is actually enviable (1168-72). Melchor still pines for his mystery woman, Luis mourns the loss of the woman he loves, and Ángela, the neighbor, finds herself attracted to the engaged Melchor. As we will see at the end of the chapter, the ending of this act is a prefiguration of the ending of the play.

The action of this play is somewhat unusual for a *comedia de enredo*. Instead of a central ongoing confusion, we see that the initial uncertainty, created by the unexpected meeting of Melchor and Magdalena, is partially resolved at the end of the first act. This initial confusion only continues for Melchor and is the result of his refusal to see Magdalena as his mystery woman, despite the urgings of his servant. In effect, it is only Melchor's obsession with his imagined woman that allows for the continuation of the uncertainty in the play. In the second and third acts, we will see how Melchor's determined insistence on the separate existence of the mystery woman he met after mass allows both Magdalena and Ángela to occupy the identity he creates in order to win his love.

As the second act opens, Quiñones makes explicit the earlier critique of love and desire that is implied in the first act. As Magdalena expresses her concerns about Melchor, Quiñones replies:

No me espanto. Todo aquello
que está en ajeno poder,
tiene el gusto por más bello,
y el valor suele perder,
en llegando a poseello.
Juzgaste ayer a tu esposo
por prenda ajena; y así
te pareció más hermoso.
Viene a ser tu dueño aquí,
y júzgasle ya enfadoso.
Efímera es tu afición. (1204-14)

While this observation is key to understanding the play, it is misplaced in terms of its recipient. I see this misplacement as the result of dramatic necessity. Quiñones, in the role of wise maid, is best suited to make the observation. Magdalena replies that her unease is not the result of her own fickle nature, but rather, is based on an entirely

realistic appraisal of Don Melchor's character. The following exchange between the two lays the groundwork for the rest of the play, as well as revealing the anxieties that motivate these actions. Therefore, it is important to cite the conversation at length.

Magdalena discusses this with Quiñones, saying:

MAGDALENA: ¿con qué seguridad
rendiré mi voluntad
a quien, con tan fácil fe,
la primer mujer que ve
triunfa de su voluntad?
Hombre que a darme la mano
viene aquí desde León
y es tan mudable y liviano
que a la primera ocasión,
liberal y cortesano,
a un manto rinde despojos
y a una mano el alma ofrece.
¿No quieres que me dé enojos
quien así se desvanece?
Y sin penetrar sus ojos
lo que, por no ver, ignora,
se suspende y enamora,
exagera, sutiliza,
y palabras autoriza,
pues con escudos las dora.
¿Qué satisfacción dará
a quien por dueño le espera?
¿O quién me asegurará
de voluntad tan ligera,
que, desposado, no hará
lo mismo con cuantas mire,
y yo con él mal casada,
quejas al alma retire,
llore mi hacienda gastada,
y sus mudanzas suspire?
QUIÑONES: ¡Pues siendo tú quien despierta
su voluntad, y encubierta
diste causa a sus desvelos,
¿de quién puedes formar celos?
MAGDALENA: De mí misma. Y está cierta
que si le amé forastero,
doméstico y dueño ya,
dudo, al paso que le quiero. (1234-71)

In this speech, Magdalena highlights the difference between reality and imagination and shows herself to be the opposite of Don Melchor. She clearly defines the difference between the attraction for an image and the reality of married life. Furthermore, she expresses her concerns that Melchor's behavior is a systemic problem rather than an exceptional incident. She highlights the fact that Melchor's obsession was not with a specific woman, but rather with a "manto" and a "mano." Where Melchor has argued to Ventura that his fascination is the result of unparalleled beauty and is the natural result of a desire to marry for love or beauty, rather than for money (100-05, 370-76), Magdalena, as the potential loser in such a situation, perceives this as an indication of a wandering eye, and is driven by "the irresistible urge to test Don Melchor" (Smith, "*La celosa de sí misma*" 829). She abstracts his actions into a pattern of behavior that is worrisome to say the least.

As does the practical Ventura, Quiñones remains focused on the realities of the situation. While Magdalena is, rightly, concerned with Melchor's character, Quiñones wonders about the details. She points out that it is Magdalena herself who is the source of Melchor's distraction. The question for Quiñones is: Who does Magdalena have to be jealous of? She fails to see the overall pattern that Magdalena is considering, instead focusing on the specific circumstances of the moment. Magdalena's response is the source of the play's title. She explains that her jealousy is based on the separate identities that she now occupies. She draws a clear distinction between her attraction to Melchor, when both are unattached and free to act, "forastero," and his actions when placed in a domestic situation, where he is responsible for the consequences of his actions, and where she is liable to suffer for his misdeeds.

It is in order to learn more about Melchor's character, and to verify that he will be faithful, that she decides to return to the church to meet him. Her hope is that, after seeing the real Magdalena, Melchor will not be interested in the image that he first saw.

Quiñones assures her:

No tendrá de ti memoria;
que tu presencia gallarda,
siendo a sus ojos notoria,
borrará la primer copia
que vio tapada e impropia,
pues se enamoró en bosquejo,
y mudando de consejo,
te olvidará por ti propia. (1276-83)

In Quiñones's opinion, the real trumps the image.⁹ She believes, or at least tells her mistress, that reality is preferable to fantasy. This statement however, contradicts her earlier warning that it is typical to desire that which we do not possess and discount that which we do. This contradiction is the first clue that the reader has of Quiñones's mercenary nature. Rather than faithful retainer, we will see that Quiñones fits the stereotype of the corrupt and self-serving servant, given that she acts in her own best interest rather than that of her mistress. At this point, her betrayal is limited to saying what Magdalena wants to hear, in effect telling a white lie. Magdalena seems to harbor some suspicions about Quiñones's reliability. When she is asked why she is dressed as she is, she tells Quiñones it is part of an overall plan. In response to her maid's request to know the details of the plan Magdalena responds. "Si los impides, / dándome consejos, no; / mas sí, si a mi amor te mides" (1291-93). Her condition for sharing her plan is a promise of help and obedience, and even then she continues to keep Quiñones in the dark (1307-10).

⁹ This contrast between reality and the imaginary lends itself to a Lacanian reading, such as Raúl Galoppe's work on other plays by Tirso.

It is at this point in the play that Magdalena begins to take an active part in the creation and maintenance of disguise. In her initial meeting with Don Melchor, her role was a very passive one. She was nothing more than the blank slate upon which Melchor projected his fantasy of the perfect woman. At no point did she provide any information, true or false, that would affect the outcome of the conversation. Now, with her order to Quiñones to provide an anonymous servant and litter, she begins to participate in the creation of deception. She has yet to make a movement towards the creation of identity, but she has taken control of the erasure of her identity.

In the first act, her use of the cloak was the result of social convention, without any secondary purpose. Now she is taking advantage of her socially acceptable mourning clothes to provide her with anonymity. She assures this anonymity through the rental of a servant without any connection to her family. As a result, she has separated herself from the identifiers which link her to her place in society. This action is not the result of any desire to break societal conventions, as is the case in *El amor médico*, nor does it come from the need to restore lost honor, as in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. Rather, her stated motive in blurring her identity is to avoid misunderstandings on the part of her father or brother (1311-17). Despite Magdalena's tentative steps into the world of disguise and identity creation, we soon see that she is not prepared for the various associated pressures and difficulties, despite Halkhoree's assertions to the contrary (76).

As she returns to meet with Don Melchor, she is seen by Luis, who speaks with her without recognizing the woman under the cloak. In doing so, Luis's actions provide both an echo to, and a contrast with, those of his cousin. Unlike Melchor, he is not overwhelmed by the sight of a hidden face, but he does show interest. This interest is

certainly more appropriate in him, since he has abandoned any hope to win Magdalena. His actions can be read as the more typical behavior of a youth who hopes to find love and a match. His actions here serve to highlight the inappropriateness of Melchor's approach, since he is already committed to Magdalena and has shown no restraint in his wooing of his mystery woman.

This contrast is reemphasized as Melchor exults, to the disgust of Ventura, over the hand that has won his imagination (1478). As Melchor and Magdalena verbally spar, she tells him that she has heard that he is committed to a Doña Magdalena "noble, cuerda, hermosa y rica" (1508). This moment is the first deliberate doubling of identity in the play. Although the creation of Melchor's mystery woman is the result of his earlier transference of desire to the unmarked "cáscara" (1341), it is not until the Magdalena in the guise of the *tapada* distinguishes herself from Magdalena, daughter of Don Alonso and promised wife to Don Melchor, that we actually are presented with a splitting of Magdalena's identity. The original doubling that Melchor created was the result of his idealistic search for perfection. He indeed created a separate individual, but until this moment, this ephemeral form was in constant danger of collapsing into the more solid identity of Doña Magdalena, just as his role as the handsome stranger collapsed into the named identity of Don Melchor. Because Magdalena did not provide Melchor with any information regarding herself, her cloaked version was only a separate identity in Melchor's mind. Ventura was easily able to recognize Magdalena as the woman seen earlier that day. Now, with this statement, there is a clear presumption of a separation between Magdalena and the mystery woman. Even though Magdalena has not provided a

separate identity for her self-as-*tapada*, she has moved up the ladder of disguise from erasure of identity to masquerade.

This transition is important in a number of ways. As a character moves from one category of disguise to another, there is a change in the level of involvement with the secondary identity created. Erasure presumes almost no interaction between the interior identity and the blank face presented to the world. In fact, that is the ideal: a complete divorce of identifying characteristics. As a result, there is almost no need for active creation of characteristics or interaction between the two facets. When one leaves this level and moves to masquerade, and later role-play, etc., more demands are placed upon the person performing the masquerade. The presentation of an alternate identity, whatever the level of identification, requires the creation of a secondary personality which must be maintained separate from the hidden identity, and which must present a level of validity that varies according to the level of disguise used. As we move from erasure into masquerade and disguise, the character is forced to assume a *persona*, which Jung describes as “a kind of mask, designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and, on the other, to conceal the true nature of the individual” (*Essential Jung* 94). This *persona*, constantly active in everyday life, is imposed here as a literally theatrical addition to the identity of Magdalena worn by the actress on stage.

By differentiating the identity of the unknown woman from that of Magdalena, Magdalena begins to take control of the division of her self that was initiated by Melchor. It is only through the assumption of this separate personality that Magdalena has the opportunity to verify Melchor’s character and influence events. Because Melchor has already shown interest in, what is to him, a woman other than his fiancée, Magdalena is

justifiably concerned with his future fidelity. By taking control of the persona of the cloaked woman, she has the chance to test Melchor before she is committed to him permanently.

This transition is also important because it signals the beginning of the shift of control from Melchor to the various women in the play. Magdalena starts to indicate her growing independence, not only through her preliminary appropriation of the persona inadvertently created by Melchor, but also by directing the conversation to points that are important to her. Thus Magdalena is not only taking on a more active role in her interaction with Melchor, but through her use of disguise, she is actually gaining a measure of control over the events that surround her. While this control is far from complete, it is certainly more than she has previously had in her role of obedient daughter.

At issue here are two linked concepts, control of identity and control of the surrounding world. The first has to do with representation. To discuss this, I turn to Judith Butler. Although she speaks explicitly of gender performance, what she says is also pertinent here as Magdalena (re)presents herself as a new person, as yet unnamed, but separate from her primary identity. We read:

As a public action and performative act, gender is not a radical choice or project that reflects a merely individual choice, but neither is it imposed or inscribed upon the individual, as some post-structuralist displacements of the subject would contend. The body is not passively scripted with cultural codes, as if it were a lifeless recipient of wholly pre-given cultural relations. But neither do embodied selves pre-exist the cultural conventions which essentially signify bodies. Actors are always already on the stage, within the terms of the performance. Just as a script may be enacted in various ways, and just as the play requires both text and interpretation, so the gendered body acts its part in a culturally restricted corporeal space and enacts interpretations within the confines of already existing directives. (“Performative Acts” 410)

In Magdalena's case, we can say that her choice to embody a new persona helps her to move away from the "scripted cultural codes" which lock her into a certain role. The unnamed woman, whom Magdalena now represents, is not as tightly locked into the cultural norms which bind her identity. There is a psychic space which is created. Because of her lack of definition, she is able to act more freely. I agree with Butler that gender, and indeed identity as a whole, is neither a matter of individual choice nor imposed norms, but a combination of the two. My belief is that the creation of a new persona, however it comes to exist, allows for the *possibility* that the person involved in this role-play can shift the balance between the two extremes of pure self-creation and helpless puppet towards self creation, and as a result, gain more freedom for herself.

The second aspect is that of control of the surrounding world. In a society in which a woman's options in life were primarily limited to marriage, the convent, or the street, the chance to secure the best possible outcome was a matter of great importance. One, perhaps the primary, way to do so is to use language to control events. However, speech can be a perilous thing, with undesirable consequences. Foucault, in *Fearless Speech*, explains that "if you do not have the right of free speech, you are unable to exercise any kind of power, and thus you are in the same situation as a slave" (29). In fact, the ability to speak is a key to limiting the power of others. "The man who exercises power is wise only insofar as there exists someone who can use *parrhesia* [direct, fearless speech] to criticize him, thereby putting some limit to his power, to his command" (29). As Magdalena creates a social opening through the use of disguise, she also increases her ability to speak. In the guise of Melchor's mystery woman, she can ask questions that

would be unthinkable for Magdalena, the bride-to-be. Michel Foucault continues by saying that

[T]he problem of the freedom of speech becomes increasingly related to the choice of existence, to the choice of one's way of life. Freedom in the use of logos increasingly becomes freedom in the choice of bios. And as a result, *parrhesia* is regarded more and more as a personal attitude, a personal quality, as a virtue which is useful for the city's political life in the case of positive or critical *parrhesia*, or as a danger for the city in the case of negative, pejorative *parrhesia*. (*Fearless Speech* 85)

Here he explicitly links the ability to speak with the ability to choose one's existence. The one provides the possibility of the other. Because of the link between speech and freedom, it is necessary for Magdalena to gain a position from which to speak in order to be free to act. In some ways, this seems to be a Catch-22. Speech and freedom are linked, but without the one, the other seems impossible. This is the value of disguise. Where power and speech cannot be openly exercised, there is still the possibility to speak as the unknown, the Other. Magdalena has a greater chance to influence events if she is not constrained by an identity that is not allowed speech, and employs instead multiple personae to create a polyphonic voice.

As Melchor and Magdalena converse, Melchor tells her that in his opinion, she, the cloaked woman, is more attractive than the woman he is to marry (1554-66).

Magdalena's response is at once ironic and serious. She tells him:

... vuestro deseo me pinta
más bella de lo que soy,
y temo perder la estima
en que estoy imaginada,
cuando no la iguale, vista.

...
Yo os juro a fe de quien soy,
si es licito que se siga
la pública voz y fama
que tengo de aquesta villa,

que no es doña Magdalena
ni más bella, ni más rica,
ni más moza, ni más sabia,
ni más noble, ni más digna
de serviros y estimaros
que yo (1576-80, 1585-94)

Magdalena communicates to Melchor that she is just as beautiful than Magdalena, but that she is concerned about his disappointment with the reality of her physical appearance. What Melchor is not aware of is that she bases her fears on experience, since he has just professed to her that he did not find Magdalena attractive. In so doing, he has confirmed her fears about his character. She now knows, for a fact, that his imagination constructs a woman underneath the cloak that she, as Magdalena, can never equal. This problem is reaffirmed as he answers “os juzgo por maravilla / de la belleza” (1600-01) and says that the difference between her and Magdalena must be “como la noche hace al día” (1604). This exchange certainly does nothing to encourage Magdalena. Her earlier impressions have not only been verified, but strengthened.

Magdalena is placed in a difficult situation. She knows that Melchor is fickle and more attached to his imaginary creation than reality. Furthermore, she cannot readily explain the source of her knowledge to her brother or father. While the initial meeting could be considered innocent, the second is a deliberate defiance of her proper role as a guarded woman. Her solution is to force Melchor to act. Her insistence that he leave Magdalena’s household and enter hers is a clever ploy. Either Melchor will have to abandon his pretensions towards his mystery woman, or he will offend her father and brother and become a less acceptable suitor. Either outcome would strengthen her position. By requiring him to act, Magdalena hopes to find a resolution to her dilemma.

Melchor accepts her proposal readily, but he inadvertently complicates the situation when he tells her that his cousin, Don Luis, loves Magdalena. He does so to provide an acceptable way out of his commitment to Magdalena, while seeming both honorable (since his cousin loves Magdalena and he does not, he gallantly cedes his claim to her), as well as faithful to his love for his mystery woman, since he is negating the possibility of playing one woman against the other. As a reward, she uncovers her eyes for Melchor and Ventura.

Magdalena's relatively simple stratagem is disrupted, however, by her newly hired servant, Santillana. In an attempt to earn the bribe that Ventura offers him, he creates a name for his unknown mistress (1673-79), the countess of Chirinola in Naples, and provides an address as well (1680-82). When confronted by Ventura with this new name (1765-70), she accepts it without pause. Santillana's act of naming takes away some of Magdalena's new found freedom; what Dawn L Smith describes as a hijacking of invention ("*La celosa de sí misma*" 829). However, it is important to note that the role she occupies as the *tapada* has already been hijacked by Don Melchor. Her subsequent actions, and those of Santillana and others, are nothing more than a further hijacking of the identity already created by Melchor's imagination. This is not a case of her plans being undermined, as Smith argues. Rather, it is a constant battle to name and control the idea represented by her disguised body. Santillana's intervention is less a case of undermining than a narrowing of Magdalena's options. By providing her with a name and address, Santillana has exposed Magdalena to discovery. It is now possible to verify whether there is such a person as the Countess and whether she does indeed live at the

stated address. He has thus forced her into a further commitment. If she wishes to continue her masquerade, she must now add role-play to her repertoire.

By creating a named personage, rather than a masked woman, Santillana has forced another level of disguise upon Magdalena. She must now play the role of the disguised Countess, rather than a mystery woman. Because there is now an additional layer to her disguise, later in the play, Ángela, when she wishes to gain Melchor for herself, can take advantage of the countess's identity, and marginalize Magdalena. While any disguise is susceptible to appropriation, the added layer of theater makes the usurpation an easier task. Melchor knows that the cloak is just a covering, an erasure. By naming, defining, the person beneath the clothes, an imposter can expose the 'real' countess. This naming helps to 'solve' the mystery of the cloaked identity and provides the seeker with answers.

The deep division that exists between her two identities is something that Magdalena perceives clearly. After her second encounter with Melchor, and after she accepts the identity created by Santillana, she discusses her situation with Quiñones and expresses her frustration at her seemingly impossible situation. She exclaims:

¡Mira mis contradicciones!
Cubierta, doy ocasiones
a su pasión amorosa;
vista, soy fea y odiosa;
enamoro y desobligo.
Y compitiendo conmigo,
de mí misma estoy celosa. (1962-68)

This division is a common occurrence in Tirso's works. In fact, Henry Sullivan calls this tendency to present the individual as a divided being "a hallmark of the Mercedarian's art" (*Tirso de Molina and the Drama of the Counter Reformation* 113-14). Magdalena

feels almost powerless in her attempt to win Melchor. Her actions, seemingly wise at the time, have forced her into a conflict with herself. Not only does the real Magdalena have to compete with the imaginary beauty conjured up by Don Melchor, but now that she is committed to playing the role, thanks in part to Santillana, she has placed the two identities in direct opposition.

As Magdalena discusses how the same hand and eyes are treated so differently by Melchor, she contrasts the power of imagination with prosaic physical realities: “puede la aprensión tanto, / que es bastante sólo un manto / a amarlos y a aborrecellos” (1976-78). She marvels that a simple change of perspective is enough to make Melchor either love or hate her. She knows that she is one single person, yet at the same time, the dividing of her self into the countess and Magdalena has opened a new territory for her, and the basis of reality upon which everything rests seems suddenly less substantial than before. “Yo que como sombra sigo / sus pasos, pues lo parezco” (1983-84) is how she expresses this feeling. We must remember that, although she is taking an active part in the role-play of the countess, she is not the primary creator of this identity. In fact, she is more comparable to the actor who fills the role created by the playwright. Her seeming control of her situation is scant at best. Quiñones observes: “sin darte a conocer, / siendo sola una mujer, / te partes en dos mujeres” (1996-98). This impossible condition is the direct result of Melchor and the power of his imagination.

Despite this challenge, Magdalena is willing to maintain the charade. She explains her reasons for this to Quiñones, saying:

no te espante
que me obligue la Fortuna
a ser conmigo importuna,
y quiera ser sola amada;

pues soy dos imaginada,
aunque en la verdad soy una.
Sólo en la imaginación
vive amor; y siendo en ella
dos, una fea, otra bella,
tengo celos con razón.
En cuanto doy ocasión
a que se case conmigo,
si soy dos, ya desobligo
a la que desprecia y deja,
y si no, ya forma queja
la que es de su amor testigo. (2013-28)

This passage repeatedly emphasizes the single-double contrast which is at the heart of her problem. In the battle between reality and imagination, she realizes that it is imagination that is the more powerful. She states that imagination is the repository of love, and because of this, she cannot dismiss the power of Melchor's imagined countess. Therefore, she feels that she needs to play both parts until it is clear where Melchor truly stands. She further argues that her actions have, at least, placed Melchor in a position in which he has to act and prove his love for the countess, or reveal himself as unable to live up to his commitments.

As if Magdalena's conflict between herself and her disguise as the countess were not enough, Tirso adds a new level of complication as the siblings, Sebastián and Ángela, confess to each other the love they feel for the soon-to-be-espoused pair. Sebastián, like Luis, longs for Magdalena, while his sister has been smitten by Melchor (1775-87). Sebastián proposes that they disrupt the planned wedding. To do so, he intends to claim that Magdalena has already promised herself to him. He assures his sister that his wealth will help to sway her father, relying on the greed that he associates with old age (1803-22). Although Ángela approves of his ploy, she doubts its efficacy. However, she gains

hope when she learns from Ventura that Melchor is not interested in Magdalena, but rather in a countess. He also assures her that she could easily gain his love. Stating:

... en sabiendo vuestro amor
mudará de parecer,
porque sólo dejó ver
la condesa a don Melchor
un par de ojos y una mano.
Mostradle vos la nariz,
con el rosado matiz
de ese rostro soberano,
el hocico y dentadura,
cocándole con el dote;
que a Magdalena y su bote
olvidará, y por Ventura,
digo por mí, a la condesa. (1931-43)

The appearance of this new love interest gives her hope that she can delay the wedding and win Melchor. His information also provides her with the means to later imitate the countess, since he affirms that the countess has only displayed her eyes and hand. With this information, she and her brother are able to go to Don Alonso and, with Magdalena's support, convince him that Melchor has chosen another bride. They propose that Sebastián marry Magdalena, and Ángela marry Magdalena's brother Jerónimo. This proposal is readily accepted, and when Melchor arrives, everyone congratulates him on his new arrangement.

Melchor's happiness is short lived, however. As the act closes, Magdalena approaches to tell him that the countess has been forced to leave without notice and will have to marry someone else in order to maintain her estate (2222-25). Melchor, crushed by this news, and mocked by Ventura, resolves to leave Madrid and return home. With Melchor's loss of the countess, and the arrangements made for the marriage of the other single characters, it would seem that there is little to provoke action in the final act.

Although Ángela has not won the man she desires, at this point the play could be read as a morality tale in which desire and Melchor's need to chase the unreal are punished. Melchor has no one to marry and is now so poor that he is forced to ask his servant for a loan (2313-14). Despite Ventura's urgings to apologize to Magdalena and try to marry her, or to woo Ángela, Melchor remains locked into his fascination with the countess and would rather return home poor. He seems the perfect negative example. His stubbornness and failure to keep his promise to Magdalena seem to have been justly punished. Such a conclusion would appear to support the traditional societal structure and warn against grasping for that which is not in reach. Furthermore, Magdalena has escaped the trap of an undesirable marriage and is rewarded with a husband who loves her. However, Tirso is not content to resolve the situation so easily. Not only does the seeming resolution at the end of the second act lack the baroque twists so common in Tirso, but Magdalena has yet to assert herself and take control of her situation. Instead of the tidy ending that Tirso intimates, in the final act he reignites the conflict and confusion created earlier in the play.

The third act opens with a seemingly nonsensical action as Magdalena sends Santillana to Melchor with a gift and a note telling him that the countess is not leaving nor is she obliged to marry. This emboldens Melchor and renews his hopes to marry the woman that he loves. The obvious question here is why Magdalena would fetch Melchor back after dismissing him just a few hours earlier. The theatrical reasons are apparent. There is a need for action during the third act and the return of the countess provides for the *enredos* that are needed to keep the audience in suspense.

On a character level, this is more difficult to justify. While Magdalena may scorn Melchor, the countess has proved his faithfulness and now wishes to marry him. This recall is a *de facto* concession on the part of Magdalena—that she wishes to marry Melchor, despite his previously poor treatment of her. This decision, to recall Melchor, signals an end to Magdalena’s prior expressions of internal division, at least as far as it concerns her feelings for Melchor. Any further distain on the part of Magdalena will have to be considered play acting rather than ambivalence regarding her feelings for Melchor.

Following this scene, in which Melchor is restored to hope, we are presented with the return of Ángela as a contestant for Melchor’s love. At this point, Quiñones reveals herself as unfaithful to Magdalena by telling Ángela about the letter from the countess to Melchor. Her excuse is that “estoy obligada / a tu hermano, y cohechada / de mil regalos que agora / estorbos han de allanar / que su cuidado encarece” (2490-94). She claims that as long as Melchor loves the countess, Sebastián will not be able to marry Magdalena. She further tells Ángela that “Nuestra doña Magdalena, / que para decir verdad / tiene extraña voluntad / a don Melchor, con la pena / y celos de quien adora” (2521-25). Magdalena’s previous suspicions of Quiñones are verified as she shows herself to be completely mercenary.

Although Quiñones’s statements are true, for Ángela, who is not aware of Magdalena’s role-playing, they should not make any sense. She has been told that her brother cannot marry Magdalena while the countess and Melchor are involved. Quiñones has also told her that Magdalena is in love with Melchor. Yet, at the same time, Quiñones has made the division between the countess and Magdalena explicit, to the extent that she

says Magdalena sent her to spy out the countess's intentions (2528). This paradox is something that is not explained by Blanca de los Rios or any other critic that I can find.

I can present several possible explanations. First, this may be a mistake by Tirso, who lost track of which character knew what information. Or it may be a case of dramatic license. Or Tirso decided that it was necessary for the plot structure. Also, it could be an attempt by Quiñones to give Ángela a hint about Magdalena's doings without explicitly betraying her. Or finally, Quiñones made a logically fallacious argument, relying on Ángela's preoccupation with Melchor to cause her to overlook the problems with her story. While any of these options is possible, I tend to support the last scenario. Because there is a specific mention of Magdalena sending Quiñones to find out information about the countess, it seems unlikely that Tirso simply lost track of what Ángela did or did not know. Likewise, Quiñones' actions in helping Ángela constitute a sufficient betrayal that hinting to Ángela about Magdalena's secondary identity as the countess rather than specifically stating the fact is a needless complication. No matter what the reason for the difficulty of this section may be, the result is that Quiñones advises Ángela to meet Melchor, disguised as the countess, and outlines, in detail, a whole scenario in which Ángela can gain Melchor without harming anyone else (2547-608). To further bolster Ángela's chances, Quiñones gives her the purse that Melchor gave to Magdalena at the start of the play.

Shortly after Ángela arrives, dressed as the countess, she shows Melchor one of her eyes, as a symbol of favor. What Ventura notices immediately, and Melchor refuses to perceive, is that Ángela has blue eyes, while Magdalena is brown-eyed. When Ventura attempts to tell his master this fact, Melchor responds to Ángela:

No hagáis caso de este necio;
que yo doy crédito al alma,
que con pinceles más vivos
en mi memoria os retrata.
Yo sé que es ése el que adoro. (2779-83)

As I have stressed throughout this chapter, Melchor is so consumed by his imagination that not even an indication as clear as a different eye color can convince him that the person playing the role is not who he expects. Melchor has repeatedly refused to see reality, and has instead superimposed his image of the perfect woman on the covering of Magdalena, and now Ángela. In contrast to other plays, such as *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, in which there is a constant threat that someone will pierce the protective cover of disguise, Melchor actively acts to blind himself and create the very disguise that causes his misadventures. Because of the strength of his mental construct, there is no room for the person underneath the covering, a fact which bodes ill for Magdalena in the future, since he has already dismissed her as inferior to his image.

The appearance of Doña Magdalena, also dressed as the countess, forces Melchor, for the first time, to consider the person under the clothing, rather than just the visible surface. Magdalena's words express her knowledge that her identity has been supplanted. She says: "me ocupan mantos la plaza / que pensé yo que era mía, / cuando la juzgué estar vacía" (2792-94). While her statement superficially refers to her place as Melchor's beloved, she simultaneously refers to her identity as the countess. This immediate understanding is the result of her previous discourse on the internal division created by the identity of the countess, where she stated that love lived in the imagination, a realm in which her actual self was divided.

As the two women vie for Melchor's affection and each attempt to convince him that she is the true countess, they present various signs in order to convince him of their authenticity. Confused and unable to decide he turns to Ventura for help. Ventura replies:

Que ha sido almendra preñada
nuestra condesa de a dos,
o erizo con dos castañas,
huevo que dos yemas tuvo,
y aunque con cáscara entrambas,
tu amor, que es gallina clueca,
hoy estas dos pollas saca. (2932-38)

His humorous reply indicates that the countess has doubled from the seed planted by Melchor's imagination. His phrasing further indicates that the creation of the countess is a result of Melchor's love. He makes no argument that there is an authentic woman and an imposter. Rather, both are equally real, or false, as the result of Melchor's wish fulfillment. When both women run away as their brothers approach, Ventura makes one last attempt to bring Melchor to reality. Instead of revealing the cloaked women's identity, he advises his master to choose between Ángela and Magdalena.

Magdalena, who now seems desperate to win Melchor's love, gives him one more chance. He is told to appear at her house at one in the morning and the countess will speak with him. As Magdalena prepares to meet Melchor, she expresses her frustration with the events of that afternoon. With the appearance of a second countess, she tells Quiñones that she feels as if "aunque una sola en tres soy" (3120). Part of her problem is the amount of knowledge that the other woman displayed, including a detailed description of gifts sent to Melchor.

As we consider Magdalena's situation, it seems that throughout the play she has been unable to ever take control of her alternate identity. It first appears as a construction

of Melchor's imagination; it is then given substance by Santillana as he proclaims her a countess; and it is finally usurped by Ángela who holds Melchor's purse in her hand. In her conversation at the window with Melchor, this same problem repeats itself. She tells him that she, the countess, must leave for Italy, and suggests that he marry Magdalena (3279-97). When he accedes, she castigates him for his fickleness. Magdalena has become so caught up in her disguise that she briefly passes to the stage of identity, where she starts to believe herself the countess, and to forget that Magdalena is not a separate person. She says in an aside:

¡Qué esté yo de mí celosa,
y en cuanto soy la condesa,
me pese que don Melchor
ser mi esposo me prometa!
¡Extraña condición tengo! (3369-73)

It seems clear that she is unable to control this second identity. When she was only erasing her features, Melchor created in her an imagined beauty; as the countess she is easily supplanted by Ángela; now, as she plays the roles of the countess and Magdalena, she finds the countess taking control and acting against Magdalena's interests.

The entire episode ends abruptly as the men of the house overhear Melchor and confront him in the street. He asserts that the countess led him to this house and that he plans to marry her. Ángela takes this opportunity to claim the identity, asserting her independence and telling her brother "no es razón que obedezca, / si es libre mi voluntad, / las bodas que tú conciertas" (3470-72). This is followed by Magdalena, who arrives and claims to be the true countess. She presents her servants, and hand, as signs that she is the 'real' countess. To which Melchor, overwhelmed with evidence, replies, "Conózcola, y

con vergüenza / en ella sello mis labios” (3502-03). This hasty ending is completed with the marriage of Ángela to Jerónimo and Ventura to Quiñones.

Although the ending is a conventional one, with the woman recovering her desired man, there are a number of loose ends that remain. Quiñones is never punished for her duplicity, while both Don Sebastián and Don Luis, who have been honorable men, are deprived of a spouse. Furthermore, Melchor capitulates incredibly rapidly, considering his repeated disdain for Magdalena and his earlier rejection that she could be his mystery woman. Part of this can be resolved when we consider Magdalena’s words as she unmasks the countess. She proclaims: “yo soy la condesa, / si en el título fingida, / en la sustancia de veras, / a quien don Melchor adora” (3482-85). In her revelation, it is the countess who remains. Magdalena folds her identity into that of the woman imagined by Melchor. Thus, what remains is the countess, under the name of Magdalena, rather than the original Magdalena. It is almost as if she has been subsumed into the ideal woman created by Melchor. And so the play ends, problematically. Not only are there too many suitors waiting in the wings, but the viewer is left to wonder who Magdalena really is, and what will happen when reality and imagination again clash in Melchor’s life.

The presentation of disguise in this play is one which emphasizes how it can be both a path to greater freedom, as well as a threat to one’s sense of self. As Melchor creates his imagined woman, he simultaneously sets the standard to which everyone else must conform and opens his created image to manipulation by others. In the case of Magdalena, the primary occupier of the identity, this is both a blessing and a curse. Magdalena is initially set in direct opposition to the image that Melchor has projected onto her covered self. His rejection of her-as-Magdalena is based explicitly on his love

for his mental creation. It is only when Magdalena decides to embody the role of Melchor's imaginary love that she gains some control of the action of the play. However, her actions tend to further divide her from the entity she impersonates, as becomes crystal clear in the final act of the play, where she seemingly acts against her own interests. This dual action, towards control as she is simultaneously alienated from herself, not only highlights the restricted role of women in early modern Spain, since she cannot act freely within the role of obedient daughter, but it also emphasizes the difficulties inherent in the use of disguise. Although Magdalena is able to play the role thrust upon her, she never controls it and is unable to integrate the Countess, a naming made by a servant, with Magdalena, the bride-to-be. Thus the freedom of her imagined form is countered by the antagonism between it and her self. At no point do they work together in an integrated strategy.

Despite the fact that the entire action of the play is enabled by misidentification and the presence of disguise, there is no systematic use of the potential that disguise provides. Disguise, in this play, is the result of accident and opportunity. Melchor's mystery woman is the result of the intersection of Magdalena's hand and Melchor's imagination. Likewise, the Countess of Chirinola comes into existence when Santillana needs to provide a name to an inquiring Ventura. Furthermore, Ángela, in an opportunistic moment, is also able to successfully play the countess, despite the difference in eye colors between her and Magdalena, and her lack of knowledge of the previous details of the countess's actions. We can see therefore that the use of disguise, mistaken identity, and role-play, is done in a free form manner. I mean by this, that there

is no one person in the play who creates or controls disguise. It is created, multiplied, and resolved almost independently of the characters.

Even though it is the ideal woman, as projected by Melchor onto the erased form of Magdalena, who is the object of desire, it is the character controlling this image who directs the action of the play. Melchor unknowingly creates a fictitious woman who is the image of his desire, and the power of his imagination is such that Magdalena is forced to play the role in spite of herself. Although Magdalena plays the role of the countess, she never gains control of the identity. She is instead constantly forced to react to Melchor's imagination, Santillana's invention, and Ángela's usurpation. It is only at the end, when she unites herself-as-Magdalena with the Countess, that she is able to finally control her alter-ego.

Disguise is presented here as an element of chaos which works against the good of the main character, Magdalena. Although it does create a space in which to act, disguise is not part of a systematic plan or the result of a need to retain anonymity. Rather, its creation is accidental, and this accidental creation opens a hole in the societal framework. It is a hole that Magdalena simultaneously relies upon to provide her with a legitimate husband and which she attempts to close in order to secure Don Melchor's love. It is only once this opening is created by Don Melchor that Magdalena makes use of it. However, her actions are intended to close the opening rather than to extend, maintain, or take advantage of it. The fact that it is the created identity which holds sway over Melchor's thoughts, hardly a surprise since it is the result of his imagination, is what makes this closure problematic. Magdalena's struggle is to close the gap between the surface image

painted over her cloaked body and her named self. The fact that she is ultimately unable to fully do so bodes ill for her future with Don Melchor.

Magdalena, the countess of Chirinola, the mystery woman of Melchor's imagination, and Ángela's usurpation of the countess, all exist, at least to a degree, as separate beings. While this distance is a problematic one for Magdalena, since she wishes to unite Melchor's desire for her various permutations into one, it does stress the possibilities inherent in disguise, as well as some of its potential downfalls. While Magdalena is unable to interest Melchor as herself, her disguised, unmarked body is the site of a powerful attraction since it allows him to project his imagination onto her.

His inadvertent creation of a new identity, which is then used for the purposes of disguise, is the least complex use of disguise that will be examined in this study. In later examples, we will see how disguise can be used to provide the character with a greater range of action. However, in this play, that is clearly not the case. Disguise in this play is more of a problem for Magdalena than it is for anyone else in the work. Part of her difficulty has to do with the fact that Magdalena has no need for a new space in which to act. Thus the creation of the countess is the source of a potential conflict for her rather than the path to a solution of an existing problem. Another factor is that the creator of the identity is unaware of his role in its creation and, as a result, there is no one person who controls it. Magdalena supplies the body underneath the robe, Santillana the name, and yet Melchor is the creator. Indeed, we can argue that disguise and mistaken identity are stylistic echoes which serve to propel the plot and to emphasize the gap between imagination and reality (as embodied by Melchor). This, then, is the central theme of the play rather than just tools used by the protagonist.

La celosa de sí misma is not a play about disguise. Nor does it present us with an unfaithful *galán* as is frequently the case in similar plays. Instead, *La celosa de sí misma* is a play focused on desire and imagination. In this sense, the play lends itself well to a Lacanian reading, due to the constant attempt by the various characters, especially Don Melchor, to capture the imaginary, rather than the real. This, however, is a topic that must wait for another time. My focus here is on how disguise and erasure in this work allow for the imposition of imagination on the female body as well as how this provides the means for a solution, in addition to acting as the cause of Magdalena's woes. Disguise is revealed to be the medium which provides the canvas upon which Melchor paints his image of the perfect woman. This is identical to the way in which absence allows Don Quijote to do the same when he tells Sancho: "píntola [Dulcinea] en mi imaginación como la deseo así en la belleza como en la principalidad" (245). However, as the play makes clear, this imaginary space is not one which can continue to function in the everyday world.

The disguise, at the end, must come off. And although Don Melchor has obtained the very woman who caused his fascination, the gap between reality and his imagination remains. Lest we believe that disguise is simply a site of erasure, it is important to note that it is this same site of imagination, created by Don Melchor and facilitated by disguise, which allows Magdalena to snare Melchor. Thus, disguise allows Magdalena the space in which to act that is necessary in order for her to circumvent the strictures of society and win her husband-to-be. Without her use of disguise, however tentatively she makes use of it, she would be in worse straits.

In this play, one of the primary aspects of disguise is the way in which anonymity takes advantage of a gap in the strictures of society in which the female character is freer to act. However, disguise is certainly more than erasure. Once the identity of the countess of Chirinola is created, it, rather than a specific disguised woman, becomes the focus of Melchor's attention. Because both Ángela and Magdalena occupy the identity of the countess, it is clear that his focus has moved from the hand seen at mass and the woman underneath the cloak to the idea of the countess, whoever may be playing the role at the time. The countess, free of parents, brothers, or any other accoutrement, is able to act in ways that Magdalena, the daughter and sister, would never be allowed to act. This is why Ángela attempts to usurp this space. The disguise has power that the women lack. As we continue on to explore *El celoso prudente* in the following chapter, we will be presented with a different, and more elaborate, use of disguise, one in which the misdirection of identity is a deliberate act.

CHAPTER III

EL CELOSO PRUDENTE: THE DANGER OF DISGUISE

Bibliographic entries on *El celoso prudente* are so scant as to be almost non-existent. In the past four decades, the MLA database has not included a single reference to the work. In fact, the most recent work that I have been able to find that provides any analysis of the play is the 1974 book by Ruth Lee Kennedy, *Studies in Tirso*. In this work, *El celoso prudente* is discussed briefly on two occasions. The first is in the context of Tirso's efforts to deal with honor conflicts. Kennedy cites a key phrase in which the seemingly cuckolded husband decries society's law of vengeance, and places the work in the context of a historical outcry against the *comedia's* effect on public morals (56-57). Kennedy's other discussion of the play is a brief mention in which she discusses Tirso's defense of his work and declares it both educational and enjoyable (179). The most valuable information provided is her argument, in a footnote to page 179, that the play was either written or re-written in 1620-21. This contrasts with Blanca de los Ríos's assertion that the play was written in 1615, although de los Ríos does consider the possibility of revisions (280).

Blanca de los Ríos's analysis, from 1958, focuses mostly on the possible connections between this work and *Don Quijote*, *La penitencia de amor* by Don Pedro Manuel de Urrea, *El toledano vengado* by Lope de Vega, and later plays by Calderón de la Barca. She also discusses the character of the main personage in the play, Don Sancho. In reference to Don Sancho, de los Ríos proclaims:

Don Sancho no es un personaje teatral, un elemento necesario como la lanzadera para urdir la tela o el bolillo para tejer el encaje, la trama dramática. Don Sancho es un hombre, un español, un aragonés, un caballero, a quien vemos vivir, pensar, sentir, dialogar consigo mismo de lo que no podía comunicar con nadie y le rebosa del alma y se le escapaba y transcendía de todo su ser, como un fluido incontenible. (276)

In no case is there any depth of discussion of the major themes of the play, much less the importance of disguise within the work. Although there are other studies that make mention of the play, Ignacio Arellano mentions it briefly (“La Máquina del poder” 70), Jean Chittenden gives a summary of the action of the work (133), and Pilar Palomo Vázquez in “La creación dramática de Tirso de Molina: Comedias de enredo,” mentions the piece as well, viewing it as an honor play. These few critics are the only ones in recent decades to do more than mention it in passing. These scholars commonly refer to this work in the context of other honor-vengeance plays, yet to simplify the text to nothing more than a variation of the wife-murder play subgenre is a mistake. Don Sancho’s position, as the apparently wronged spouse, only forms half of the two-part plot. Don Sancho’s fears for his honor are balanced by Lisena and Prince Sigismundo’s desire to marry. These two themes are linked through Diana, Lisena’s sister and Sancho’s wife. Her position as connector binds the two elements of the plot together and places her as the pivot point for both halves.

The central motivator of action within the play is the use of disguise. Unlike Calderon’s *El médico de su honra*, there is no dishonor, or even intended dishonor, on the part of any of the involved parties as a way of furthering the plot. In the Calderonian drama, Don Gutierre takes his revenge on his wife, Doña Mencía, because he cannot directly attack the prince. Her protestations of her innocence have no effect, since he

either disbelieves her, or decides that the image is more important than reality, and feels compelled to erase the perceived stain on his honor.

In contrast, in *El celoso prudente*, Don Sancho's suspicions are the direct result of the misdirection employed by the women in the play in their efforts to order the world according to their design and to circumvent the will of those in power. Because Diana has allowed herself to become involved in this use of disguise and deception, she becomes an object of suspicion. Unlike Calderon's play, where disguise only functions to further the themes of jealousy, honor, and innocence, this work by Tirso de Molina uses disguise as a double-edged sword. While it does provide Lisena with her desired spouse, the plot only avoids tragedy because of Sancho's restraint. Thus, this section of our discussion focuses on the way in which disguise is used by the female characters within the play; the themes of honor and vengeance, as well as Sancho's moral dilemma, will be discussed in relation to the use of disguise and not in their own right. Although this will result in a somewhat incomplete elaboration of the play, this focus will be necessary in order to avoid diversion from the overall theme of this study. It is hoped that at some point a fuller examination of this work could be attempted.

In the discussion of *La celosa de sí misma*, I examined the way in which Don Melchor created an imaginary identity from the glimpse of Magdalena's hand. In that play, the creation of the secondary identity that Magdalena and others adapt is the result of the imagination and desire of her suitor. In contrast, the creation of alternate identities in this play is generally the result of the deliberate choices of the women involved. However, this assumption of a new identity is more problematic than in the previous play because the new identities assumed are pre-existing *personae* and, as a result, the actions

undertaken while one of the characters is playing at that identity reflect onto the ‘owner’ of the name. As Tirso mixes a *capa y espada* comedy with the tragedy of a wife- murder play, he explores the way in which desire and fear shape our perception of the world. Most of the misunderstanding in the work is produced, or at least facilitated, by these two elements. Additionally, as we compare the use of disguise, in the broadest sense, with that of the other plays in this study, we will see that the freedom created by its use is dependent upon anonymity. Within this work, Tirso highlights the dangers of misnaming and misidentifying.

The play is set in Bohemia, apparently shortly after the famous Defenestration of Prague, when Protestant nobles threw three Hapsburg officials out of a window of the Castle Hradshinan in a revolt provoked by religious differences. This event is referred to twice within the work. Although these references are never directly linked to the main action of the play, their existence is notable because they help to date the play as having, at least, a rewrite after the May 23, 1618 incident. Furthermore, this event, which touched off the 30 Years War, was a serious affront to the Catholic Church as well as to the Hapsburg Emperor, Matthias II, who was second cousin to Phillip III, the Spanish king, and thus set the political stage for the play (“Defenestration of Prague” Encyclopedia Britannica).

While the play is ostensibly about the relationship between Sancho and Diana, the backdrop includes serious political questions of the time, including dynastic alliances and questions of political necessity. At one point, the king explains to Alberto, his younger son, the necessity of the dynastic union he has planned:

Di a Diana a don Sancho porque, loco
con desigual amor, ofensa hacía

a mi palabra real; y aunque no toco
otros inconvenientes que podría,
basta la enemistad que ocasionaba
entre Bohemia, y su vecina Hungría. (2.7; 306)¹⁰

In the same speech the king states his fear that Sigismundo “entienda el caso poco” (2.7; 306). Although Ignacio Arellano argues that the king “se muestra despótico y airado” (“La máquina del poder” 70), an evaluation of the motivations of the various characters of the play requires us to remember that Sigismundo’s desire, in a time of war, to marry the daughter of a minor noble rather than the princess of a neighboring country, can be easily read as an abrogation of his princely responsibility— a very serious matter indeed.

As the action of the play begins, the reader is presented with two sisters arguing over a note that Lisena, the younger daughter, has in her hand. Diana, the older of the pair has caught her furtively reading it in the garden at night and insists on knowing the contents of the letter. Lisena is equally determined not to share the letter. Diana explains to her sister her justification for seeing the letter. She tells Lisena:

Cuando te recates
de que sepa tus quimeras
y encubras tus disparates,
como en cosas del honor
no toquen, no soy curiosa;
mas soy tu hermana mayor.
Ésta es hora sospechosa;
el papel, encubridor
de algún liviano suceso;
la luz, señal que procuras
publicar tu poco seso;
que el yerro que se hace a oscuras
alivia a la afrenta el peso;
el sitio no conveniente
para quien profesa honor
y el riesgo que corre siente;
caviloso tu temor,

¹⁰ I have not been able to find a version of the text with numbered verses. Therefore, I make use of the numeration by acts and scenes created by Blanca de los Ríos. Page numbers are from the 1989 edition.

o al menos impertinente
pues has dado en recelarte
de mí con tan necio extremo.
Soy tu sangre, tengo parte
en tu mal o bien, y temo
no haya venido a engañarte
quien a tal hora provoca
tus deseos inconstantes;
que una travesura loca
es mal de participantes
que a todo un linaje toca. (1.1; 285)

Here, in the early verses of the play, Tirso prepares the reader for the upcoming conflict that will form the core of the action. As Diana lectures her sister on the importance of honor and appearance, she stresses the fact that Lisena's actions appear improper. The concern is not so much that Lisena has acted dishonorably, but rather that she may do so.

In this speech to her sister, Diana highlights the connection between appearance and action, between seeming and being. As she lists the various reasons for her suspicions, Diana emphasizes the notion that these actions lead to doubts about her sister's honor. She connects the time, location, letter and light to a loss of honor. The time is late and "suspicious," the location is one often used for clandestine meetings; the letter is a sign of the involvement of a second person (a writer to the letter's reader); and the light is presented as the most foolish element of all, a means of illuminating the very dishonor that is seemingly imminent. She continues to berate her sister by pointing out that, as her sister, she is inextricably linked to Lisena and her actions. Any disgrace that falls upon her will rebound onto Diana as well.

Diana's actions in this introductory scene are a foreshadowing of the overall play. Diana assumes that she can correctly read her sister's intentions due to the clues that she has just mentioned. The circumstances lead her to the logical conclusion that Lisena is

waiting for a rendezvous with the author of the letter. These same circumstances, and the conclusion drawn from them, lead her to believe that Lisena's honor is in danger.

Likewise, as the play develops, Sancho will see numerous signs that indicate the infidelity of his wife. However, his sign-reading is much less accurate than he believes.

Tirso contrasts this initial case of logical deduction with that made by Sancho and others later in the play. What develops is a consciousness that signs can be misleading, and that it is disguise that is the primary cause of this untrustworthiness of what "should" be clearly legible.

This ambivalence is highlighted by Lisena's response to her sister. She argues for an alternate reading of the signs presented. Instead of a hiding in the shadows of the night and then foolishly proclaiming her actions by bringing a light, she claims:

Y que como no la esmalta
el sol, de los cielos vida,
por si algún temor me asalta,
vengo con luz encendida,
supliendo lo que le falta,
señal que no ha de temerse
cosa indigna de mi ser (1.1; 285)

In Lisena's version, her light replaces the missing sun and adds an air of dignity to her actions. What Diana had read as a sign of her foolishness is presented as a hallmark of her virtue since she has no fear of discovery. She similarly inverts the role of the letter.

Her argument emphasizes the value of her honor as the primary determinant of meaning:

Este papel que ha causado
la inquietud que en ti se ve,
aunque le hayas injuriado,
basta que en mi mano esté,
para estar calificado. (1.1; 285)

While she does not directly dispute Diana's argument that the letter implies a second person, she asserts that her mere possession of the document should be considered proof that there is nothing dishonorable about it. She disputes Diana's other concerns in a similar manner, focusing on herself as above reproach, and thus bestowing dignity on the setting and situation. This double interpretation of the physical signs presented in the first scene of the play is the first in a series of situations that are interpreted distinctly by the different characters. This doubling of meaning is a common theme in the works of Tirso de Molina and a touchstone of the Baroque in general. In this sense, the use of misunderstandings and differing interpretations of events is no different from dozens, if not hundreds, of plays of the period. What helps to distinguish this work is the way in which the misunderstandings are produced.

One of the central themes of this play is the difficulty of sign-reading. Even when the signs are apparently clear, such as in the case of the opening scene, the final interpretation still depends on external factors, mainly the preconceptions and preoccupations of the interpreter. What Diana sees as a prelude to dishonor and ruin is presented by Lisena to be nothing more than a meeting. Thus, from the outset, it is apparent that the seemingly clear physical signs are susceptible to reinterpretation and redefinition, depending on the desires and doubts of each viewer. This reinterpretation is the result of a rereading of the signs presented, what Jonathan Dollimore calls the appropriation of discourse. While he argues that this is normally the result of the dominant structures creating a discourse which benefits them, he adds that, "Appropriation could also work the other way: subordinate, marginal or dissident elements could appropriate dominant discourses and likewise transform them in the

process” (54). Alan Sinfield, basing his views on the arguments of Anthony Giddens, makes a similar assertion: “Power relations are always two-way; that is to say, however subordinate an actor may be in a social relationship, the very fact of involvement in that relationship gives him or her a certain amount of power over the other” (47). This is the essence of the entire play. While I will characterize the play’s central conflict in a number of ways, including a generational conflict, as well as a struggle between the world of theater and the real world, in each case, there is an attempt by each group to control the discourse and bend it to their purposes.

Tirso sets his work apart from other plays which make use of misunderstanding to drive the plot by focusing the site of misreading on the human body. While there are multiple misunderstandings and misinterpretations throughout the play, the key confusions all revolve around the female body. Instead of signs pointing to the possibility of betrayal (a voice, a half-seen figure, a dagger, as is the case in *El médico de su honra* or other similar plays), the seeming fault is directly connected to a person and name. As we take a detailed look at how disguise both causes and resolves the problems fomented by the multiple interpretation of signs, it becomes clear that disguise and misidentification can be a deadly serious business.

As the two sisters argue, Lisena states that her suitor is in fact the prince. While she rejoices in this, Diana warns:

En amor tan desigual
donde el pincel ha firmado,
recelo algún grande mal.
Sigismundo es heredero
de Carlos, rey de Bohemia;
Tú, hija de un caballero,
a quien la Fortuna premia,
más en sangre que en dinero.

El Rey espera a Leonora,
de Hungría infanta, y tan bella,
que hasta la envidia enamora,
para que case con ella
el príncipe que la adora.
Por ella en Belgrado está
su hermano el infante Alberto,
y deben de llegar ya
pues si el casamiento es cierto
de quien retratos te da,
¿qué puedes tú pretender
de tan desigual amor,
ni qué alteza puede haber
que no derribe tu honor,
no siendo tú su mujer? (1.1; 287)

Diana imagines a number of practical hurdles to this match. Both the differences in social station between Lisena and Sigismundo, and the politics of the moment, seem to her to guarantee that Lisena will be used and tossed aside. It is only when Lisena shows Diana a letter written and signed by Sigismundo, promising to marry her, that she changes her mind. With this document in hand, Diana's earlier fears are discarded. Lisena has convinced her sister that her interpretation of events is legitimate. Sigismundo's letter is, in effect, a contract; in fact, she later uses the word "obligado" to describe the prince's commitment. Diana now is convinced that the prince, despite common logic, does in fact intend to honorably marry her sister. This revelation also serves as a pattern for the development of interpretation and misunderstanding within the play as a whole. Just as both sisters initially presented distinct, yet viable, interpretations based on the signs present, Diana's view, while the more logical of the two, was proved to be wrong. Likewise, the male authority figures in the play will make a number of logical, but incorrect, deductions which will cause the action to teeter on the edge of tragedy, as the

king will observe at the end of the play, saying: “digno es este cuento / que se acabe en tragedia” (3.19; 333).¹¹

The first of these misinterpretations comes as Fisberto, the girls’ father, arrives to put a stop to the evening rendezvous. Orelío, his servant has notified him that there has been a man in the garden:

FISBERTO: ¿Hombre dices que salió
del jardín?
ORELIO: ¿No ves abierta
la puerta?
FISBERTO: Y con ella abrió
sospecha a mi agravio cierta
quien en él de noche entró. (1.4; 294)

When Fisberto arrives, Sigismundo has already come and gone, but his daughters are both present. Like Diana, he sees the setting as a sign of potential dishonor.

The open door to the garden not only signals a threat to his honor, but also harks back to the medieval motif of the *hortus conclusus* linked to the Virgin Mary in such texts as *Los Milagros de Nuestra Señora*. The open door, like Calisto’s intrusion into Melibea’s garden at the beginning of *La Celestina*, is a violation of the sanctity of his house and points to the deflowering of his daughter. His accusation, and reasoning, is similar to Diana’s at the beginning of the play and, ironically, Diana’s defense is an echo of her sister’s earlier justification:

¿Sabes que Bohemia sabe
en lo que mi honor se precia
sin que de humanarse acabe
y que en opinión de necia
estoy por honesta y grave?
Pues ¿qué sospechoso humor
quitarme intenta este nombre,

¹¹ The Blanca de los Ríos version reads “digno es este cuento / que no se acabe en tragedia” I have used the electronic text by Vern G. Williamsen based on the 1603 *Cigarrales de Toledo* version of the play. In both readings there is an acknowledgment of the play’s tragic potential.

sin estima de mi honor? (1.4; 294)

Her father's reply, "Sin puerta aun no está segura / la honra en mujer" (1.4; 294), avoids the question of her personal honor, and instead recasts it in terms of women in general. Whereas Diana permitted herself to be swayed by her sister's logic and Sigismundo's letter, Fisberto adopts a much stricter view. This is typical of patriarchal society in general, in which the male is obligated to maintain a constant vigilance in order to ward off dishonor. Jonathan Thacker tells us that

Patriarchal society can be characterized by its oppression of the individual in the interests of stability. Men may be almost entirely ignorant of this oppression because society apparently directly serves their interests (Butler, *Gender Trouble* p. 141). They are enabled, empowered to behave with freedom and impunity in society. The woman's body, maintained virginal becomes a unit of exchange between families of a similar social status. It has an economic value like an object. Female desire is controlled, and is legitimized, as Henry Sullivan points out in his Lacanian rereading of Tirso, only within the framework of marriage which carries the stamp of the patriarchal sanction of law. (39)

Fisberto makes no concession to the possibility that the women involved may act as the keepers of their own honor. His concern is not that his daughter's honor is in danger; rather he worries that they are a danger to *his* honor. It is this societal attitude that sets the females in the play against the various male authority figures. Fisberto provides no room for negotiation or compromise, as we see when he threatens the maid, Carola, with a dagger, in an attempt to force the identity of the nocturnal suitor from her. In contrast to Diana's reevaluation of the night rendezvous, he is impervious to counter arguments. Although both partially misread the details of the situation, only Diana is willing to accept that her fears and concerns, which were the same as those of her father, were not objective reality.

Diana's response to her father's actions highlight the limited choices available to her. She retorts "¿Eso se ha de imaginar / de mí? Iréme a un monasterio, / y podráste asegurar" (1.4; 295). While her retort is certainly hyperbole, it does emphasize the boundaries placed upon her. She, in effect, is limited to obedience or the church:

Exceptuando a las nobles que tenían la vida resuelta económicamente y a la villana, cuyo lote no era muy diferente del de otras campesinas en el mundo, no había muchas sendas que la mujer pudiera seguir en aquel tiempo fuera del matrimonio. Su abanico de posibilidades incluían: recluirse en un convento, darse a la «mala vida, ponerse al servicio de alguna gran dama, o la vida en familia. (Hernández García 79)

Both paths lead to a life of subordination to male authority figures and enclosure from the world. Even within marriage, which would be the best option, her freedom would be limited. As Merveen McKendrick writes,

Marriage was the passport to what freedom was available. Unmarried girls were treated with the care due to a valuable commodity and their movements were limited. They could usually attend Mass accompanied by a chaperone but most other non domestic pastimes were denied them. They told their beads, learned their lessons, sewed a fine seam and dreamed. The married woman on the other hand could visit her woman friends and receive visits from them. She could go to the theatre, to bull-fights and to cane-tourneys as well as to church. She could take walks, ride in her carriage, and even go hunting, fishing and hawking. Card-playing and other forms of gambling were not unknown to her. (*Woman and Society* 28)

It is because of these limits, and her desire to aid her sister in her relationship with the prince, that Diana abandons her previous reputation as a *dama desdeñosa* and becomes involved in the play's intrigue.

When Diana attempts to leave the garden, Fisberto discovers the letter and portrait of Sigismundo that she was holding for Lisena. Once he reads the note, he berates Diana, telling her that this letter, far from being a guarantee of marriage, is, in fact, nothing more than an illusion:

¿Papeles que han de rasgarse
cobras, cuando tu honra das?
¿Es más aquesta pintura
de un papel en que trabaja
el engaño, pues procura
la deshonra en su baraja
darte un rey sólo en figura?
Da crédito a firmas fieles,
funda en ella tus cuidados;
sabrás, cuando más reveles,
que a mujeres y a soldados
paga un príncipe en papeles. (1.4; 295)

While it is easy to demonize Fisberto for his reaction to his daughter's actions, we should remember that his concern, while essentially based on his honor and reputation, is founded on his real-life experiences. Whereas Diana took the letter from Sigismundo to be a valid contract, her father argues that it is just the opposite. Instead of committing Sigismundo to marry, in Fisberto's mind, the letter and portrait are ephemeral substitutes for the real item. His comparison to the tendency to pay soldiers with promissory notes, instead of coin, refers not only to Spain's financial difficulties (Kamen 214-16), but also to the moral bankruptcy of the aristocracy, a theme that is common in the works of Tirso de Molina. Once again, the emphasis of the scene, and the source of conflict, is the disparate interpretations given to the same pieces of information. Where Lisena and Diana see the letter as part of a chain of meaning leading back to the prince and thus assuring his sincerity, their father perceives it as an act of misdirection, transferring meaning and responsibility from the prince onto paper. He shortly thereafter tells Diana "en sombra al príncipe tienes, / princesa serás en sombra" (1.5; 295). His fear is that her shadowy relationship with the prince will end up being just that, an illusion that fades in the light of day.

Diana allows her father to believe that the letter is addressed to her and takes the blame for the nocturnal meeting. Lisena, understanding the ploy, feigns affront at her sister's actions. Her act, as the offended sister, is the beginning of an increasingly complex use of misdirection and disguise, which will culminate in the impersonation of the Hungarian princess herself. The wisdom of this misdirection is soon apparent. Fisberto goes directly to the king and explains the entire situation, indicating, as he believes is the case, that Diana and Sigismundo plan to marry. As proof of what he claims, he tells the king: "Sospechas averigüé; / que en este papel perdieron / el nombre, pues ya no son / sospechas indicios ciertos" (1.8; 298), and shows him the letter and portrait that he confiscated from his daughter. Ironically, the very letter that he has just dismissed as an illusion is presented to the king as firm proof of intent. He recommends to the king that he marry off his daughter quickly. The reasoning he uses is almost purely political in nature. He states: "yo quedaré premiado / con que sepan que he antepuesto / la lealtad a una corona / que me daba reyes nietos" (1.8; 298). The king immediately agrees and decides to match Diana with Don Sancho de Urrea, a man who has served him faithfully. This is an advantageous match for Fisberto. He receives the gratitude of the king for his warning, and a son-in-law who sits high in the king's regard.

The first act concludes with Sigismundo and Alberto, the two princes, conspiring to disobey their father. Sigismundo, apprised of the events of the previous night, knows that his father believes Diana to be his love. As a result, he feels free to court Lisena in secret. Alberto, who loves the Hungarian princess, Leonora, the woman betrothed to Sigismundo, is encouraged by his brother to marry her in his place. As is also the case in *La celosa de sí misma* and in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, there is a generational

conflict, which can be characterized as a clash between love and practical material security. In the first of these plays, part of Don Melchor's discontent, and his motivation to seek out an idealized lover, is the fact that he is marrying to cement an alliance between his father and a friend, and to obtain financial security. As we will see in the next chapter, part of Juana's problem in *Don Gil* is that her lover's father has urged, or perhaps browbeaten is the better term, his son to marry a woman for her dowry. In the current case, the considerations are political and involve dynastic matters. The other two plays include additional elements that help to spur the conflict: Melchor is not just rebelling against his father but also seeks an idealized love, while Don Martín's actions in *Don Gil* cannot be considered solely the results of his father's wishes. In *El celoso prudente*, almost the entire conflict can be regarded as the efforts of the younger generation to subvert the will of their fathers, which Halkhoree describes as "the conflict between society and the individual" (40). The exception to this general rule is the case of Don Sancho. He plays a role outside of the main lines of conflict and, in fact, stands apart from the rest of the characters. While most of the other characters in the play are involved in this conflict between fathers and children, Don Sancho is a husband, indeed, the only husband in the play. Therefore, his set of concerns is distinct. Rather than becoming involved in the struggle to make a good alliance, preserve the honor of his daughter, or marry the person of their choice, Don Sancho's only worry is the faithfulness of his wife. While this is by no means a trivial concern, it does highlight the difference between the other characters whose actions revolve around the issue of marriage.

This curious space inhabited by Don Sancho is what causes the previously noted split in the play's thematics. Despite the danger of creating a play that is neither fish nor

fowl, neither tragedy nor light comedy, Tirso places Don Sancho outside the main flow of action. By so doing, Don Sancho comes to occupy a unique position. The *comedia* typically presents a closed world in which the actions of the characters have no consequences outside of those directly involved. *La celosa de sí misma* is a good example, for despite a number of comments that address the cheek-to-jowl living in the capital city, the actions of the protagonists are strangely isolated from the rest of the world. Melchor's fascination is with the very woman he is to marry. His competitor is his cousin, and Magdalena's rival is a neighbor who ultimately marries her brother. In contrast to this closed system, in *El celoso prudente* the title character remains outside the circle of intrigue and deceit. He takes on the role of a spectator to the action of the play, and his concerns and reactions to Diana and Lisena's subterfuge are that of an outsider. Here Tirso addresses the unanswered question common in other *comedias*: How would society react to the characters' actions?

By presenting Don Sancho as the observer, Tirso is able to examine the consequences of the seemingly harmless play of identities, and thus the question of the world outside of the *comedia* comes into relief. For example, what would the rest of Spain think of Fuenteovejuna's rebellion and the way the king dealt with it? Such real-world concerns rarely enter into consideration in the *comedia*. Don Sancho embodies this exception. He is a bystander, who is inadvertently affected by the interplay of the ladies' love game. While the main action of the play follows the attempts of Sigismundo and Lisena to marry, we are repeatedly reminded of how Sancho is forced to deal with the subterfuge that tears his stable world apart.

The roots of Sancho's concerns are expressed at the wedding itself. As the king congratulates them on their union, Sancho replies:

Bien conozco cuánto agravio
hace a mi bella consorte
el cielo y que en esta corte
esposo más mozo y sabio
correspondiera a su edad;
que amor que las almas mide
como en las costumbres, pide
en años conformidad; (2.1; 300)

He is very conscious of the differences in age between him and his bride, as well as the fact that this wedding comes as the result of the king's will: "vuestra majestad / por cuenta suya ha tomado / el darme esposa y estado" (2.1; 300), and not because of love or even through an understanding with her father. The fact that it is Fisberto, Diana's father, who answers Sancho cannot help but fan the flame of his concern:

Diana, conde, es discreta,
y conmigo ha consultado
cuán bien dice con su estado
vuestra edad sabia y discreta,
respondiendo yo por ella
a vuestra excusada duda;
que en tal acción el ser muda
hace a la novia más bella. (2.1; 300)

This preemption of Diana's voice by her father, while saying all the right words, is undermined by the speaker himself. Because Fisberto, rather than Diana, speaks, what he says serves to drown out any unspoken objections that she might have wanted to voice. Although she is later allowed to speak, she has been effectively silenced. Her only realistic choice is to echo: "Habló mi padre por mí / como mi padre en efeto." (2.1; 300), and bow to her father's will.

Contrast this with Sigismundo's exaltation that "¡Con qué venturoso engaño / de mi padre se ríe Amor! / Estorbos pone el temor / en mi provecho y su daño" (2.1; 301).

Sigismundo sees the marriage as a furthering of his desires:

Fingirme sentido quiero
de que Diana se case
para que adelante pase
el engaño de que espero
conseguir mi alegre intento. (2.1; 301)

This same sequence of events that Sigismundo sees as leading to his happiness serves to further unsettle Sancho. Although the Prince's act is for the benefit of Fisberto and the king, it also affects Sancho. As Sigismundo pretends to be angered at his father's decisión to marry Diana to Sancho, he implies that he is now angry at Sancho. This causes Sancho to wonder "¡De mí el príncipe ofendido! / ¡Válgame Dios! ¿Qué será?" (2.2; 302). As his wedding comes to a close, Sancho must deal with the seeming anger of the prince and the fact that he has a wife he does not know. Shortly thereafter, Tirso further complicates matters as Enrique, the marquis of Oberisel, arrives at court to woo Lisena. As he speaks with Gascón, who is Fisberto's servant and facilitator in the plot to marry Lisena and Sigismundo, two important things are said. The first is directed to Enrique as Gascón tells him that Lisena is being courted by a noble. In order to keep Sigismundo's secret he tells the marquis that her suitor is the duke Arnesto. Not only does this have important repercussions later in the play, but it serves initially to protect Lisena from Enrique's attention while keeping Sigismundo's involvement silent.

The second thing that Gascón says is aimed at the audience and serves as a reminder of the artificial nature of the play that they are viewing. When Enrique addresses him, Gascón's initial response is "nunca los señores, / sino en las comedias,

hablan / con lacayos, si no entablan / por sus medios sus amores” (2.4; 303). His explicit evocation of the representation as a play, and his comment on the conventions of the genre acts as an early form of Brecht’s *Verfremdungseffect*. While the play was written centuries before Bertolt Brecht and his efforts to highlight the artificiality of theater, Tirso is clearly aware of the gap between theatrical portrayals of life and life itself. Although we see similar reminders in such works as Calderón’s *El gran teatro del mundo* and Tirso’s *El vergonzoso en palacio*, this is a much more explicit comment to the audience than in these other plays. This seemingly odd remark makes more sense when it is placed in thematic context. As I have been emphasizing, the role of Don Sancho in the work is, in part, to show the consequences that a “typical” *comedia* plot would have on members of the real world. This is a complexity that is not considered in the traditional view of the *comedia*’s structure where

comic emplotment is typified by the representation of young lovers who overcome an obstacle to their union by winning over or tricking a blocking figure who attempts to prevent the marriage. Frye’s archetypal closure foregrounds the re-establishment of order around the younger generation, the marginalization or exile of the blocking figure, and restoration of harmony at all levels of the plot. (Simerka 521)

Gascón’s comment serves to remind the audience that the game that he, Lisena, Sigismundo, and Diana play is quite different from the serious world of honor that is represented by Don Sancho’s point of view. The glee with which the conspirators manipulate events is a vivid contrast to Sancho’s worries about his standing at court and his concerns about his wife’s chastity.

The next step in the charade commences as Gascón tells the prince how the sisters have arranged for him to continue his visits to Lisena:

Diana y Lisena están

en este engaño conformes
y dicen que te transformes
en un fingido galán
de Dïana, y en nombre suyo
corresponderá Lisena
entreteniendo tu pena
para que si el padre tuyo
acaso tu amor supiere,
vea que es mujer casada
la dama que es de ti amada
y que si casarte quiere
con Leonora, no podrá
impedirlo aqueste amor.
Dejando a salvo su honor,
licencia a aquesto te da;
que a trueco de ver su hermana
reinar en Bohemia, intenta
tomar su amor por su cuenta
y así, ya sea en la ventana,
ya en papeles, ya en acciones,
y sujeto de tu amor
es Dïana en lo exterior,
si bien en las intenciones
Lisena tu gusto obligue. (2.6; 305)

The plan, as the women have designed it, is to have Lisena play Diana in matters concerning love, so that if the king should learn of Sigismundo's actions, he will still believe that the marriage to Leonora is unthreatened. Their actions are an attempt to avoid the observation that is the precursor to discipline in the Foucaultian sense:

Its aim was to establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits. It was a procedure, therefore, aimed at knowing, mastering and using. Discipline organizes an analytical space. (*Discipline and Punish* 143)

By breaking the chain of naming, or more accurately, by misdirecting it, the lovers hope to maintain the freedom that they desire to court, since "The exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation" (*Discipline and Punish*

170). Lacking this observation, the king's discipline is voided, and they are, theoretically, free.

From this communication we learn that all the conspirators are in agreement as to how the ruse should be carried out. There is even a mention made of questions of honor, although there does not seem to be any real concern that Diana will be placed in any danger. The use of disguise is made explicit as Gascón describes Diana as the exterior and Lisena as the actual reality. Thus, for the purposes of this deception, Lisena will literally take on the identity of Diana. While they realize that this could mean the "exposure" of Diana, little or no thought is given to the consequences should something unexpected occur. This use of disguise goes against the grain of the normal pattern in the *comedia*. While it is not at all unusual to make use of disguise in some form, when the character does so, this action typically follows one of two paths: if the person making use of disguise or deception is engaged in an activity that could result in shame, dishonor or other negative consequences, the disguise used is either that of a non-existent person, or is a simple erasure. Secondly, the impersonation of another character is generally done for the purpose of gaining access to something, or someone, that the impersonated character can reach but the impersonator cannot. Thus Rosaura, in *La vida es sueño*, disguises herself as a man in order to chase her errant lover. Likewise, Don Juan, when he seduces Isabella at the beginning to *El burlador de Sevilla*, does so by pretending to be Duke Octavio, and when that disguise is penetrated, he only identifies himself by saying he is "Un hombre sin nombre" (line 15), refusing any connection that could result in his injury. In *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, Juana occupies the already extant identity of Don Gil in order to gain access to Doña Inés, but when she must tell a fictionalized account of

her disgrace by Don Martín, she creates a new identity, that of Doña Elvira, as a buffer from the consequences of her confession. In none of these cases does one friend occupy another's identity. The closest parallel to the current situation is when Don Juan pretends to be the Marquis de la Mota in order to take advantage of Doña Ana, a ploy which almost results in de la Mota's ruin.

Because of the possible consequences for the person whose name is usurped by another, Diana and Lisena's gamble has to be considered in context of their potential gain. As Gascón states, the prize is Lisena becoming the queen of Bohemia, a fact which is reiterated throughout the play. This however, does not obviate the dangers involved in this charade, a thought which does not seem to enter into their minds:

SIGISMUNDO: Fingirme su [Diana's] galán trato,
y con debido secreto
guardar el justo respeto
que pide el cuerdo recato
de don Sancho, que es su esposo
y el vasallo más leal
de Bohemia, y haré mal
si vive por mí celoso.
GASCÓN: A eso voy; que es cosa llana
si le damos ocasión,
que ha de echar el bodegón
don Sancho por la ventana. (2.6; 305)¹²

It seems that Sigismundo's concern is limited to being sure that he does not make a loyal subject jealous. It is possible that the reason he fails to conceive of any other possible problem is due to cultural differences between the German-Czech rulers of Bohemia and Don Sancho, who, as Blanca de los Ríos mentions, is a dyed-in-the-wool Spaniard. Still, it seems odd that no one is more cognizant of the concerns of honor, especially after Fisberto and his daughters have had an argument that dealt specifically with this issue.

¹² This is the reference to the Defenestration of Prague, previously alluded to.

Whether this lack of concern is the result of overconfidence, cultural variation, or simply an oversight, it serves to highlight the differences in perspective and priority between this group and Don Sancho.

Shortly thereafter, the king speaks with Sigismundo and reveals that he knows all about his son's love for Diana and about the previous meetings. He further continues by advising his son to forget her completely and to focus on his marriage to Leonora, since Diana is now married and unavailable (2.8; 308). Don Sancho, who overhears this conversation, exclaims:

¡Qué mala información veo
sustanciar contra mi honor!
Jardín, retrato y papel
tienen mi ventura en calma,
siendo en pleito tan crüel
tres enemigos del alma,
y tres testigos en él.
¿Esto es, cielos, ser casado? (2.9; 308)

After the king leaves, Sigismundo speaks with Gascón, who confirms that night's meeting with Lisena, although, in keeping with their plan he uses Diana's name. During the course of the conversation, Sigismundo inadvertently drops the letter and portrait that his father had returned to him. Once Sancho has listened to their plans and has read the letter Sigismundo wrote to Lisena, he is almost convinced that his wife is unfaithful. He concludes:

¡Honor, hacer, y callar!
El silencio sabe obrar;
indicios he visto llanos;
si a pensamientos livianos
obras aplica en mi mengua
Diana, calle la lengua
porque el honor todo es manos. (2.11; 310)¹³

¹³ The 1989 edition improperly labels this scene XII.

This perceived threat is presented in sharp contrast to the discussion between the two sisters that immediately follows. While Sancho confronts his apparent dishonor and reconsiders the politics of his marriage, Diana and Lisena echo the previous conversation between Sigismundo and Gascón. As is the case in the conversation in scene six, both Diana and Lisena are confident of the outcome of their deception. Diana calls the plan “Provechosa” (2.12; 310), while Lisena believes that since Diana is married, there is no danger involved. Diana’s greatest concern is that it “no toque al decoro / de don Sancho” (2.12; 311). Diana’s concern for her spouse is presented in direct contrast to Sancho’s feelings in the previous scene. Where he frets over the arranged pairing, Diana joyously tells her sister of her love and respect for her husband. As the scene closes, Diana provides the only evidence that she is conscious of the possible consequences:

DIANA: Mi honra y nombre te encomiendo.
LISENA: ¿Pones más que el nombre aquí?
DIANA: ¡Corre riesgo, y me da pena!
Guárdamele, y no te asombre
porque quien tiene mal nombre,
nunca cobra fama buena. (2.12; 311)

Yet even here, there is a fundamental lack of understanding of the full repercussions that could occur. Diana realizes that the use of her name could attach her sister’s actions to her and thus damage her reputation, but she perceives no other danger.

The way in which the two scenes involving the conspirators bracket Don Sancho’s moment of discovery highlights their differences in perspective. Just as the two sisters, by playing on the gap between perception and reality, misdirect their father and the king into believing that it is Diana who Sigismundo loves, Tirso divides the perceptions of the two groups. While Sigismundo, Alberto, Lisena, Diana, and Gascón are all apprised of the plan of deception, including Alberto’s efforts to convince the king

that Leonora and Lisena are identical (2.7; 306), they have no idea that Sancho has been given reasons to suspect his wife's fidelity. Likewise, Sancho, through what he has overheard, feels confident that he is correct in believing his wife to be unfaithful.

Rather than one person having complete access to all the information, such as is the case of Doña Juana in *Don Gil*, or Doña Jerónima in *El amor médico*, and to a lesser degree that of Magdalena in *La celosa de sí misma*, both groups believe that they are privy to information unavailable to others. Instead of one person manipulating events to serve her own purpose, we have two groups that are apparently blundering in the dark. This action at cross-purposes is an interesting intersection of the two elements I have been developing throughout my examination of this work. The conflict arises through the differing perspectives of the main characters. Essentially, this division is that of the Bohemians versus the Spaniard Don Sancho. Here, the Bohemian youth represent the world of the *comedia* in which trading identities, love games, and dismissal of political obligations in favor of love are common themes and have seemingly no consequences. In contrast, Don Sancho embodies the world of the spectator, an element reinforced by his reoccurring role as an observer, rather than the initiator, of any action. In his world, questions of honor and duty are paramount. He, as a spectator, sees the results of the other's play, but must deal with the fallout of these actions. For Diana, Lisena and their group, failure means that Lisena does not marry the prince, and perhaps that Diana offends her husband. For Don Sancho, if his suspicions prove correct, it means that he has been dishonored and earned the enmity of the heir to the kingdom. There is an essential disequilibrium between the risks associated with the two perspectives.

This conflict between the two perspectives is driven by the use of disguise. While the perspectives of the two groups are what create the conflict, without the specific permutation of disguise, as it is used in this play, there would be nothing to exacerbate Sancho's fears. It is the fact that disguise takes the form of replacement of identity that causes Sancho's quandary. If Lisena had invented a new identity, or simply settled for an erasure, Sancho would have no reason to fear. At the same time, the mechanics of the play demand that she use misdirection to convince the king that Sigismundo will marry the princess Leonora, at least until it is possible to present him with their accomplished marriage. What is notable here is less that Diana has opted to allow Lisena the use of her identity, but that they both are seemingly unaware of the possible consequences of these actions. This disjunction, between the world of the stage and the 'real' world, sits at the heart of the play.

When Sigismundo goes to speak to Lisena later that night, he runs into Don Enrique, who, thanks to Gascón's invention, believes that Lisena is to marry Duke Arnesto. Enrique, mistaking the prince for Arnesto, proclaims his love for Lisena and his honor in not pursuing her further. This misunderstanding gives Sigismundo a taste of his own medicine, as he becomes convinced that his plans have fallen apart. His overly dramatic response is tempered by the sound counsel of his brother:

SIGISMUNDO: Pues ¿qué aguardas,
infante? Dame la muerte.

Saca aquese acero, saca
este corazón, primero
que el duque con esto salga.

ALBERTO: No sé, por Dios, qué sospeche
de estas nuevas disfrazadas
sin conocer al autor
ni el efecto a que se causan.
El duque Arnesto es mi amigo

y hasta aquí no sé que haya
tenido amor, que es señal
que sale luego a la cara.
¿No podrá ser que éste sea
algún burlón de éstos que andan
dando picones de noche
y cifran su trato en gracias?
SIGISMUNDO: No, hermano. Verdades son,
en mi daño averiguadas
todas cuantas éste ha dicho;
ni las finge, ni me engaña...
ALBERTO: Calla,
y procura hacer de suerte
que a ver a Leonora vaya;
que si ella su intento ayuda
y te desposas mañana,
¿qué celos hay que te inquieten
ni qué escrituras que valgan
contra consumados gustos
y dichas anticipadas? (2.15; 313)

This scene is, at first glance, superfluous. Enrique only enters to proclaim his love and then leave. His connection to the rest of the play is tenuous at best. His only function is to plant the seed of doubt in Sigismundo. As a part of the play's development, his character is entirely unnecessary, and we have to ask ourselves if his presence is the result of Tirso succumbing to the temptation to add further plot twists at the cost of coherence.

However, if we further examine the result of Enrique's intrusion, we see that his entry permits a thematic development that would be otherwise lacking. For the first time, one of the conspirators is placed in Don Sancho's position. Sigismundo is forced to face the possibility that he has been displaced. Alberto's advice is not only practical, but his 'wait and see' reasoning is similar to that later used by Don Sancho.

It is at this point that we see the first mixing of the two represented worlds. While Sigismundo is still locked into a world of drama, Alberto crosses into the territory previously occupied only by Don Sancho. His approach is highlighted by his pragmatic

reasoning when he tells his brother: “¡Bueno es que te persuadas / a que Lisena es tan necia / que más estimación haga / de un ducado que de un reino!” (2.15; 313). Where Sigismundo only sees the machinations of love, Alberto points to cupidity as a guarantee that Lisena still wishes to marry his brother. This cynical view is a departure from the idealism previously shown by those involved in the scheme. While Diana justifies the risk of Lisena using her identity by the possible reward, she still sees her sister’s actions as being the result of love. Her primary concern seems to be the happiness of her sister, with the station to be gained perceived as an extra benefit. This moment of thematic encounter is followed immediately by the physical intrusion of Sancho onto the scene. The carefully maintained separation between the world of the lovers and Sancho’s reality of doubt is finally brought into direct contrast. This follows the trend of the play, as reality and idealism have come ever closer, without, until this moment, touching. Diana’s reality-based concerns of honor melted before the desire of Lisena, just as Fisberto’s attempt to lock his honor safely away by marrying off his daughter is preempted by the girls’ decision to misdirect the apparent path of desire from Lisena to Diana. When Sancho overhears the king and Sigismundo speak, he rubs against this fantasy world, but does not interact directly with either the king or the prince, and thus remains outside, a spectator.

Finally in this window scene, Sancho’s presence is the result of a deliberate action, provoked by what he has learned from the previously mentioned conversation. For the first time, Sancho takes an active role in the formation of the play’s action. As he arrives at the rendezvous, he says to himself:

A desengaños tan ciertos
y a sospechas confirmadas,

¿de qué sirve, honor, buscar
tanto indicio, prueba tanta?
Pero si sois juez, hacedlas;
que todas son de importancia
hasta cerrar el proceso (2.16; 313)

Not only does Sancho here take an active part in determining whether he has been dishonored or not, but he signals an important distinction in how he chooses to act. The contrast he makes between honor and judgment is an important one. In fact, it is this distinction that keeps the play from becoming a tragedy.

One of the important contrasts that Tirso draws throughout this play is that of impulsive actions and reasoned decisions. Prince Sigismundo has chosen to pursue the daughter of a minor court figure rather than accept the dynastic alliance that his father has prepared. While Tirso frequently champions free will and personal freedom, Sigismundo's actions can only be viewed as negligent. In fact, if it were not for his brother Alberto's personal interest in the Hungarian princess, Sigismundo's love for Lisena could be a cause for war. The fact that Alberto does win the love of Leonora avoids this pitfall, but the very fact that a successful resolution is dependant on Alberto's involvement is a signal of the dangers of precipitate action. The lack of concern that the conspirators consistently show is contrasted, at every point, by Sancho's extreme insistence on gathering all the information possible before acting. In this sense, Sancho's patience can be compared with the king and Fisberto's actions to plan a dynastic alliance and to keep Sigismundo from other women who would distract him from, in their view, this most important of goals. Sancho's contrast of honor with judgment highlights how these two paradigms control action. In a like manner, the conflict we have observed

between the lovers and the king and his councilors can be distilled down to a difference in paradigms.

In using the word *paradigm*, I am aware that the word has passed in and out of fashion. However, in the sense with which I use the word, paradigm describes the way in which each group perceives and interprets the world around it as well as the information available to each. In the world inhabited by Sigismundo and Lisena, and to a lesser degree Diana and Alberto, love conquers all, and is its own justification. Sigismundo, when he first meets Diana, provides a clear example of his thinking when he proclaims:

Y no reinos, ni riqueza
creáis que son el tesoro,
Diana, de más grandeza.
Los diamantes, plata y oro,
se crían en la aspereza
de una infrutífera sierra;
las perlas que el mundo estima,
una concha las encierra;
la púrpura que sublima
la vanidad de la tierra,
es sangre de un vil pescado;
las piedras que el sol congela,
un monte las ha criado;
las sedas de tanta tela,
que dan soberbia al brocado,
un gusanillo pequeño
las hila de sus entrañas.
Sacad su valor del dueño.
Las monarquías extrañas
que la ambición funda en sueño,
tal vez dan blasones reales
a un bárbaro sin razón;
mas no dotes naturales
de hermosura y discreción
porque esos son celestiales. (1.2; 291)

He distains all material gain and wealth as being earthy and illusory. In contrast, personal qualities, specifically the ones praised by lovers, are presented as divine artifacts and well

worth any sacrifice. This conviction, that his point of view is clearly superior to other perspectives, is part of what helps blind him, and those of his group, to the possible consequences of their actions. These consequences have little or no importance to them, other than the possibility of hurting Sancho's feelings, since they seem unable to conceive of a tragic ending to their plans, other than the failure to marry each other.

The king and Fisberto, in contrast, understand the world in terms of alliances, honor and practical politics. Love has little or no importance in their plans. Fisberto tells the king about Sigismundo's desires:

menospreciando conciertos
que con la infanta Leonora
por él en Hungría has hecho,
persuadiera la entereza
de Dïana al fin honesto
con que la iglesia permite
vivir un alma en dos cuerpos. (1.8; 298)

He further suggests quickly marrying his daughter off to someone else. If this occurs, he believes that "este impedimento, / volverá el príncipe en sí. / Será de la infanta dueño" (1.8; 298). They believe that Sigismundo's love is merely a distraction, and by placing an obstacle in his path, he will meekly return to fulfill his duty. Both of the viewpoints presented are somewhat extremist in the way in which they represent the world around them. One assumes that personal concerns can exist in isolation from the surrounding world, while the other is too calculating and fails to take into account the power of emotion and individual will. In both cases, the disparate elements meet and interact through the representative relationship between Don Sancho and Diana. These two characters act as the bridge between the opposing world views, represented by Sigismundo and Lisena on the one side, and Fisberto and the king on the other. Diana,

while clearly a member of her sister's camp, has shown some awareness of the dangers of lost honor. Although these comments have been tentative, and quickly dismissed, they do exist. Don Sancho, in the role of loyal vassal to the king, and seemingly dishonored husband, helps to bridge his side of the gap by his resort to reason, rather than emotion, and his determination to learn the truth before acting.

Throughout this discussion, I have characterized the division between the children and parents in a number of ways. The primary approach has been to present the conflict in terms of differing perceptions of the world. The younger group, concerned with love and romance, sees everything as an elaborate game, with marriage as the prize. The king and his group, primarily Fisberto, are preoccupied with political, dynastic, and honor-based concerns. Love is not a factor in their calculations, other than as an annoyance to be overcome. I have also portrayed this division as a symbolic split between the stage and real life, with the younger group representative of the consequence-free world of stage comedy. Finally, I argue that this division can be viewed as a generational conflict as well, a perception bolstered by the king's argument for choosing an older man as Diana's spouse, since he will not suffer the flightiness of youth (1.8; 298). However we choose to view it, there is a fundamental difference in the understanding and purposes of the two groups.

Disguise has a similarly split function within the play. Not only is the use of disguise limited to the younger, theatrical, group, thus creating a have / have not situation, but even within this usage, disguise provokes two opposite reactions and results. For those in the know, disguise is a tool which provides a means to act in ways not typically allowed. For example, it allows Sigismundo to continue to court Lisena

without fear that his father will discover his covert actions and marry off Lisena as he did her sister. The resulting shift of identities results in an uncertainty effect, which can unbalance those involved. This is what we observe as Sigismundo listens to Don Enrique's proclamation. Sigismundo gleefully embraces disguise when it works to his benefit, but despairs when it negatively affects him. Thus, we can argue that disguise in this play, as in the other plays in this study, is a two-edged sword. Not only does it provide the possibility of freedom and self (re)creation, but it also threatens to undermine stability by misdirecting signs and undermining the accepted semiotic system. Added to this inherent polarity of disguise is the fact that, in this play, the identity assumed for the purpose of disguise is one previously occupied. This leads to the misunderstandings and dangers that serve to unite the two groups within the play. As we return to the evening scene in which Lisena and Sigismundo meet, we see how the use of disguise acts to both bridge the distance between the two represented viewpoints, and to highlight the stark difference that one's perspective gives to the interpretation of events.

As Sigismundo calls to Lisena, she answers him, affirming her disguise as well as the identity underneath. SIGISMUNDO: "¿Es Dřana? / LISENA: Soy, y no soy" (2.16; 314). While this answer is clear to the prince who expects such a response, Sancho reacts entirely differently. "Sospechas, ya no hay excusa. / No salieron, honor, falsas / las nuevas de mis desdichas" (2.16; 314). He either ignores the second part of Lisena's answer or views it as one of the metaphorical statements common to the era. As the scene continues, the conversation between Lisena and Sigismundo is commented on and reinterpreted by Sancho who stands in the shadows listening. As their conversation progresses, Sancho reinterprets what he hears in terms that he understands. While not a

unique technique (Tirso makes a similar, but not identical, use of misunderstanding in *El castigo del penséque*), this dual dialogue marks the previously mentioned collision of the two paradigms represented in the play. At the end of the conversation, Lisena and Sigismundo agree to meet and consummate their relationship the following evening.

Sancho is left alone to reflect on, what is to him, clear proof of his wife's infidelity. As he considers his options, he makes a startling statement that deserves attention. He condemns the conditions that have placed him in the current situation, and exclaims:

¡Válgame Dios! ¡Que las leyes
del mundo fundado hayan
la honra en una mujer!
¡En una pluma liviana
el honor de tanto peso!
¡Cielo! ¿El matrimonio ata
con una tan frágil cuerda
que la más fuerte es de lana?
A cabo de tantos días,
honra por mí conservada,
con tanta industria adquirida,
ilustre con tanta hazaña,
¿un pensamiento os destruye?
¿Un soplo liviano os mata?
¿Un poco de viento os quiebra?
¿Una mujer os maltrata?
Mas sois de vidrio; ¿qué mucho
que si os derriba una ingrata,
cayendo el vidrio se quiebre,
y el honor pedazos se haga? (2.18; 315)

The first three lines of this quotation contain a striking statement, one that seems very out of place in the text of a seventeenth century Spanish work. His explicit assertion that it is the world's laws, in essence culture, that make women the bearers of male honor, is revelatory, and can be linked to humanistic tendencies in Europe as a whole (Kimbrough 20) and Tirso's ideology specifically (Sullivan, "Love, Matrimony, and Desire" 91).

Despite the misogynistic dialogue that follows, Sancho is revealed as being aware of some of the cultural assumptions that he lives with. While he is far from arguing for the equality of the sexes, he is able to view this particular tradition as something other than a divinely ordained truth, and thus, as an unchangeable part of the natural order of things. Sancho's portrayal of honor as something earned over years and destroyed in a night, provides a logical segue to his decision to avenge himself secretly. The syllogism can be described as follows: if honor is something gained by man but lost by woman, and if woman, as the repository of honor, is a man-made tradition, then, private vengeance can be justified morally, if not legally, since his actions, in effect, are the reclaiming of his own possession from an unworthy, earthly designated, keeper.

Not only is this statement valuable in its own right as an example of Tirso's awareness of the synthetic construction of social, and perhaps, gender roles, but it also marks Sancho as a man who is far more insightful than the typical character in the *comedia*. Despite the fact that he has collided with the world of theater created by the would-be lovers, he remains partially separated from it. While he is personally affected by what he overhears, he remains a clearly marked spectator. In his role of balance point between life and theater, Sancho's challenge is to separate the intermingling of the two that point his life towards tragedy. Whereas Lisena and Sigismundo see their role-play as a tool, and Fisberto and the king are completely at the mercy of the play put on for them, to them it is a disguise, as we will see towards the end of the work, Sancho is neither completely the dupe nor the deceiver.

As the second act closes, Sancho catches Gascón talking to Diana's maid, Carola. When Sancho chastises him for his indiscretion, saying that "En España / no se usa hablar

los criados / con las doncellas de casa / tan familiarmente” (2.20; 317), Gascón replies: “Acá, / la llaneza de Alemania / todo esto, señor, permite” (2.20; 317). Although this exchange is superficially a jab at the German realms, this interchange serves to highlight and emphasize the cultural differences between the two kingdoms. Additionally, this conversation provides an external voice that reminds Sancho, and more importantly the viewer, that cultural standards of propriety can vary and are not innate. Just as Don Sancho realizes that women carry a man’s honor due to the cultural traditions of the time, the “leyes / del mundo” (2.18; 315), as he calls them, the standards of appropriate behavior are also mutable (although the behavior of all the characters is, in practice, very Spanish). Sancho’s response is another reference to the Defenestration of Prague. He tells Gascón, as they climb the stairs to the house, that he is fired. The exchange proceeds as follows:

SANCHO: Basta.
No subáis esta escalera
de aquí adelante...
GASCÓN: (¡Qué extraña Aparte
condición!)
SANCHO: Porque en subiendo,
bajaréis por la ventana.
GASCÓN: (De volatín me gradúa.) (2.20; 317)

The allusion to being thrown from the window, directly after the reminder that they are in German territory (Bohemia was part of the Hapsburg Empire), provides a clear link to the historical event.

As the final act begins, we see that the two worlds, previously characterized as the conflict between the stage and the real world, have begun to interact as Sancho becomes both an actor and observer in the role-play created by Diana, Lisena, and Sigismundo. Sancho, while still blinded by the sisters’ identity swap, has decided to forgo direct action

in favor of delay and discretion. He has decided to hide the signs of his dishonor and vengeance:

aunque mas le satisfagan,
en público siempre queda
la señal donde hubo mancha.
Secretos, buscad remedios;
discurrid, industria honrada.
No sepa de mí ninguno
cosa con que me dé en cara.
No ha de haber quien imagine
que una mujer alemana
osó afrentar atrevida
la honra y valor de España. (2.18; 315)

His decision, based on his desire to maintain his image, compels him to become an actor and disguise his feelings and suspicions. In a parallel fashion, Diana is coming to realize the potential for disaster inherent in the situation that she and Lisena have created: “¿Qué he de hacer, triste de mí? / si algo de aquesto ha sentido [Sancho], / y sospechas del honor / mi crédito en duda han puesto?” (3.1; 318). She later states: “Gracias al cielo que puedo, / nombre mío, restauraros. / No pienso otra vez prestaros; / basta un peligro y un miedo” (3.6; 321). When Lisena asks if he has shown signs of suspicion, Diana replies that Sancho has disguised his feelings: “Don Sancho es cuerdo marido / y el cuerdo es disimulado” (3.1; 318). Not only is she coming to the realization of the real world consequences of the suspicion that her identity switch with Lisena could bring, but she has also been positioned as the audience for Sancho’s theater. While neither Sancho nor Diana have fully integrated the two opposing behaviors, they both have begun to incorporate the two.

Sancho’s first entrance in the third act is a recapitulation of the internal debate that occurred toward the end of the previous act. He again highlights the conflict between

God's and man's laws, saying: "¡Ay leyes fieras del mundo, / de las de Dios embarazo!" (3.2; 319). Again he debates the options available to him, and fails to find an appetizing solution. When his servant comes in to relate the story of a man falsely accused and then exonerated, but who continues to be known as the "azotado" (3.4; 320), a permanent sign of his previous dishonor, he decides to keep the entire affair and revenge secret, in order to avoid public humiliation. As Diana overhears Sancho's plans to kill her and erase his dishonor, she finally realizes the full danger of her role-play. Sancho's dissimulation has been penetrated, and Diana becomes aware that the separation that she and her sister have assumed to exist between their world of role-play and the real world that Sancho, Fisberto, and the king inhabit is imaginary. The contrast which had been established from the beginning of the play, and which began to break down only in the closing scenes of the second act, has now been completely destroyed for Diana. Her only option is to reveal all to her husband. She tells herself:

si hasta aquí fue prudencia
callar, ya no lo será.
Mi hermana a casarse va;
la ocasión me da licencia
descubrir este engaño;
que si para lo que he hecho
fue el secreto de provecho,
ya de hoy más, será en mi daño. (3.6; 322)¹⁴

The value that she previously perceived in keeping her secret is no longer a benefit, and must, for her own safety, be revealed. Sancho, however, is unwilling to discuss the subject and, as a result, Diana decides to flee until her secret can be fully revealed.

As Lisena's plans come to a head, she assumes a new identity, that of the princess Leonora. Where her first use of disguise only involved the assumption of a name,

¹⁴ The numbering of the scenes in the 1989 Blanca de los Ríos version is incorrect. The numbering skips from VI to VIII.

retaining all the while her own voice and identity, this new role requires her to act as the princess while retaining her physical identity as Lisena. The separation of theater and real life, which has collapsed for Diana, is still very much in evidence as the king greets Lisena as Leonora, princess of Hungary. Although he repeatedly comments on the similarities between the two (3.12; 325-26), he seems utterly unable to pierce what is, even for the *comedia*, a weak disguise. Lisena, in the name of Leonora, goes on to tell the king that, after the death of her brother, she had been told to marry the prince of Poland rather than that of Bohemia. She uses this fiction to justify her marriage to Sigismundo by stating that “por no dar ocasión justa / a guerras, que al poder hacen tirano, / luego que supe su demanda injusta, / de esposa a Sigismundo di la mano” (3.12; 327-28). This gambit has a double purpose. First it appeals to the practical, real world viewpoint championed by the king and Fisberto. Secondly, by supporting her decision, the king shows tacit approval for disobedience to a father’s wish, despite the political implications, thus preparing the way for the revelation of the truth.

The play comes to a climax as Sancho rushes to Valdeflores in search of his wife who he believes to be with Sigismundo. There, now that the couples are safely married, the entire charade is revealed and Sancho concludes the play by telling the audience:

El celoso como yo
calle y averigüe cuerdo
sospechas, mil veces falsas,
como las mías salieron;
y si fueren verdad, cobre
satisfacción con secreto;
que la pública da causas
al vulgo, siempre parlero. (3.19; 333)

Within moments, the deception is revealed. Sancho is assured that his wife is faithful, and the various couples end up with their desired spouses. Indeed, the play ends well for all

the conspirators. Alberto gets the Princess Leonora, Sigismundo weds Lisena, and Sancho's restraint means that Diana does not suffer the consequences of her apparent infidelity. Yet the feeling that tragedy continues to lurk in the shadows cannot be banished. As if to underline the point, the king remarks "digno es este cuento / que se acabe en tragedia" (3.19; 333). The very stratagem of misdirection that allows the various lovers to achieve their ends escapes control and almost causes a starkly different finale to the play.

Throughout this play, Tirso has represented two contrasting groups and worldviews. Each faction assumes that its actions are universally valid, and that its members can act independently of the other group. In fact, we can say that the central focus of the play is the clash between these two groups. While I have characterized this partition in a number of ways, in each case, there is a clear division, even a polarity, between them. Whether we choose to view the conflict as a generational clash, practical versus idealistic worldviews, or, as I have tended to do, as the world of the stage versus a portrayal of the 'real' world, we see that the groups have mutually exclusive goals, with greatly differing justifications for their actions. Disguise and misdirection serve as the tools which allow the younger group to disrupt their parents' plans. As the weaker of the two groups, the lovers are unable to rebel directly and successfully defy their father's power. Instead, they use techniques which create an unclaimed, intermediate, space. This space, specifically the freedom allotted to Lisena, is what permits the lovers to misdirect their father's intentions. Thus, they gain by guile, what they cannot by direct confrontation.

Diana and Sancho, as the principal characters in the play, represent each group while also acting as the point of contact between them. Diana is the only member of the theater group (consisting of herself, Lisena, Sigismundo, Alberto, and Leonora) who shows more than a casual awareness of the potential consequences of their plot to have Sigismundo and Lisena marry. Likewise, Sancho, unlike the king and Fisberto, shows a partial understanding of the machinations of the first group, and an awareness that all may not be as it appears. The heightened sensitivity that this pair demonstrates, especially on the part of Don Sancho, is the key element that keeps the play from ending as a tragedy. One of the central elements of classical tragedy, and its imitators, is the inability of the tragic figure to see the actions which lead to his or her own destruction. This *hubris* remains a factor in Golden Age tragedy where it is the blindness/pride of the protagonist that is the enabling element in the tragedy, although these plays do not follow the pattern of the classical tragedy inherited from the Greeks. This is the case for Don Juan in *El pintor de su deshonra* and Gutierre in *El médico de su honra* (both by Calderón). It is the fact that Diana and Sancho, especially Sancho in his role as the wronged husband, are willing to pause and consider the consequences of their actions that elevates the play from the subgenre of wife-murder tragedy.

It is this key difference that has been overlooked by the few critics who have studied this play in previous decades. Tirso has not created in *El celoso prudente* a variation of the wife-murder sub genre at all. The very title invites us to make this conclusion once we shift our attention away from the word *celoso* to *prudente*. It is not Don Sancho's jealousy that is at the heart of the work; rather it is his prudence. Thus, the play acts as a meditation on the unreliability of perception and the danger of rash

judgment. Throughout the work, Don Sancho is given indications that his wife is unfaithful. His hesitation in seeking vengeance is justified, in the play, by his need to avoid the wrath of the prince, his uncertainty that his wife is truly unfaithful, and his desire to avoid public scorn. Yet, despite the excuses that allow him to delay the *comedia's* proscribed penalty for an unfaithful wife, his actions are represented by Tirso as wise, rather than as signs of a weak character; again I refer to the title: *prudente*. Furthermore, the conclusion, from Sancho's own mouth, highlights the wisdom of his actions. While Sancho still advocates punishing true violations of honor, he insists that the husband be certain of his suspicions before acting.

Sancho's worries are the result of Lisena and Diana's decision to have Diana act as a proxy for her sister. When Diana allows herself to be the supposed recipient of Sigismundo's attention, she acts as a disguising element for her sister. The fatal flaw in this act of deception is that Lisena's actions become Diana's responsibility. As in *La celosa de sí misma*, disguise acts as a mediator which allows greater freedom to act. It is Lisena's assumption of Diana's identity, as well as the misdirection of Sigismundo's apparent interest, that permits the lovers to continue their courtship. Furthermore, the actual marriage is made possible by Lisena's use of Leonora's name and place. In both cases, it is the slip between true identity (in this play the characters never doubt their own sense of self) and the name being used that allows them to achieve their goals.

This particular usage, however, is highly problematic. One of the central benefits of disguise is that it breaks the chain of meaning which links the person with a name and identity. Yet, because the sisters have been forced by circumstances to misdirect, rather than break, this chain, they are unable to completely free themselves from the restraints

of society. Instead, they rely on Diana to be the false face for her sister as Sigismundo courts Lisena. As long as the division between theater (the younger group) and audience (the older characters) is complete, this name borrowing is safe and functions as intended: the fathers believe the threat to Sigismundo's dynastic marriage to be safely ended. Yet, as soon as this boundary line begins to blur, e.g., as Sancho moves from spectator to participant, unanticipated consequences begin to appear. Lisena's name borrowing quickly becomes more than a stratagem to keep her and her lover's fathers at bay. It threatens her sister's marriage and life once Sancho is able to partially see through the charade and is forced to consider the effect that Diana's infidelity has upon his honor and political status. This partial revelation, that of the prince's love but not the true identity of his intended, highlights the weakness of the sister's plan. The entire purpose of the misdirection is to free Lisena to marry the prince. Yet, they fail to consider the possible consequences. In effect, Sancho stands in the middle between the two groups, neither being completely deceived, nor totally aware of the truth. This permeability between the 'stage' and the 'audience' provokes a near tragedy and highlights the danger of disguise.

The entire purpose of disguise, as compared to erasure or masquerade, is to convincingly present a false face to the world. The sisters, princes, and Leonora, Princess of Hungary (the theater group) are successfully able to do this. Yet, they neglect an important element of disguise. In cases where the actions of the disguised person may result in undesirable results, which is frequently the case given the motivations for the use of disguise, the disguise must remain independent of any real person. By stating this I mean that the disguise should not be linked directly to a real identity. Doing so allows the *persona* created by disguise to act in ways not permitted to the identity beneath. In this

case, it allows for Lisena and Sigismundo to court and ultimately marry. However, if the *persona* used is actually another's identity, then even a successful role-play carries danger, as we see here. While disguise inherently admits the possibility of discovery, and even unmasking, transference of identity also places the responsibility for another's actions on the person being imitated.

The use of disguise in this play is one which highlights the negative aspects which are inherent in its use, as well as one of its greatest strengths. Despite the freedom offered through the use of misdirection, the lack of complete anonymity implies the potential for tragedy as Lisena's actions are attributed to Diana. Although there is no penetration of the various disguises used, the redirection of Sigismundo's apparent object of desire, from Lisena to Diana, highlights the way in which the autonomy of disguise remains consequence-free only if the mask remains anonymous. By shifting Lisena's actions onto Diana, the stage is set for tragedy, and it is only luck, and the will of the dramatist, that keeps Don Sancho from seeking revenge for his supposed injuries. Because disguise is commonly used to permit actions which would be otherwise impossible, it carries with it the stain of disrespectability. This is why veils were, at times, prohibited (Sánchez 49n1). By simply shifting the responsibility for Lisena's actions onto her sister, rather than employing a more complete form of disguise, this disrespectability (the romance with Sigismundo) falls on Diana. We conclude, therefore, that one of the great values of disguise is that it provides for the possibility of acting in socially unacceptable ways while evading the consequences of these actions, as is the case for Lisena. The caveat that comes associated with this application of disguise is that the actions must not be traceable to a specific person.

In the following chapter we will see a more complex use of identity borrowing as Doña Juana attempts to regain her lost lover, Don Martín. Not only does she make use of disguise, but she will also usurp Don Martín's false identity and cross the gender barrier. In so doing, she passes from simple erasure and disguise into a much more elaborate dance of identity, disguise, and self.

CHAPTER IV

DON GIL DE LAS CALZAS VERDES AND THE BATTLE FOR IDENTITY

One of the best known female-to-male cross-dressers in Spanish literature is Doña Juana in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. Of the plays examined here, this text has been the recipient of the most critical attention (a total of 23 entries in the MLA database), including studies by such scholars as Everett Hesse, David Darst, and Henry Sullivan. These studies range from a 1962 explication of the text by Hesse, in which he provides a plot description as well as a basic analysis of the plot structure, to Ellen Frye's recent (2004) performance study, in which she discusses how the metatheatrical elements of the play, specifically meta-imitation, function in a production of the play. Her key argument is that this meta-imitation is the key to the play's structure.

In contrast to the limited amount of criticism extant for *El celoso prudente* and *La celosa de sí misma*, in the criticism of *Don Gil* we see some efforts to define and explain Doña Juana's character and to relate it to her use of disguise and cross dressing. Carmen Bravo-Villasante sees her as a descendant of similar women in the works of Lope de Vega. She states that

Una fusión de *El lacayo fingido*, con todas sus peripecias y los equívocos amorosos de *La Francesilla*, o las conquistas de *Beltránico* de *El galán Castrucho*, bastan para explicar la figura de don Gil. Ciertamente es que debe reconocerse que Tirso combinó todos estos elementos de un modo tan mágico y genial, que su obra admirable es típica como ejemplo de mujer vestida de hombre. Ni una línea de su obra puede explicarse sin el disfraz y todos los movimientos de cualquier personaje se explican por el engaño del vestido. (53-54)

Yet, as she notes, what Tirso accomplishes is much more than simply rewriting already existing characters: “Sus comedias [han] quedado de modelo para estudiar el tipo de mujer vestida de hombre, haciendo palidecer no sólo las obras de Lope sino las de dramaturgos posteriores. En Tirso el tema llega a una perfección” (69).

J. E. Varey studies Doña Juana as a character and as the voice of the outsider who can critique the corruption of Madrid (360). He contends that “La figura dominante de la comedia es, sin duda, doña Juana; en comparación con ella, inteligente, audaz y firme en su propósito, los demás personajes, y sobre todo los galanes, palidecen” (362). Paul Figure, in his study of cross-dressing women in Tirso, sees Doña Juana not only as “una mujer de gran fuerza de carácter” (140), but continues further to assert that in her, “Tirso solidariza con el anhelo de justicia del alma femenina, oprimida por una sociedad que no sólo permite el abuso de la mujer por parte del hombre, sino que lo instiga, a través de un código de honor unilateralmente injusto” (140-41). Darcy Donahue sees a different purpose for Juana’s character. She feels that her function is “primarily parodic” (176), and argues that Juana, in the guise of Don Gil, is an androgynous doubling of a previously existing character. Donahue argues that this serves to parody standards of gender performance. Matthew Stroud, in a Lacanian reading of the text, believes that “Juana's adventure allegorizes one's search for sexual identity” (175), and reads the text from this viewpoint. As is demonstrated by the efforts of each of these critics to define and explain Doña Juana, she has remained a continued source of critical interest. In this chapter, although I will not make an effort to define Juana in terms of psychological or social models, as I examine the way in which she makes use of disguise, it is necessary to point out her ingenuity and assertive character.

In the opening lines of *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, Doña Juana recounts to her *criado* Quintana the situation which has forced her to leave Valladolid and come to Madrid in search of her wandering lover, Don Martín. This exposition at first appears to be the rather conventional story of a woman who must reclaim her honor by re-winning her faithless lover, such as we see in *La vida es sueño* and in the case of Dorotea in *Don Quijote*, to name just two examples. In fact, this was a common technique in Tirso's works. Henry Sullivan counts more than twenty such examples in his theater ("Love, Matrimony and Desire" 92). However, we soon see that the situation is more complex than initially presented.

Juana continues, explaining that Don Martín's father arranged to marry his son to a Doña Inés, who, in addition to being noble, has a dowry of seventy thousand ducats (152-60). In order to avoid the legal and moral obligations which Martín has already incurred, he is to take on the pseudonym Don Gil to woo her. Juana, after having learned all these details, decides to take action, and upon entering Madrid, takes on a new servant, Caramanchel, and the name Don Gil. In so doing, her actions echo historical reality. Cross-dressing was actually used to allow women to remain with, or follow, a spouse. Rudolf Dekker and Lotte C. van de Pol remark that "[f]or the women whom we know to have been married, transvestism appears to have been either a means to remain with their husbands, or escape from them" (30). While Juana's situation is somewhat contrived, we will see that Tirso's representation of Juana's motivations echo, although they may not copy, historical reality.

The assumption of Juana's new identity is not without problems. Caramanchel, in his role of the astute *gracioso*, who sees beyond the surface façade, casts immediate

doubt on the masculinity of his new master, using the word “capón” twice in succession (507, 519). However, this exposure is a necessary risk for Juana as she begins her project to recover Don Martín. Juana’s search for justice is limited by a number of factors. The first is, of course, her status as a woman, with all the restrictions on individual action that this implies. Furthermore, the creation of a false identity for Don Martín has been designed specifically to avoid problems should “viniese en su [Martín’s] busca aquí / la justicia” (178-79). Instead of a confrontation with her faithless lover, or a plea to justice, Juana elects to take advantage of the creation of the identity of Don Gil. Since this person does not actually exist, what occurs is the creation of an unclaimed space. The original purpose was to provide Martín a means by which he can secure the marriage his father desires. However, the lack of any “real” person behind the name means that this created fiction is subject to redefinition and appropriation by others, notably by Doña Juana, as Varey observes (367).

The complex nature of this play, and the various themes which are addressed within it, has made a clear exposition of the work a true challenge. In his recent book, *Género y confusión en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*, Raúl Galoppe has opted to view the text in Lacanian psychological terms. Although there is not enough room to do justice to Galoppe’s interpretation of the work, there are some elements which must be briefly mentioned here as a recent example of a sexualized, gender-oriented, reading of the text.

In focusing on a Lacanian interpretation of *Don Gil*, Galoppe examines how gender, the Other, and desire interact. His investigation into the ways in which Juana is able to manipulate the perceptions of the other characters in the play and to direct desire into an outcome which she wishes, is based on whom and what are the objects of desire

in the three Lacanian levels of the Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary (151) within the text of the play. In his reading of the play, the personage of Don Gil becomes the object of desire for the varying aspirations of the different characters: a means to gain a wife, the perfect husband, freedom, etc. In Galoppe's view, Doña Juana's use of disguise is first and foremost a way to hide her gender: "Tirso de Molina cubre a las protagonistas femeninas Doña Juana y Finea con la máscara primordial de la condición humana: el género, en sus tres manifestaciones: sexual, vestuarial y literario. Al cambiar de género, las mujeres se ocultan a la vista de los demás personajes y pueden realizar sus cometidos con éxito" (143); the other aspects of disguise are considered secondary. While this reading is certainly valid (and I might add, very convincing), in choosing to focus on a Lacanian reading, Galoppe has perforce neglected other aspects and important themes of the play, such as how disguise and the use of secondary identities creates a space in which the female, who must function within a male world, is free to act.

This brings us back to the question of Don Gil as an identity. Although it is common to read cross-dressing in terms of gender and sexuality, as Kristina Straub does in "The Guilty Pleasures of Female Theatrical Cross-Dressing and the Autobiography of Charlotte Charke," it is certainly not the only way in which to view this technique.

Melveena McKendrick argues that

none of the *mujeres varoniles* of the theatre except Dionisa shows any evidence of a fondness for her own sex. Many indeed despise their own sex, and prefer the company of men. That such feelings are often the first psychological manifestations of lesbian tendencies does not mean that they lead inevitably to lesbianism. And in the manufactured world of the Golden-Age drama they certainly do not. Those who argue that they do are confusing feminist statements with deviant tastes. . . . Careful distinctions must be made if hasty amateur psychology is not to lead one to misunderstand the whole nature of the *mujer varonil's* revolt. That revolt is against Society and convention, and woman's inferior position in

them, not against her sexual role vis-à-vis man. The *esquiva*'s revolt against Nature is prompted, not by homosexual impulses, but by the way the concept of Nature is invoked by men to justify their delegation of women to an inactive and inferior role in life. The age-old tradition of the physically aggressive woman is a reflection not so much of lesbian tendencies (if at all), as of one of the more basic forms of female envy. The *guerrera* and particularly the *bella cazadora* are an expression of woman's envy of man's freedom. (*Women and Society* 316-17)

Catherine Larson further states: "The *mujer vestida de hombre* convention might then emerge as a type of feminist strategy, in which the woman dons the clothing of the more powerful Other to gain power, authority, freedom, and equality" (503). Jonathan Thacker agrees, saying: "In Golden-Age plays, set in a pre-feminist society, such role-play allows the woman to express her self in the first place, using often masculine roles to hint at the gulf between this potential self and the limitations of social role" (42). Finally, P. R. K. Halkhoree considers cross-dressing in Juana's case to be "sociologically justifiable" (64). If we postulate, as these critics have, that the true motivation for cross-dressing is the desire for power, i.e., an ability to act and to control events, and that cross-dressing is considered by the female protagonist a path to this greater freedom, then it becomes evident that questions of gendering are, in fact, secondary. If this is the case, we must ask ourselves, how does cross-dressing allow the female protagonist to exercise power? The answer is twofold. The first is directly linked with the power of anonymity. The second, as I will discuss shortly, is concerned with the greater freedom afforded masculinity.

Foucault mentions that one of the aspects of discipline, which he presents as the successor to punishment, i.e., the vengeance of the despot versus the correction of the state, is to fix those observed within a "network of relations" (*Discipline and Punish* 146). In a society in which discipline functions, it "makes possible the operation of a relational power that sustains itself by its own mechanism and which, for the spectacle of

public events, substitutes the uninterrupted play of calculated gazes” (*Discipline and Punish* 177). Even though he places the transition from punishment to discipline in the latter half of the eighteenth century, we can easily see how this concept is a key to understanding the use of disguise in Tirso’s works. One of the essential elements to discipline is that “it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them” (*Discipline and Punish* 187). This visibility is reliant upon the practice of accurately naming.

Don Martín’s father has his son create and occupy the identity of Don Gil de Albornoz specifically to avoid the consequences that are legally and morally attached to his true name. Thus, the value of the Don Gil ‘identity’ is that, in fact, it is not one; it makes the person who occupies it invisible to the efforts to locate, identify and define, as Caramanchel will later complain (2199-209). This is what Susan Baker means when she states: “When a new identity is to be personated, it has no preexisting relationships: no bonds, no reciprocal obligations, no legitimated sexual or other status” (307). The lack of any substance behind the identity of Don Gil is what allows both Don Martín and Doña Juana to avoid this previously mentioned “uninterrupted play of calculated gazes” and thus to act freely.

This first element, in and of itself, fails to deal with the question of why cross-dressing should enter into the picture. The simple use of disguise, such as we see in *La dama duende*, provides anonymity. However, there are a number of limitations to this approach, as well. A disguise, in fact, advertises that there is something hidden to be discovered, as we see in both *El amor médico* and *La celosa de sí misma*. The assumption of another identity, on the other hand, does not broadcast the ongoing deception. Once a

female character has made the decision to assume an identity, it is a logical choice to play the part of a man, since men were granted much more freedom in the society of the time.

Judith Butler, discussing Foucault's view of sexuality and the connection between sex and power, observes that

we are not, as it were, (merely) discriminated against on the basis of our sex; power is more insidious than that: either discrimination is built into the very formulation of our sex, or enfranchisement is precisely the formative and generative principle of some one else's sex. And this is why, for Foucault, sex can never be liberated from power: the formation of sex is an enactment of power. ("Sexual Inversions" 349)

She later adds: "Luce Irigaray ... would, I think, argue that the only sex that qualifies as a sex is a masculine one, which is not marked as masculine but parades as the universal and thereby silently extends its dominion" ("Sexual Inversions" 353). If masculinity is the only sex considered valid, then it is logical to cross-dress if a woman wishes to gain any standing within society. Valerie Hotchkiss argues:

The assumption underlying female transvestism, after all, is that maleness is a gender of empowerment. Women in disguise literature are defined by masculine stereotypes and metaphors that equate holiness, courage, or intellectual ability with a "manly spirit," whereas femininity, as an idea, represents weakness and corruption. Nonetheless, disguised women are often said to surpass men, and the basic premise of disguise literature, it would seem, endorses a view that women are hampered only by the demeaning and restricting, force of cultural perceptions of gender roles. (125)

A reading following this logic sees cross-dressing in terms of the greater power afforded to the transvestite, rather than positing a suppressed lesbianism, gender crisis, etc. I do not wish to imply that such issues do not exist, nor that they have a lesser value. Rather, I wish to emphasize that starting with a different paradigm for reading the text leads to a radically different understanding of the mechanisms which motivate the action of the play.

When the play is read in this light, the questions of gender and desire tend to fade to the background as we foreground the theme of freedom of action within the constraints of society. Of course, desire remains a key element in motivating the characters, driving the action of the play etc., but disguise can now be read in terms of power relationships rather than as an accessory element to the psycho-sexual interplay of the personages within the play. With this in mind, we need to turn our attention to the character of Don Gil and its position as an unclaimed space. Until the arrival of Don Martín in Madrid, there was no Don Gil. This new name supposedly frees Don Martín from anxiety about his past with Juana, as well as allowing him to woo Inés. He begins to establish his new identity with the help of a letter from his father in which he is introduced as Don Gil de Albornoz.

The letter of introduction that Martín presents, is a skillful exercise in misdirection and, as we would call it today, doublespeak. The portion of the letter which is read aloud begins with a condemnation of Don Martín for promising himself to Doña Juana. The complaint is based on the historical reality of Spain's contemporary financial crisis in which Phillip IV had declared bankruptcy, and when 98 percent of the coinage in circulation was copper (Kamen 215-16). The critique of Juana comes, as Juana had stated earlier, from her lack of wealth. Don Andrés, Martín's father, then begs Don Pedro, the father of Doña Inés, to accept Don Gil "en lugar de don Martín" (prose between lines 538 and 539). The direct rebuke of Don Martín, in the letter, as well as the multiple references to financial matters, "pobre," "sin hacienda," "mayorazgo," and "diez mil ducados de renta," presents us with a clear contrast between the concept of love and the need for financial stability. While young lovers may try to marry for love, the older generation,

desiring stability and financial security, perceives marriage as a merger of estates and a way to secure a “dichosa” old age. This same attitude is echoed by Don Pedro, the father of Doña Inés (652-83). This attitude is criticized by J. E. Varey, who observes that “Los padres de los jóvenes enamorados de esta obra son llevados demasiado por el interés económico” (362). This error helps to justify Juana’s actions.

Thus Martín is placed in the position of a romantic mercenary, fighting under a foreign flag, that of Don Gil de Albornoz, in order to win security for his father. The previous reference to Don Gil’s inheritance is a tactic to assure his acceptability to Don Pedro. Don Martín continues to establish his new identity by means of a bluff. He tells Don Pedro: “Deudos tengo en la corte, y muchos dellos / títulos, que podrán daros noticia / de quién soy, si os importa conocellos” (571-73). His assertion that there are many men at court who could vouch for his identity is a patent falsehood. However, since Don Pedro accepts this statement without question, instead of revealing the deception, this statement acts as second verification of Don Gil de Albornoz as a rich and noble young suitor.

Don Martín’s assumption of a new identity is little more than the assumption of a different name. His new role, as Don Gil de Albornoz, is that of a stand-in for the ‘absent’ Don Martín who, because of legal entanglements, is unable to come to Madrid and woo Doña Inés. Don Martín is therefore acting as a proxy for himself. In practical terms this means that he can continue to play himself, but under a different name. Nothing else about his character, identity, or actions has to change. In Jungian terms, we could say that the *persona* of Don Gil de Albornoz and that of Don Martín are almost

identical, since the face presented to the world, in both cases, is almost the same. The key difference is that of Don Martín's obligation to Doña Juana.

In theory, this similarity between the Don Gil de Albornoz and himself should give Don Martín great control over his new role. However, this is not the case. From the beginning, Don Martín seems unable to fully embody his new identity. He relies on a letter from his father to establish his new existence, and in his opening lines he states:

Comenzáis de manera a aventajaros
en hacerme merced, que temeroso,
señor don Pedro, de poder pagaros
aun en palabras (que en el generoso
son prendas de valor), para envidiaros
en obras y en palabras vitorioso,
agradezco callando y mudo nuestro
que no soy mío ya porque soy vuestro. (563-70)

This introductory speech highlights a key weakness in Don Martín. Although couched in a typically baroque style, which highlights the nobility of the listener by downplaying the abilities of the interlocutor, Tirso inserts a number of clues which indicate Don Martín's inability to control his own discourse. He states that he feels unequal to the task of repaying Don Pedro's generosity, even verbally. Instead, he characterizes himself as "callando" and "mudo," and finishes by stating that "no soy mío." He is "an unresisting puppet in the hands of his father" (Halkhoree 45). When we compare the facility with which Juana is able to manipulate the situation around her and to embody her version of Don Gil, we will see that Don Martín indeed seems to be constantly tongue tied. In fact, once the personality of Don Gil de las calzas verdes becomes the preeminent version of the Don Gil fiction, we see the literal truth of the statement that Don Martín is not his own (person).

It seems no accident therefore, that Don Martín is not given the chance to speak until the midpoint of the first act. In contrast, Doña Juana, who is his opposite on a number of levels, is able to freely express herself and, in her conversations with Quintana and Caramanchel, it is she who plays the role of social superior. Thus, even before the initiation of the true action of the play, we are presented with the concept of Don Gil as an empty identity, which will be occupied, with varying degrees of success, by multiple characters. We also see that while Doña Juana is actively involved in her self-creation and is freely able to speak and act, Don Martín has been characterized as inactive, since it is his father who creates the identity of Don Gil de Albornoz, and unable to speak, not only by his own explicit admission, but also in the fact that he is forced to listen silently to his father's written rebuke.

In contrast to Don Martín's rather passive assumption of his new identity, Juana can be characterized by her vitality and assertive personality. In her opening monologue, in which she describes to Quintana, and the spectator, the situation which has caused her to leave Valladolid and come to Madrid dressed in men's clothes, she says:

Saqué fuerzas de flaqueza,
dejé el temor femenil,
dióme alientos el agravio,
y de la industria adquirí
la determinación cuerda;
porque pocas veces vi
no vencer la diligencia
cualquier fortuna infeliz. (209-14)

She continues by telling her servant what she intends to achieve:

Yo, pues que he de ser estorbo
de su ciego frenesí,
a vista tengo de andar
de mi ingrato don Martín,
malogrando cuanto hiciere:

el cómo, déjalo a mí. (229-34)

Juana's speech is full of terms indicating her protagonism. Words such as "fuerzas," "alientos," "industria," "determinación," and "diligencia" pepper her description of her decision to follow Don Martín. In addition, her goal is clearly stated. She intends to disrupt Martín's plans and inflict her revenge, in an eye-for-an-eye retribution.

As Doña Inés is introduced, we see a continuation of the generational conflict initiated earlier. Inés is dedicated, at least for the time being, to Don Juan, but her father insists that she be open to the courtship of the rich Don Gil. Her reply strikes at the heart of the matter. She exclaims: "Si la codicia civil / que a toda vejez infama, / te vence, mira que es vil / defecto" (694-97). Her rejection of her father's choice is heightened once she learns the name of her new suitor: Don Gil. His reply: "No repares en los nombres / cuando el dueño es noble y rico" (702-03), is meant to highlight the priority which he gives to financial stability, but it also serves to foreshadow the confusion that Juana will cause by making Don Gil de las calzas verdes the object of Inés's desire.

In the first meeting between Juana, dressed as Don Gil, and Doña Inés, Inés feels an immediate attraction. She exclaims "¡Extremada cara tiene!" (839). Her cousin, Doña Clara expresses similar feelings: "¡Perdida de enamorada / me tiene el don Gil de perlas!" (911-12). Don Juan is forced to sit passively observing the scene, although he is obviously displeased by the fickleness shown by his *dama* and jealous of this intruder. There is, in this garden scene, a clear gender connection to the question of Don Gil. In a prelude to the scene, Caramanchel refers to his *amo* as "hermafrodita" (724) and "capón" (743). Upon meeting Juana, dressed as Don Gil, Doña Inés remarks on "his" face twice (793, 839). Both she and Doña Clara are immediately won over by his style and grace. In

her depiction of Don Gil to her father, Inés describes him in the following manner: “don Gil no es hombre, es la gracia, / la sal, el donaire, el gusto / que amor en sus cielos guarda” (939-41). It is interesting to note that she states, specifically, that her beloved Don Gil is not a man; an ironic comment that the audience would certainly catch. It is also interesting to note that the gender of the words that she uses to replace the previous definition of Don Gil = man are, in Spanish, half masculine and half feminine. This reaction is reasonably close to historical reality. Dekker and Pol report that “In literature, these women [transvestites] are usually represented as handsome and charming young men, objects of passion to the women they meet. The historical sources, however, do not depict our women as being pretty as women, although as men their charms were usually rather higher” (16). Thus, Tirso’s presentation of Juana-as-Gil as an object of female desire is one that corresponds to historical events.

Various critics have offered explanations for this preference that is shown to a “man” who is clearly androgynous in character. For Galoppe, this is partially explained by “la maleabilidad inherente a la mujer en el ámbito de la travestía por su condición de ‘no-otra’, lo que sin duda inclina la balanza hacia el cuadrante del Otro en cuanto a flexibilidad y diversidad de posibilidades con relación al juego de la seducción entre la máscara y el disfraz” (144). This malleability and intermediary status between Self and Other makes the transvestite woman a point of contact in the search for the Other. Sullivan sees it as a “comic demonstration that secondary gender distinctions between the sexes are largely arbitrary” (as quoted in Galoppe 157), while Everett Hesse sees it in terms of homosexual attraction (*La mujer como víctima* 138-39). It seems that it is Matthew Stroud, following a Lacanian interpretation, who provides the best explanation.

He argues that “Inés is not in love with Juana as a man or a body ... Inés is in love with Juana’s clothes”; that is, she is “captivated in the imaginary by the trappings of masculinity which are defined as such in the symbolic” (*The Play in the Mirror* 168). Juana presents Inés with an image which fulfills her expectations. As a result Inés is predisposed to accept Don Gil’s advances.

As Juana introduces herself as a Don Gil “yo me llamo también / don Gil” (820-21), she is careful not to claim to be the Don Gil de Albornoz whom Don Pedro plans to introduce to his daughter. However, Inés makes the logical assumption that this Don Gil de Valladolid is indeed the man her father has told her about: “¿Puede haber más que un don Gil / en todo el mundo?” (800-01). Juana’s decision to not provide a patronymic is, textually, the result of her lack of knowledge (194-95). However, the actual result of this choice by Tirso is to create a partial overlap of the identities of the two Don Gils, since he could have easily permitted Juana to learn this detail. Because the two claimants to the name are obviously distinct personages, there is a contest for the identity. What permits this contest is the fact that neither can truly claim and occupy the identity of Don Gil. While Don Martín has the advantage of being biologically male, and of having the “evidence” of the letter from his father, Juana is the more active and verbally skilled of the two.

The question of validity is presented in terms of the generational conflict, which has been a repeated element of the first act. Don Martín, obedient to his father and the traditional power structures of the era, has presented himself to Inés’s father for approval, and in order to gain access to Inés. Don Pedro approves of Martín’s courtship based upon Don Gil’s supposed financial state. In contrast, Juana, in her iteration of Don Gil, follows

the path trod by so many literary lovers and goes directly to Doña Inés and, in the name of Don Gil, wins her by charm.

Thus, the two versions of Don Gil are representative of two distinct philosophies towards marriage: patrimony and love. The ensuing conflict between Don Martín and Doña Juana is, on one level, a justification for love in marriage. This is not the prime level of conflict between the two, and certainly not the most interesting, but it serves to further establish Juana as the heroine of the play and justify her actions towards Martín, since, as Jonathan Thacker observes: “Spanish theologians such as the Jesuit Tomás Sánchez, whose influential work, *De Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento*, was first published in 1592, upheld the importance of Natural Law in defending ‘the freedom of the individual to make his or her own choice of partner, while upholding the need of the state to guarantee social order’, Casey, p. 208. This is a *de facto* defence of marriage based on love” (39n43). We can reasonably expect the audience to side with Juana, not only because of Martín’s betrayal, or because of her charm and wit, but also because she represents love in conflict with what is portrayed as “codicia” (694). This difference is reflected in the naming of the two Don Gils. While Martín’s version is named by his father, with a patronymic, Albornoz, and given a background, Juana chooses to avoid any further definition than a first name and city of origin. In fact, it is Inés who, in a need to distinguish the Don Gil she favors from her father’s version, names Juana’s iteration: “*Don Gil de las calzas verdes / le llamo yo, y esto basta*” (996-97). In response to this, Martín tells her “*Calzas verdes / me pongo desde mañana, / si esta color apetece*” (1012-14). He is under the impression that a change of costume, in the same way he changed name without altering character, is sufficient to gain his goal.

What Tirso has done is to fabricate two versions of the same fictitious being. The original, that played by Don Martín, is a thinly disguised version of his personal identity. Doña Juana's version is a much freer one, since her Don Gil is characterized by his lacks, that of a beard, penis, and last name, all of which are linked together by Caramanchel (519-22) as he contemplates his new master. These lacks are simultaneously indicators of the 'true' Don Gil and the erasures which permit Don Gil to exist as a non-entity, an absence.

As the first act ends, it becomes apparent that Juana's version of Don Gil has usurped the position as the primary identity. This is, in part, due to the fact that she reached Doña Inés before Don Martín did. By gaining the advantage of being the first 'Gil', she sets the standard by which all other versions will be judged. In addition, because Juana's version is defined by what 'he' lacks, Don Martín is placed in an impossible position. He is marked as different by the masculine characteristics of which he cannot dispose. Additionally, Martín's passive character and willingness to change to please others, cause him to cede dominance to the rival Don Gil. His statement of willingness to wear green stockings indicates that he has lost control of the identity of Don Gil. From this point on, he, as Don Gil de Albornoz, must attempt to become a copy of Don Gil de las calzas verdes, since it is to this person that Inés has declared her love and loyalty.

One of the defining characteristics of Don Gil de las calzas verdes are his lacks. From the beginning, the lack of masculine sexual characteristics, a deep voice and beard, have been linked to Juana's decision not to provide a last name for her alter ego. In the second act, Juana herself, speaking to Quintana, expands on this power of absence. She

relates to him the recent successes she has experienced. In this description, one of the key elements, which is repeated frequently, is her elusiveness. She flees Don Martín (1029); Inés sends everyone she can to search for ‘her’ Don Gil (1037-44); Don Juan attempts to track her down (1050-51); and finally Doña Clara also is searching for Don Gil (1065-69). This universal desire to find Don Gil de las calzas verdes does not concern Juana. She compares herself to a magician or spirit who is uncatchable by normal means (1030). She further states that “yo me libraré de todo” (1056). She clearly feels herself to be in complete control of the *enredo*.

Now that Don Gil has become the object of desire for virtually every character in the play, Doña Juana makes Don Gil’s precarious existence even more ephemeral by stepping away from the character and creating a new identity, that of Doña Elvira. Doña Elvira is created as a thinly veiled alter-ego for Doña Juana, just as Don Gil de Albornoz is a scarcely disguised Don Martín. The story which she tells Inés, and which will be examined in depth shortly, is, in essence, Doña Juana’s actual history (1286-413). The creation of Doña Elvira has a number of purposes. This identity provides Juana with an escape from the need to constantly play the role of Don Gil. In addition, Doña Elvira serves as a second means of access to Inés. Furthermore, by relating a slightly altered version of her history to Inés, Juana has been able to gain sympathy for herself and to strengthen the reality of the identity of Don Gil de las calzas verdes, by ‘verifying’ his previous existence. Again, this closely echoes the creation of Don Gil de Albornoz, where Don Martín’s true situation is presented in order to create the subterfuge of his new identity.

Once again, the value of the identity of Don Gil is that he represents an unfilled identity which can be used to further the ends of the various characters within the play. Now that Juana has successfully offered Don Gil de las calzas verdes as the primary version of the identity, she now needs to balance the need for anonymity and the ability to maintain Don Gil as an unoccupied space with the necessity to link her version of Don Gil to the 'real' world. This is part of the problem with the creation of a free identity. While it provides the possibility to act in a wider arena and to avoid the observation and naming that could lead to suffering the consequences associated with violating the accepted standards of society, this very anonymity also excludes such identities from participating in the more prosaic, nuts and bolts, aspects of life. This ability to avoid the consequences of one's actions is part of the reason that Don Juan in *El burlador de Sevilla* makes frequent use of anonymous disguise (see Rhodes). Don Gil de las calzas verdes can present a dashing and exciting alternative to marrying the man Don Pedro has chosen for his daughter, but without a more concrete background, he can do little more than woo. Juana can use this identity as a blocking character to frustrate Martín's goals, but she cannot replace him without identifying her version of Don Gil more explicitly. This is the "Catch-22" that she is forced to navigate. Don Gil de las calzas verdes cannot be further identified without risking the loss of the deception, but she also needs access to the business of love, and not just the image that Don Gil can conjure.

Where the person of Don Gil de las calzas verdes is the presentation of a fleeting image, Doña Elvira acts as the concrete realization of Juana's needs. The two act as complementary aspects of Juana's deception. Quintana realizes the value of this double disguise when he states: "Yo apostaré que te truecas / hoy en hombre y en mujer / veinte

veces” (1135-37). While Quintana’s statement would seem to indicate that this switching between Don Gil and Juana is arbitrary, in fact Juana is very clear on her purpose. She explains to him that her role playing is part of an overall plan, in pursuit of her goal of winning Martín back. She tells him that she will make the switch between the two identities “Las que viere / que mi remedio requiere, / porque todo es menester” (1137-39). Unlike the case of Jerónima in *El amor médico*, Juana creates this multiplicity of identities for a specific purpose.

The final step in Juana’s plan to free herself to act against Don Martín is to erase the presence of her identity as Doña Juana. She does this in response to Don Martín’s suspicion that she is the cause of his difficulties (1146-50, 1464-65). To counteract this suspicion, she has Quintana bring Martín a letter saying that Juana has retired to a convent because she is pregnant (1156-59). Her logic is that “creyendo que allá estoy, / no dirá que don Gil soy” (1165-66). She will take this deception a step further, later in the play, when she sends Quintana to Don Martín with the news that she has died (2046-53). Although at this stage Juana’s erasure is only partial, a separation rather than a removal, the process has been set in motion. In essence, what Juana has done is to split her original identity into a duality, Don Gil and Doña Elvira. Doña Elvira is a sanitized version of Juana herself. The personage of Elvira is that of the stereotypically wronged *dama*. Elvira’s existence allows Juana to rewrite her history to counter Don Martín’s rewriting of his identity. Furthermore, it provides her with an alter ego to her Don Gil.

As we look at Juana’s creation of the Don Gil/Elvira duality and the erasure of her self in the process, Jungian terminology can be useful in explaining how this process functions and the way in which it relates to the play as a whole. I have characterized the

identity of Elvira as being closely connected to the reality of Juana's situation, while Don Gil de las calzas verdes is an ephemeral projection designed for the dual purpose of usurping Don Martín's position as the primary Don Gil and allowing Doña Juana the opportunity to act freely. In his explanation of Jung's portrayal of the psyche, Ira Progoff explains:

Jung has described the psyche as being based on a tension of opposites. Consciousness balances the unconscious in a "reciprocal relativity," each side of the psyche actually being dependent on its opposite. Psychic energy emerges out of this tension. The varying intensities of energy expressed in psychic movements are determined by the degree of conflict between opposites. The main characteristic of a tension in the psyche is that its force is exerted beyond the control of the individual. It is autonomous in the sense that it sets energy free independent of the guidance of consciousness. The very fact of its existence as a conflict in the psyche indicates that it is something that consciousness cannot subdue. Energetic forces set free by these conflicts, therefore, may operate under their own power and live, as it were, a life of their own within the personality. (69)

We can easily read Doña Elvira and Don Gil in these terms. In so doing, however, we must be careful to avoid slavishly applying these concepts to the play and assuming a perfect fit. The key difficulty in viewing Doña Juana's alternate identities as concrete manifestations of the conscious and unconscious is the question of control. Jung views these contrasting elements of the personality as something beyond the control of the individual. This certainly does not seem to be the case with Juana. In the first half of the play there seems little doubt that she is consciously and deliberately creating these identities for specific purposes and with a clear goal in sight. The creation of these alternate identities is the result of a historical and social situation in which she, in her original identity as Doña Juana, is incapable of solving her dilemma. Her only other

recourse is either to withdraw from society in shame or to publish her shame and hope that the justice system will oblige her lover to honor his commitment.

While this creation does not seem to fall within the realm of Jungian theory, the realization does. The need for a masculine identity is easily justifiable based on the historical reality of Tirso's time. The creation of a female identity to serve as an escape from the Don Gil identity, and to provide a concrete link to the world is also understandable. It is the development of these identities that can be linked to Jung's theories. As we do so, special care must be taken to consider what aspects may be viewed as deliberate creations by Juana and which may be unconscious manifestations. I again turn to Progoff to further explain these ideas:

As Jung interprets it, "the tendency to split means that parts of the psyche detach themselves from consciousness to such an extent that they not only appear foreign but also lead an autonomous life of their own." This means not only that they go out of the control of consciousness, but that they may operate in consciousness within their own terms. They become "autonomous partial systems," and they function like small personalities within the total personality. In itself, this is not necessarily an abnormal condition. Such psychic "splits" are actually necessary if the individual is to specialize the direction of his energies so as to accomplish some particular work. The "autonomous complex" provides, very often, the "flavor" and distinctiveness of an individual's personality. It becomes a danger point only when, operating as a "partial system," it goes too far out of relation to the rest of the psyche, and a condition of unbalance results. (70)

It is this idea of "autonomous life," that seems to be most applicable in examining and characterizing the Don Gil and Elvira personalities. Certainly, in the final scenes of the play, the multiplication of Gils is an example of the autonomous nature of this aspect of Juana's personality, since Don Gil de las calzas verdes becomes the source of further fragmentation, as multiple versions of this fiction are portrayed.

Juana's decision to erase herself, in favor of her two created identities, aside from the purely practical aspect, is an interesting choice. By renouncing her 'true' self she enters a world of role play where her creations become the intermediaries through which she interacts with the world. Elivra, with her clear similarities to Juana's own history, is easily categorized as a Jungian *persona* which fulfills the expectations of a scorned woman. The close, but not exact, association between Juana as a person and Elvira as a *persona*, indicate a fundamental congruence between the essence of Juana and her face, or one of the faces, she presents to the world. In saying this, it is important to remember that what we are presented with as Juana is a literal *persona*: an actress on the stage, and not a direct observation of a real human being. As a consequence, we cannot hope to reach a 'real' analysis. What we are doing is viewing the sub-personalities created by Juana as the fragmentation of what is, within the play, a complete person. Of course, in absolute terms, this is not the case.

In contrast to Elvira, Don Gil is the projection of a fantasy. His charm and verbal dexterity are the stuff of dreams and of the stereotypical *galán*. This is the source of his appeal. Because he has no true existence, no need to conform to financial concerns or parental pressures, and, as Caramanchel notes, no penis, he is the perfect image without any of the inconveniences of reality. Juana's creation of Don Gil de las calzas verdes, while done in reaction to Don Martín's Don Gil de Albornoz, and to further her goals, is, in many ways, a projection of her *animus*, what Jung terms "the persona's counterpart" (*Essential Jung* 96): "Everything that should normally be in the outer attitude, but is conspicuously absent" (*Essential Jung* 102). Donahue states that "the union of external masculine and feminine selves is symbolic, in Jungian terms, of the interdependence of

animus and *anima* within Juana” (180). All the things which must be repressed in the acceptable façade of a scorned woman come to light in Don Gil de las calzas verdes. This can be seen as we juxtapose a number of characteristics of the two *personae*. The Elivra/Don Gil duality simultaneously expresses the contrasts of active lover/passive recipient, concrete/ephemeral, named/unnamed, female/male, obligated/free, as well as desiring/desired.

What we see then, is that Juana has seemingly unleashed two primary aspects of her personality, her *persona* and *animusi*, and given them a physical manifestation. In doing this, she is still careful to link the two: “Don Gil, a quien imité / en el talle y en la cara, / de suerte, que hizo un pincel / dos copias y originales / prodigiosos esta vez” (1389-93). She ties the two identities together even more tightly by mentioning the attraction that they feel for each other (1386, 1399), although she makes it clear that Elvira has no romantic claim on Don Gil (1402-03). These two identities created by Doña Juana complement each other and together form the whole person that Juana has erased by “placing” herself in a convent. The danger of releasing these two facets of her identity is that she may lose control of them, either because they are co-opted by someone else, as she did to Martín’s Don Gil de Albornoz, or because their autonomy becomes too great.

Juana, however, is seemingly very aware of this danger and takes care to maintain as much control over these identity fragments as is possible, given the circumstances. As she presents Elvira’s history to Doña Inés, Juana intertwines truth and fiction in such a way as to link Don Martín, Don Gil, Juana and Inés with a new character Don Miguel. She explains her love and disgrace in terms of a relationship between Elvira and Miguel. Simultaneously, she writes in the true history of Don Martín and Doña Juana into her

fictional account. In her version, Don Martín feared to break his word and dishonor Juana, although he is still described in negative terms (1323). In the alternate scenario which Juana presents, it is Don Miguel, who, stealing the identity of the true Don Gil, comes to Madrid to wed Doña Inés. As a result, Juana is able to convince Doña Inés that there is a true Don Gil who is available as a match. She further establishes her version of Don Gil as the ‘authentic’ iteration. In so doing, she has produced a reaction in Inés similar to that which the truth would have created, but with two important differences.

The first is that Doña Juana has protected her true name. We must remember that part of the purpose of disguise and the use of assumed identities is to be able to act without those actions being linked to a qualifiable identity. Elvira, since she has no parents (1310), is freer to act than Doña Juana. Additionally, her disgrace at being abandoned is acceptable, since there is no real father and family to be shamed. In Juana’s version of reality, it was not she who was dishonored; rather it was a woman in a similar circumstance, but from a different city and with a different lover (1288). In a society where appearance and reputation were everything, this becomes a vital distinction. When everything is wrapped up at the end of the play, the ‘truth’ of Juana’s disgrace dies with Elvira. Juana is able to continue with her honor, at least partially, intact.

The second important consequence of Juana’s rewriting of her history is to lock Don Martín into a closed space. He cannot return to his real identity, since Elvira has stated that Don Martín is committed to Doña Juana. Likewise, due to Elvira’s assertion that what he has portrayed as Don Gil de Albornoz is a usurpation of someone else’s true identity, he cannot continue to successfully play that role either. He is therefore forced into the identity of the faithless Don Miguel, a role he knows nothing about. This action

by Juana simultaneously voids Martín as a candidate for marriage while protecting his name, and therefore Juana, from the shame associated with abandoning his promised wife. By placing Don Martín on the defense, Juana further justifies her identity as Don Gil, whom she can continue to use as a blocking character to prevent Martín's successful courting of Inés, since Inés's father still favors the match.

As Doña Inés absorbs Juana's tale, we see an additional purpose behind Juana's deception. The immediate result is that Inés accepts the person of Don Gil de las calzas verdes as the rightful Don Gil. Juana has managed to make her variation of a fictitious personage not only the primary identity of Don Gil, but also "el don Gil / verdadero y cierto" (1419-20) in Inés's mind. Juana has achieved a reversal of the identity of Don Gil. The original chain of creation led from Don Martín's father to Don Martín, to Don Gil de Albornoz, and finally ending at Don Gil de las calzas verdes. This first chain led from creator, to actor, to role, and finally, to the usurpation of that role. Now, Juana has inverted this pattern. The Don Gil without a last name or family affiliation is now the primary identity. The image of the beardless Don Gil de las calzas verdes is now the signifier of the "verdadero y cierto" Don Gil de Albornoz. This, of course, negates the efforts of Don Martín and his father. Don Martín has been dispossessed of his role, and is now branded an imposter.

This inversion is possible because the identity of Don Gil is an absence, without any true link to verifiable details. The primacy of the various versions of Don Gil is dependant on who can tell the most credible and appealing story. Don Pedro is inclined to believe Martín's version since it is backed by the word of a friend and the promise of fiscal security. Inés, on the other hand, is swayed by other factors. She is inclined accept

Juana's presentation, since it plays upon the established literary patterns of the gallant youth and the scorned maiden. For her, it is certainly a more appealing script to follow than a marriage designed to provide her father with a secure retirement.

Juana uses the commitment free identity of Don Gil to provide Inés with the opportunity for wish fulfillment. Lest we think that Juana's actions are part of a game, or designed to provide an escape for Doña Inés, we must remain aware that this serves her purposes as well. Her entire creation of an alternate narrative is aimed at securing Inés's cooperation without exposing herself to shame or the risk of revelation, as we see in her aside: "Ya esta boba está en la trampa. / Ya soy hombre, ya mujer, / ya don Gil, ya doña Elvira. / Mas si amo, ¿qué no seré?" (1438-41).

Once she has finished her account, she makes a deal with Inés: "Como a don Miguel desprecies, / también yo desdeñaré / a don Gil" (1426-28). By creating a Don Gil who is free to marry Inés and 'exposing' Don Martín as an unfaithful lover, although without providing all the details, Juana is able to easily secure Inés's cooperation. What Juana proposes is a trade. In this inversion of the common standard of using marriageable daughters as a commodity, Juana and Inés trade *galanes*. In Inés's understanding, it is a very favorable trade since she is able to justify her previous rejection of Don Martín, her father's choice, and, further, she gains Don Gil de las calzas verdes as her true suitor. Juana's fiction has made Inés's reality conform to the very thing she had desired. Her handsome and charming suitor is revealed as the 'true' Don Gil de Albornoz and her desire seems to be well within reach.

Whether this is a necessary move on Juana's part is debatable. She certainly has the motivation to protect her true name, but Inés seems to be willing to abandon Don

Martín without any additional incentive. She tells Juana: “Hombre que tiene mujer, / ¿cómo puede ser mi esposo?” (1429-30). Of course, without the lure of Don Gil de las calzas verdes, her response may not have been as positive. In a play which emphasizes deception, we have to wonder if we can trust the word of any character to another. It is entirely possible that Inés’s words are only a convenience since her desires seem to correspond with Elvira’s. We have to remember that this is the same fickle woman who abandoned the love of Don Juan at the first sight of Don Gil de las calzas verdes.

As the play reaches the midpoint, there is a consolidation and reaffirmation of the goals and motivations of the various characters. In Juana’s case, this occurs during her conversation with Inés, in which she states clearly that all of her *enredos* were for a specific end. Following this scene, Don Martín is given the chance to explain himself. As a result, Don Martín briefly becomes the focus of the play. Quintana delivers Juana’s message to Martín, Don Juan challenges him, and Osorio, his servant, delivers letters from his father. Martín has, until this point, been an underrepresented character. He has shown himself obedient to his father, but otherwise, we have learned very little directly from him. These scenes at the midpoint allow the audience to hear from Martín directly.

These moments provide a wealth of information about Don Martín. After learning from Quintana that Juana has retired to a convent because of her pregnancy in an action that Darcy Donahue explains in terms of the creation of an inverted Juana who “symbolizes the situation in which the play’s heroine would have found herself had she accepted the social norms of the day” (177), Martín’s reaction is curiously schizophrenic. He tells Quintana that he will return to Juana within a week, whether his business at court

is finished or not (1486-88). This is more than a simple lie to get Quintana to leave him alone. He states in a soliloquy, shortly after Quintana leaves, the following:

Basta, que ya padre soy,
basta, que está doña Juana
preñada. Afición liviana,
villano pago le doy.
Con un hijo, es torpe modo
el que aquí pretender quiero,
indigno de un caballero.
Pongamos remedio en todo,
dando la vuelta a mi tierra. (1510-18)

This clear expression of remorse and disgust with his own behavior contrasts sharply with his ‘seemingly’ paranoid concern about being pursued. He is concerned enough to tell Quintana that he worries that Juana followed him to Madrid (1459-60, 1464-65).

There has been no evidence, at this point, to justify such a suspicion. The only hint he has is the appearance of Don Gil de las calzas verdes. However, this appearance was only learned second hand, and the personage described is male.

The level of ambiguity, or should I say, ambivalence, increases after his confrontation with Don Juan. Juan is determined to free Inés from Don Gil. He therefore challenges Don Martín to a duel. Martín replies that he would prefer to wait to fight until after he has been married to Inés for a month (1578-81). He then draws a strange conclusion from his confrontation with Don Juan. Although he was told that Doña Inés has no interest in him, he feels that, since she seems willing to obey her father, he should continue his courtship. In doing so, he negates his previous remorse stating that “el interés / y beldad de doña Inés / excusan la culpa mía” (1595-977). Martín has shown himself to be paranoid, somewhat cowardly, and now fickle. He recognizes the

wrongness and ignobility of his actions, but he is more concerned about winning Inés and her money.

The final scene in this series concerns the letter from his father. One of these letters is a letter of credit, which will become an important element later in the play. As Martín's father discusses Martín's courtship of Inés, he describes it as "nuestra pretensión," and he fears that Juana's absence from Valladolid means that she may inhibit "lo que tan bien nos está," a revealing phrase. He closes the letter saying: "Dios os me guarde como deseo" (text between lines 1621-22). In this letter, even more than in Juana's narration at the start of the play, Don Andrés is presented as a greedy and controlling father. Yet, the text tells us more than that. The confusing of his identity with that of his son is significant. The key phrase is "nuestra pretensión." On one level, this emphasizes the need that Don Andrés has for this marriage arrangement. His comments about Juana indicate that he is aware of the relationship between Martín and her, yet his only concern is that she may act to impede the match that he wants.

The use of the first person plural here is also indicative of what we have previously observed regarding Don Martín. Although he is certainly willing to drop his promised lady for the prospect of a new, rich woman, the motivation is clearly derived from his father. Don Martín is acting wholly according to the script that his father has written for him, just as when we see the content of the first letter, in which Martín himself appears to be an empty façade, a *persona* with nothing but his father behind the surface. As the scene with the first letter established Martín's inability to control or manipulate language, this scene serves to illustrate Martín's essential emptiness. In some ways, the portrayal of Martín echoes that of Serafina in *El vergonzoso en palacio*. While

he can be enveloped in theater, he is unable to control it. Unlike Serafina, his disguise does not lead to an internal core of being. Instead, it serves to highlight his hollowness.

These three scenes together act as an inverted parallel to the opening of the play. In both cases, the protagonists are given an opportunity to explain their situation in conversations which serve as exposition and clarification for the audience. I feel it is no coincidence that this second explanatory section occupies the exact middle of the play, while highlighting the differences between Doña Juana and Don Martín. Juana speaks clearly and with an obvious plan in mind. She organizes and controls events. Catherine Larson observes that “Tirso presents a woman intent on taking control of her own destiny, even if such an act requires her to leave her home, dress as a man, court other women, and even propose marriage to them. This characterization inverts the vision of the typical *comedia dama*, confounding the masculine and the feminine in a baroque fusion of illusion and reality” (502). Martín, on the other hand, plays a role created by his father, and in a parallel to Juana’s erasure of her own self, his identity is effectively subsumed in that of his father. Later in the play, he will use this as an excuse for his abandonment of Juana, when he tells Quintana: “En don Gil me transformó / mi padre; la culpa tiene / destas desgracias, Quintana, / su codicia y interés” (2168-71).

This parallel to the introduction serves to highlight the fact that it is Martín who is completely subject to authority and unwilling to rebel. Juana’s rejection of this pattern of behavior can be read as a rejection and destruction of the established power system. The contrast between Don Martín and Doña Juana could not be starker, yet the situations are clearly parallel. The male/female duality is faced with the inactive/active pattern previously established. This inversion of the typical role of the man as the active partner

who courts the passive woman is part of the overall theme of inversion which is seen throughout the play. This does not mean that what is presented is carnivalesque except in the most general sense. Tirso does not present us with a world turned upside down. Instead, what we see is the transference of characteristics from the traditional owner to the opposite partner. What we perceive is not a world out of kilter, but instead the correction of a society which has locked women into artificial roles and denied them expression and initiative.

Tirso completes Juana's usurpation of the identity of Don Gil by having Juana make use of the letters which Martín has dropped to prove to Don Pedro the 'veracity' of her version of Don Gil. These letters, a *deus ex machina* of the highest order, provide Juana with the missing element needed to fully flesh out the identity of Don Gil de las calzas verdes. Previously, Juana had taken advantage of her Don Gil's ability to avoid definition, to present herself to Inés and to block Don Martín's Don Gil de Albornoz. Now that she has displaced Martín from the identity of Don Gil de Albornoz, she is able to take advantage of the letters and 'prove' her identity. Her ironic "hasta el nombre me ha usurpado" (1845) and the letters are enough to convince Don Pedro that she is the original Don Gil. She is so convincing that when Martín reappears, he is sent away from Don Pedro's household with threats (1984-86).

As the climactic scene approaches, Juana is faced with a final challenge. She has successfully eliminated Martín's hope of marrying Inés, and has also convinced him, as well as her father, that she is dead (2321-45), all to regain Martín:

Es para que desta suerte
parta de Valladolid
mi padre y pida mi muerte
don Martín en Madrid;

que he de perseguir, si puedo,
Quintana, a mi engañador
con uno y con otro enredo
hasta que cure su amor
con mi industria o con su miedo. (2347-55)

Juana has backed Martín into a corner and now has arranged for her father to come to Madrid to seek justice for Martín's supposed murder of his daughter. There is now no need to maintain Don Gil as an identity. As a result, her strategy should logically move to eliminating her Don Gil as a suitor for Inés. Instead, what we see is the opposite. She not only inspires jealousy in Inés by means of a letter that she writes from her identity as Don Gil to her identity as Elvira (2213-89), but she also takes the opportunity to encourage Doña Clara by telling her, speaking as Don Gil, that Clara is the true object of Gil's affection. Part of this is vindictiveness: "heme holgado, / por que experimente en sí / congojas que me ha causado" (2498-500). Yet, since Inés has already shown her willingness to help Elvira, it seems somewhat contrived, a result of her "orgullo" (Varey 366). In fact, her machinations force her to partially reveal her identity, by telling Inés that rather than Don Gil, she is actually Elvira in men's clothing (2554-612).

All this intrigue serves the structural purposes of the play by preparing the night scene and the dénouement, but in the logic of the play, it seems a fault, since these actions do not further Juana's goals. There is, however, a strategic purpose to her actions. By 'revealing' Elvira's disguise as Don Gil, Tirso opens the door for a further discussion on hermaphroditism, in which Caramanchel coins the term "hembri-macho" (2699) to describe Don Gil. While this certainly provides material for a discussion on Juana and Gil's ambiguous sexuality, it falls outside of the scope of this study. Rather, I will simply state that this ambivalence serves both as a comic element in the play and as a way to

stress Juana's chameleon-like ability. It is, after all, her ability to switch roles that has allowed her to progress to the current point.

The climactic scene of the play is one which highlights ambiguity and confusion rather than resolution.¹⁵ Because Juana, in the guise of Don Gil, has courted both Inés and Clara, as well as making it appear that Elvira is part of the love triangle (square?), almost every character in the play is desperately desirous to know the 'true' Don Gil. Juana has moved the ambiguity of her Don Gil from the lack of a last name and solid set of associations to a question of who Don Gil is actually courting and why. Additionally, some characters, such as Caramanchel, doubt the gender of Don Gil. For Don Martín, a similar doubt is further complicated by his conviction that Don Gil is, in fact, the spirit of the wronged Juana who seeks vengeance for his misdeeds. Thus, as we see, Don Gil de las calzas verdes is the central object of desire in the play. This scene highlights the need to become this object of desire, but it simultaneously presents an unparalleled spectacle of confusion and loss of identity.

The first Gil to appear is Don Juan. As a character, he has received very little attention in the play. He is the jealous lover who desires Inés, but nothing further is revealed. When he hears Inés call out for Don Gil, he decides to answer (2772-76). His imitation is one of convenience and is the result of circumstance rather than premeditation. He wishes to play the role of Don Gil because that is the person who is the object of Inés's affection. His only entrance into disguise is a pitiful one. Caramanchel is not at all deceived, and Inés fails to believe his masquerade either since he lacks the signs of 'her' Don Gil.

¹⁵ J. E. Varey sees this as a commentary on "la falsedad de la vida de la capital" (366).

Don Martín, who has already failed in his first attempt at playing Don Gil, is the second to arrive. He is furious with the other Gil who has outplayed him at every turn. He complains to his *criado* that he only was outdone by the other's clothing, since his own looks, nobility, fame, and riches are all above reproach (2799-820). The irony of his comments is completely lost on Don Martín. He seems to forget that he has hidden his name and wealth under a new name, and that he has disgraced his fame in abandoning Juana. He is unable to realize that the true source of Juana's power has been her ability to control the discourse and bend events to her will. His only solution is to imitate his imitator (2820-26). This creates a circle of imitation which leads nowhere and is very reminiscent of the ever-deferred search for the signified that we find in post structuralist theory.

Martín's ineffectuality and inability to act is reiterated as he hears Don Juan's imitation of Don Gil. His excuse this time is his fear of the supernatural (2833-38). In fact, this is nothing more than a continuation of the constant inability of Don Martín to take control of his surroundings. Whether it is a lack of words, lack of individuality, lack of green hose, or lack of courage, Martín is constantly characterized by his shortcomings. Unlike Juana, who uses her lacks (a penis, beard, deep voice and a last name for her Don Gil) to her advantage, he is consistently stymied by any obstacle that he encounters. He is also unable to maintain his disguise, since Don Juan recognizes him by his voice as the Don Gil that Inés does not want (2847-50), as does Caramanchel (2867-68). In contrast, his abilities of perception are so poor that he immediately assumes that Don Juan is, in fact, a post-mortal Juana, come back to haunt him; thus thwarted, he abandons the scene.

The third Gil in the scene is Doña Clara, who arrives shortly after Martín's departure. When she speaks to Inés the difference between her voice and that of Don Juan is immediately apparent. As a result, Inés is able to see through Juan's disguise and identify him. However, she mis-identifies Clara. In Inés's mind, one of the key signs that indicate 'her' Don Gil is a high girlish voice. Because the idea that a woman could play the role of a suitor never occurs to her, she assumes that the sign actually points to the 'true' Gil. This misreading of signs, or their inability to be used for accurate identification, emphasizes a baroque viewpoint of the world, where deception is the norm. Juana has been able to make Don Gil de las calzas verdes the embodiment of Inés's, Juan's, and Clara's desire, as well as of Martín's fear. Yet, this very identity is a pure fiction. Desire and fear become linked to the non-real, while fictionality has become more important than the reality it replaces.

Juana is the last to take on the mantle of Don Gil in this scene. As she appears, both Juan and Clara claim to be the true Don Gil de las calzas verdes. In response Quintana tells Juana, "El nombre pierdes: dél te salen a capear / otros tres Giles" (3033-35). It seems that Quintana understands the power of names. In true Tirsian style, Juana's actions have become inverted, and now it is her usurped name which has been stolen and fragmented into three new identities. Although Darcy Donahue argues that "Juana herself is at all times in control of the *personae* she creates," and is able to assume roles "with the same ease which she does the outer trappings of gender" (178), this scene belies her assertion. Juana's response is a curious echo of Don Juan's previous statement: "Don Gil, el blanco o el verde / ya se ha llegado la hora" (2853-55). She answers the affirmation of the other two by proclaiming "Yo soy / don Gil el verde o el pardo" (3035-36). This

black/white, Juana/Martín contrast once again underscores the opposition between Martín and Juana and links the two, while simultaneously stressing their differences. The scene ends when Quintana wounds Juan. Juana tells him to remember that it was Don Gil who caused his hurt. This anticlimactic ending does nothing to resolve the questions raised by the presence of four Gils. Inés and Clara are still in love, Martín still wishes to win Inés, and Juan has been wounded, but nothing has happened to change his love for Inés.

The resolution of Juana's intricate game comes quickly. Martín has come to a basic understanding of his state (3063-94). Although the details, and Juana's hand in the whole situation, are unclear, he is aware that he has been completely dispossessed by another Don Gil. Just as this realization comes, Quintana and Juana's father Don Diego arrive with the authorities who arrest him for Juana's murder. Simultaneously, another group arrives to oblige Don Gil to fulfill his promise to marry Doña Clara. As he tries to excuse himself, he is betrayed by the same signs that Juana has made the hallmark of the 'true' Don Gil, his green stockings. To complete his misery he is further accused of wounding Don Juan.

It is the arrival of Juana that provides a solution. Her brief explanation is enough to convince Martín to keep his promise, Inés to return to Juan, and Clara to promise herself to Don Antonio, a new character. Caramanchel, the first to bring up the issue of Don Gil de las calzas verdes's ambiguous sexuality, is finally able to name and label his master. He is first told that she is no spirit, as he has feared. The question that follows is clearly one of classification. "Y ¿sois hombre o sois mujer? (3261). During the entire play Caramanchel has been preoccupied by his master's androgyny, and his final question is aimed at finally removing all doubt. Now that Juana has achieved her goal,

there is no longer any need to maintain anonymity, and therefore her reply is unambiguous: “Mujer soy” (3262). With this statement she returns to the world of names and discipline. Dawn L. Smith sees this return to order as a return to the patriarchal order and the world of men. “Tirso does not allow us to forget that the world is dominated by men and that this is the normal, accepted state of things to which a world turned upside-down must eventually return” (“Women and Men” 257). Yet the very fragility of the ending belies this interpretation.

This reestablishment of the status quo, with Martín returning to Juana and Inés to Juan, is hardly a happy ending. Don Martín’s change from accused criminal to committed husband occurs in less than thirty lines, or somewhat less than one percent of the play. In addition, Juan must deal with Inés’s preference for a cross-dressing woman, and Clara is suddenly engaged to a previous non-entity. None of these resolutions seem satisfactory, and I believe that they are not meant to be. Catherine Connor observes:

The fact that such inversions and subversions were traditional and conventional did not decrease the range of meanings and responses for spectators in earlier cultures. If all spectators believed that subversion was a waste because social controls were always restored by a marriage pact ending that subversion, it would be pointless to stage and to celebrate social subversion throughout the three-act plot of the comedia. (27)

Her argument, that it is necessary to view the play in its entirety rather than relying on the conclusion to provide us with a meaning, is very reasonable. Matthew Stroud likewise argues that “there is ultimately no happy ending” (21, 175).

In view of the perfunctory nature of the conclusion, it appears that if we wish to search for significance within the work we must return to the night scene with the proliferation of Gils, the point of greatest conflict and confusion, rather than to an ending which satisfies genre demands but little else. The night scene is clearly the climactic

moment of the work and can be characterized by its complexity and the continual shifting of identities and understandings. To draw a useful conclusion, this scene, rather than the end of the play, acts as the culmination of the work. Darcy Donahue interprets this multiplication of identities as a social commentary by Tirso:

[B]y employing the doubling, tripling and quadrupling of a single figure, and by enabling that figure to become what she is not, through “ritual costume change” Tirso allows her and his audience to appreciate the socio-cultural implications of what such costume change really meant in seventeenth century Spain. Doña Juana crosses not only the boundaries of sex by assuming the attire of both sexes, she also crosses the more artificial boundaries of all the precepts concerning proper behavior for men and women as these had evolved through time and under the influence of patriarchal attitudes. Such attitudes clearly establish sharp divisions between masculine and feminine modes of conduct, abilities, etc. Both psychologically and socially Doña Juana represents the playwright's belief that the roles and resulting situations imposed by such polarities are outdated and absurd. (181)

This astute observation nicely complements my argument that the use of disguise serves to circumvent societal regulation. Furthermore, Donahue's argument takes on more force when we consider Don Sancho's portrayal of honor in *El celoso prudente* as a social construct. It appears clear that Tirso viewed the restrictions on women of his era as, at least somewhat, unjust. Juana's ability to circumvent these restrictions is a validation of the capacities of women in general, and argues for the potential for women to play a more active role in society. This is not to say that Tirso explicitly makes any such argument. Rather, what he demonstrates is that women are capable beings who are able to function outside of the protective walls build for them by patriarchy. Juana, wronged by a society which maintains a double standard of chastity, is able to rectify her situation by imitating the very man who offended her.

Throughout the play, Juana has manipulated identity to serve her specific goals: “La venganza y la necesidad de reparación constituyen los principales objetivos amorosos de la protagonista y por ellos luchará a lo largo de los tres actos hasta la consecución final de los mismos” (Eiroa 55). She has made use of Don Gil’s non-existence and, when it became appropriate, she has then convinced the other characters that her Don Gil was in fact the ‘real’ Don Gil. Taking advantage of the circumstances, she was able to dispossess Martín of his assumed identity and force him into a role of her choosing. Yet we cannot help but feel that, somehow, Don Gil de las calzas verdes has escaped her control and taken on a life of his own, as Stroud states: “On some level, she [Juana] is not just Juana in disguise; she is Gil and Elvira as well” (166). The night scene is the clearest manifestation of this, as multiple versions of Don Gil fill the stage. During this confusing scene, the *persona* of Don Gil is representative of the Trickster archetype from Jung’s theories (*Four Archetypes* 165). Although Don Gil proves useful to Juana in her pursuit of Don Martín, he is also a site of troubling complexity, which fills the archetypal role of deceiver and phantom that seems intimately linked to the chaotic. Don Gil is more than an identity usurped from Don Martín; he takes on a life of his own as Juana uses him to rewrite her history and stymie Martín’s courtship. The multiplication of Gils during the night scene is indicative of the power of Juana’s creation. The original Don Gil, Don Gil de Albornoz, did not have this power of attraction. It is Juana who imbues the name Don Gil with the personality that becomes the object of desire for the other women in the play, but it is the *persona* that acts as the focus of desire.

This brings us back to our previous discussion of *personae* as fragments of the personality which can “lead an autonomous life of their own” (Progoff 70). Despite

Juana's seemingly complete control of the Don Gil *persona* in the early portions of the play, the needless complications that presage the night scene, such as the letter to Elvira that Juana causes Inés to intercept, as well as her wooing of Clara, indicate that Don Gil is not as controllable as she thinks, since these actions belong more to the realm of the trickster than functioning as steps towards her goal. It appears that even in the most restricted circumstances, the use of a second, or third, identity poses the danger of a loss of control, as well as the promise of greater autonomy. While the identity of Don Gil, and later that of Doña Elvira, provides Juana with the means to reach her goals, the focus of the play is not Juana and her attempts to regain Don Martín, but rather Don Gil. From the title itself, as well as from the fact that the identity of Don Gil undergoes multiple permutations as well as multiple wearers of the name, it is clear that the central character in the work is not Juana, but her alter-ego.

This privileging of the façade over the 'real' character is indicative of the power that a *persona* can amass. At a certain point, Don Gil takes on a life of his own, independent from Juana, which is sustained by the combined belief of the other characters. Once this occurs, Juana is unable to make Don Gil appear and disappear at will, nor is she able to fully control his actions. This is what the night scene clearly demonstrates, as various characters try on the Don Gil identity and assay to play out the role that they expect of him. Juana, once the clear owner of Don Gil, after having wrested the name from Don Martín, now has to prove herself to be the 'true' Don Gil to the other characters who also play the role. Don Gil gains a level of autonomy, where the idea of his reality is so powerful that it exists without the support of the person playing the role. This movement, from mask to identity, is indicative of a shift of power and focus from

the person beneath to the exterior shell. With this shift, Juana is forced to respond to Don Gil rather than controlling the name and identity. This power shift endangers her aims and undermines the initial value of disguise. A disguise that becomes independent of the wearer does little to aid the user. This threat of the loss of control of the *persona* sits at the far end of the spectrum from the danger of revelation that is the most commonly perceived risk associated with disguise. While the putting on of disguise assumes the possibility that the mask may be forcibly removed, the thought that the mask may become more important than, and independent of, the creator is not automatic. Despite the fact that Juana is able to ultimately achieve her desires, in the end, she cannot fully control Don Gil.

As this play develops, the use of disguise grows increasingly complicated. The initial act of disguise, which occurs previous to the commencement of the play, is Don Martín's assumption of the name Don Gil. This involves nothing more than his presentation of a letter from his father and the assertion that he is the Don Gil mentioned in the letter. The second act of disguise is somewhat more complex, since it includes the need to disguise biological sex as well as to provide a new name. Nevertheless, Juana's initial act of disguise is less problematic for her assumption of a masculine façade, a common event in the *comedia*, than for the fact that she also assumes the name Don Gil. This deliberate usurpation of Don Martín's disguise acts as a direct challenge to her faithless lover and begins the multiplication of Gils that reaches its climax in the night scene discussed above.

In addition to the complexity attached to the Don Gil identity, Juana creates, as Martín did at the beginning of the play, an alter ego that differs from the original in

nothing more than a name and a few details. Thus with Gil and Elvira to present to the world, Juana disappears from the stage; with the exception of a few comments to her servant, misleading letters, and her triumphant return from the dead at the conclusion of the play. This disappearance may account for the vitality of Don Gil. As Juana lives as Don Gil, her self-as-Juana never has time to establish itself for the audience and, in the world of the play, withers in the face of the power and popularity of her new identity. As a result, her façade becomes the center of attention, and Juana becomes secondary to the disguise that she has used to such great effect.

In the final chapter, we will see how Jerónima places herself in a similar situation. In *El amor médico*, Jerónima creates identities seemingly at whim and, as a result, loses control of her actions and identities to the point that the real Jerónima is in danger of being lost.

CHAPTER V

LOSS OF SELF IN *EL AMOR MÉDICO*: UNRESTRAINED DISGUISE

The little scholarship that exists on *El amor médico* tends to be in the form of comparative, historical, or reception studies. One such study is Elvezio Canónica's 1990 article "*Del Vergonzoso en palacio a El amor médico: El camino hacia la ironía de Tirso de Molina frente a Lope de Vega.*" In this work, Canónica argues that both *El vergonzoso en palacio* and *El amor médico* have multiple points of contact with Lope's *La portuguesa y Dicha del amor forastero*. She continues this thesis in "Tirso contra Lope: Imitación irónica de *La portuguesa y Dicha del amor forastero* en *El amor médico*," published the same year. Blanca Oteiza's "Recepción de Tirso de Molina en el siglo XIX: *El amor médico y Celos con celos se curan*," as the title indicates, explores how this play was presented and received in the nineteenth century. Similarly, a 1972 piece entitled "The Dates of *El amor médico* and *Escarmientos para el cuerdo* (Tirso's Supposed Trip to Portugal in 1619)," deals with the historical aspects of the text, but not its literary content. Although these are not the only articles written that consider this work, they demonstrate the common tone of the research dedicated to the play. There are some, few, studies which address the theme of cross-dressing. Anita K. Stoll, in "Cross-dressing in Tirso's *El amor médico* [Love, the Doctor] and *El Aquiles* [Achilles]," uses this text, in conjunction with *El Aquiles*, to argue for the arbitrary nature of gender, presenting it as a societal and personal construction. Henry Sullivan's "Tirso de Molina: Dramaturgo andrógino" is an exploration of lesbian tendencies in the play as illustrated in the causes

for the attraction between Estefania and Jerónima. In Sullivan's view, the use of cross-dressing can be read as the manifestation of these tendencies.

Much of the remaining criticism focuses on the uncertainty surrounding the date of the play's composition. Since there is no extant manuscript copy, the earliest version of the play comes from the *Cuarta parte de las comedias del maestro Tirso de Molina* in 1635 (Bushee 93). There are two main schools of thought as to when the play was actually composed. Although each side has various supporters, the two sides are effectively headed by Blanca de los Ríos, who argues that the play was written in 1621 (*Obras dramáticas completas* 961), and Ruth Kennedy, who asserts that it was written in 1625-26.¹⁶ According to the excellent summary of the debate given by Blanca Oteiza in the introduction to her critical version of the play, most critics tend to place the play's composition around 1619 (23-29).

Anita K. Stoll, in "Do Clothes Make the Man? Gender and Identity Fluidity in Tirso's Plays," addresses the use of disguise in this play, as well as in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, and *La celosa de sí misma*. However, notwithstanding a number of insightful observations and her usually stellar analyses, this particular article has a number of, what are to me, fatal flaws. The biggest problem is that Stoll mixes a discussion of disguise and gendering without linking the two. The article begins and ends with a Lacanian (through Stroud) reading of cross-dressing from a gendered perspective. The meat of the article discusses the use of disguise, with cross-dressing presented as a secondary element. As a result, this article fails to adequately treat either disguise or cross-dressing.

¹⁶ See "The Dates of *El amor médico*" 11-33, as well as numerous references in her book, *Studies in Tirso, I: The Dramatist and His Competitors, 1620-26*.

The most detailed analysis in the last few decades belongs to Melveena McKendrick, who, in 1974, wrote *Woman and Society in the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age: A Study of the Mujer Varonil*. Because this work is focused on the *mujer varonil*, there is a necessary absence of investigation into the role that disguise and role-play have on the various characters within the play, as well as their contribution to the discussion of identity as a whole. McKendrick views Jerónima's actions in feminist terms, while explicitly rejecting a sexualized reading:

The very phrase *mujer varonil* or masculine woman has, in the twentieth century, sexual overtones of a potentially deviant nature. And the expected comments have been forthcoming. Professor Ashcom in his consideration of Señora Bravo-Villasante's book, states "The Lesbian motif is implicit in most of the plots involving masculine women." At the considered risk of appearing naïve, I should like to disagree with, or at least seriously qualify, this assertion. (*Woman and Society* 316)

McKendrick bases her views on the assertiveness of Jerónima's character and Jerónima's active pursuit of her goal. "[L]ike so many of Tirso's heroines, she translates her desires into immediate action" (*Woman and Society* 236). This reading serves as a complement to my reading of the use of disguise as a means to power. McKendrick's focus does not permit her to explain how the various disguises Jerónima uses serve her in avoiding the restrictions of society and allow her to move and act freely. Inherent in her use of disguise are questions involving identity, society, and gender.

As is the case in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, the protagonist is a bright woman who is clearly aware of her desires and who is willing to circumvent the rules of society in order to achieve her goals. However, unlike Juana who follows Don Martín in order to regain her lost honor and who seems to (almost) constantly act from a studied plan of action, Jerónima can be characterized as a woman who is much more impulsive. While

Juana acts with a clearly defined goal in mind, and, despite a few baroque twists, manages to achieve that goal (first stymieing Martín's ambitions towards Inés and then maneuvering him into accepting his duty to marry her), Jerónima chases Don Gaspar as an act of volition, not desperation. Furthermore, once she enters the world of disguise, she begins to multiply roles and identities until, as the play concludes, she becomes so deeply involved in the game that she loses track of her self and her goal of winning Don Gaspar. It takes the intervention of her maid, Quiteria, to break the illusion and bring her back to herself.

Jerónima, for the purposes of this study, exemplifies extreme use of disguise. This canavalesque presentation of disguise highlights how it can lead to loss of identity.¹⁷ Not only does Jerónima cross gender barriers, but she also actively woos Doña Estefanía and plays her various identities against each other in such profusion that the spectator almost needs a score card to track the tangle of identities and romantic connections. In this performance, all the various types of disguise that I have addressed come into play: erasure, masquerade, disguise, and identity. Furthermore, this play exemplifies the use, and potential dangers, of each type. Because, for Jerónima, the entire *enredo* is a game, there is a greater focus on play and less on the corresponding serious issues of honor and money that were central elements in the other plays examined.

Jerónima's motivation for action is revealed early in the play when she complains to her maid Quiteria:

¿Hay huésped más descortés?
¡Un mes en casa, al regalo
y mesa de don Gonzalo,

¹⁷ See Helene Keyssar, "Drama and the Dialogic Imagination: *The Heidi Chronicles* and *Fefu and Her Friends*." for a clearer definition of how the carnivalesque functions within a "deliberately constructed cultural form" (116).

y sin saber en un mes
que mujer en ella habita,
o si lo sabe, que es llano,
blasonar de cortesano
y no hacerme una visita! (1-8)

Unlike Magdalena, Diana and Lisena, or Juana, who are clearly motivated by issues linked to marriage and honor, Jerónima's complaint is rooted in her vanity. Although her argument is based on the supposed discourtesy of her brother's guest, it becomes apparent, as the scene continues, that the true source of her pique is the lack of attention that she has received from Don Gaspar, her brother's guest, as we see when she states: "Me ha enfadado / el poco caso que ha hecho / de mí" (233-35).

Despite her apparent interest in Don Gaspar, she calls him an "Adonis" (266); Tirso makes it very clear that she is her own person. Not only is she unwilling to marry someone who fails to meet her high standards, but she is dedicated to study and learning. She asserts: "Yo sigo el norte / de mi inclinación" (97-98), notwithstanding her brother's disapproval of her studies, and argues against the limitations placed on women: "¿Siempre han de estar las mujeres / sin pasar la raya estrecha / de la aguja y la almohadilla?" (101-03). Yet, she is not Lope's *mujer esquiva*, by any stretch of the imagination. "Jerónima is accepted as a feminist and as a scholar with no suggestion that she is therefore incapable of love" (*Women and Society* 236). In response to Quiteria's suggestion that she should still marry, she replies:

Dame tú un rey don Fernando
que, a Castilla gobernando,
me deje estudiar, que yo
haré mis dichas iguales.
El matrimonio es Argel,
la mujer cautiva en él.
Las artes son liberales
porque hacen que libre viva

a quien en ellas se emplea;
¿cómo querrás tú que sea
a un tiempo libre y cautiva? (130-40)

Melveena McKendrick, commenting on this passage states:

Jerónima is evidently a rational feminist. She objects to the limitations of woman's life, regarding her studies as an escape from the boredom to which women are condemned, and is unwilling to jeopardize the independence these studies give her by marrying. Jerónima's attitude would have been presented by Lope as the outcome of pride, but Tirso — who did not use the *mujer esquivada* theme in its conventional, Lope-inspired form — seems readier to accept it as both rational and sincere. If Jerónima is scholarly by nature, why should she not study? Her reluctance to marry, he implies, is reasonable enough if marriage entails intellectual stagnation. Her aim, after all, is irreproachable: to study medicine and become a good doctor. (*Women and Society* 236)

McKendrick views Jerónima as a woman who, based on logical conclusions, is willing to forgo the traditional goal of marriage in favor of a life of study. While her conversation with Quiteria demonstrates that she is a proud woman, her pride does not seem to be linked to her learning, as in the case of Lope's *La dama boba*. Not only is she naturally inclined towards study, but she also sees it as a form of freedom.¹⁸

Thus we are presented with a woman who is portrayed, from the beginning, as a bit of a rebel. While she is not agitating for great societal reforms, she certainly is aware of the inequity between the sexes and has no intention of surrendering her relatively great freedom, a freedom that, as Hernández García notes (79), was rare. Tirso's presentation of Jerónima makes her an obvious candidate for the use of disguise. Not only is she aware of the restrictions placed upon her as a woman, but they chafe as well.

Additionally, as Dekker and Pol note: "Dressing as men also, in theory, opened up the possibility to pursue careers usually closed to women" (33). While they continue on to

¹⁸ Halkhoree's view of feminism and femininity as a central aspect of the play provides an interesting approach to interpreting the play. Despite his somewhat paternalistic tone, he makes a number of excellent points. See 100-05.

state that this was not frequently the case, the reasons they give, lack of finances and education, do not apply in this instance. Jerónima is well educated and has no father to restrict her actions. For Jerónima then, cross-dressing becomes an attractive alternative to the settled role of passive wife that sits at the other end of the spectrum of choices. She not only has motive to act, but also opportunity. All that is lacking is an inciting event, an excuse, really, to step out of the role of sister and into a role that offers her greater freedom. It is Don Gaspar's presence that presents her with this opportunity.

Her first step into the world of role-play and disguise comes as an attempt to gain Don Gaspar's attention. She and Quiteria, both *tapada*, come to him as he speaks with her brother Don Gonzalo. Each makes enigmatic statements that direct him to the Alcázar (739-40, 746-48), a place that Don Gonzalo explicitly links with disguise (767). Once there, Jerónima confesses to her maid that she has fallen for Don Gaspar. She begins by marveling at how love has overcome her. She states:

Este hombre se me ha entrado
en el alma por las puertas
más nuevas y peregrinas
que ha visto el amor, Quiteria.
Comenzó por menosprecios
el mío; ¡ay Dios, quién creyera
que hicieran descortésias
en mí lo que no finezas! (829-36)

Following a long summary of the action until this point, she concludes: “En efeto, mis pasiones, / sin saber dónde me llevan, / me traen aquí ¿a qué sé yo?, / ni ¿qué espero aunque lo sepa?” (961-64). Her evident confusion is presented in the context of a logical evaluation of her situation. While she is aware of how she has come to the point of disguising herself in order to gain Gaspar's regard, she fails to understand the *why* behind her actions. Despite her consciousness of the power of emotion, she feels unable to free

herself from its effects. The irony of her situation is not lost on her, as she comments to Quiteria: “Decirme podrá el problema: / ‘Dotor, cúrate a ti mismo’” (970-71). This interior division, between logic and emotion, is an immediate echo of her use of disguise. For her, passion is an unknown experience with unforeseen consequences. Likewise, by hiding her identity, she is presenting herself as an unknown entity, free from the persona of Jerónima, female scholar. As a result, she is simultaneously exploring an unfamiliar part of her personality and freeing herself of her previous role in life.

Tirso emphasizes the importance of disguise in the form of Tello, Gaspar’s servant, who attempts to unmask Quiteria. The stage directions read, “Va a destaparla y pégale [QUITERIA]” (after line 1046). As is often the case with the actions of the servants within the *comedia*, this is a physical, slapstick echo of the actions of their masters. While Jerónima must fend off Gaspar’s inquiries through verbal means, Quiteria’s direct response to a direct action serves as a physical echo of the more refined verbal fencing of Tello’s and her masters. In both cases, anonymity is an advantage that must be preserved, since it allows the speaker to focus on the message she wishes to convey without revealing anything she would rather not.

Shortly after Jerónima tells Gaspar that his previous love is now willing to receive him again, Gonzalo arrives with the news that the authorities have come looking for Gaspar, and he urges him to leave for Portugal immediately (1069-1100). As a result, Gaspar bids farewell to the woman he believes has brought him new hope for love, and he tells her that he will wait to hear from Doña Micaela, his lover from Toledo, in Lisbon. Once he leaves, Jerónima ends the act by asking herself where her passion is leading her: “¿Qué intentáis, locuras mías?” (1149). In a reversal of her earlier attitude of slight

disapproval of Jerónima's academic interests (90-96, 143-44), Quiteria recommends to Jerónima, perhaps ironically, that she make use of her knowledge to help her understand her emotional reactions: "De los libros te aprovecha / en que estudias" (1150-51).

Jerónima likewise shows a change in character, as she responds with less faith in learning than her previous comments would lead us to believe: "¡Plegue a Dios / que por ellos no me pierda!" (1151-52).

At the end of the first act, it is clear that Jerónima is the central character of the play, not only because of her connection to the title of the work, but also because she is the primary source of action on the stage. However, despite her assertiveness and determination to control events around her, she is portrayed as a dual, conflicted, being—one who enjoys both academic studies and passionate pursuits. Quiteria's suggestion points us towards the way in which she will make use of her knowledge in the following acts. Yet, the tension between scholar and lover is also highlighted as she closes the first act by expressing doubts about the efficacy of her learning to help her in her new quest. Unlike the other lead women in this study, Jerónima is portrayed, from the first act, as a person deeply divided within herself. Whereas Magdalena, Diana, and Juana all manage to maintain a clear separation between their sense of self and the roles they play, Jerónima starts her use of disguise with misgiving about where it will take her, as she leaves her comfortable life of study to pursue a man who hardly seems aware of her existence.

Although there may be some objections to the claim that this interior division is unique to Jerónima, a closer look at the women studied will help to justify this statement. Towards the end of *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* it appears that Juana is starting to lose

track of her self-as-Juana. However, during the majority of the play, she maintains a clear distinction between herself and her alter-egos, and this perceived loss of self is linked specifically to the identity of Don Gil. In fact, it is her identification with her role as Don Gil, and her need to maintain *her* Gil as the primary iteration of the name, that leads to her over-identification with that role. This is clearly not the case for Jerónima. She begins to experience an internal split before she assumes any new identity. Her loss of self is not connected to an identification with a new identity; rather it comes from an internal conflict that is the result of her new awareness of the emotional aspects of her personality. Additionally, it is a division of which she is intensely aware. However, her self-awareness does not seem to be able to prevent this internal division.

One could also argue that this situation is actually similar to the case of Magdalena in *La celosa de sí misma*, yet there are a few crucial differences. The split that causes Magdalena's jealousy is an external one. It is Don Melchor who creates the illusion of two beings (Doña Magdalena and the mystery woman seen at mass), not Magdalena. Even the name that she later assumes, that of the countess of Chirinola, is the result of another's naming. Furthermore, the division that we see in Magdalena is never one which affects her core identity. She adds the role of the countess to her already established self. Her conflict is based on the double perception of herself by Don Melchor, not on varying aspects of her personality or identity. In *El amor médico*, Jerónima displays an internal conflict which is independent upon her use of disguise. It is this preexisting conflict which will lead to her loss of self, as she makes use of various permutations of disguise throughout the play.

Act 2 finds Don Gaspar in Coimbra in Portugal where he meets a friend, Rodrigo, who he tells of his good fortune. Gaspar is staying with his uncle, Don Íñigo de Cádenas, and now plans to marry his cousin. He tells Rodrigo:

permisión de amante
tengo también en ella.
Dueño me intenta hacer de su hija bella,
y es doña Estefanía
competencia del sol que luz le envía.
Dice que, pues heredo
a su hermano y mi padre, y en Toledo
mi mayorazgo tiene
su antigüedad y casa, no conviene,
pudiendo eslabonarla
con nuevo parentesco, desmembrarla;
que mientras se mitiga
el rey contra mí airado, a que se obliga,
a cargo suyo toma
nuestra dispensación, que ya está en Roma. (1172-86)

He further asserts that he no longer is interested in the woman from Toledo, whom he had previously courted. As is the case in the other plays examined here, there is a clear financial element in this match. As in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* and *La celosa de sí misma*, part of the purpose of the match is to secure financial stability. This is, as Don Gaspar notes, the reason that he has been encouraged to wed his cousin, Doña Estefanía. Unlike the matches presented in the other plays, however, it appears that financial reasons are not his primary motivation, as his later concerns seem to indicate (1467-71). In fact, he seems to be genuinely in love with Doña Estefanía. When Rodrigo mentions Gaspar's former lover, his response is a cool: "Las de mis celos aumentara en ellas / si no las apagara / la prenda hermosa que mi amor repara. / Ya el suyo en mí es olvido" (1194-97). The only thing that seems to trouble his idyllic situation is his curiosity concerning

the identity of the disguised woman he spoke with in Seville, since he now knows that she was not a messenger from Toledo, as she had claimed (1201-08).

After this brief conversation, which serves to inform the public of offstage events, we are presented to Estefanía. Once Doña Estefanía is introduced, two important things occur. First, we learn that she suffers from “melancolía” (1405), apparently inherited from her mother (1457-59). This trait serves as the opening that Jerónima needs to carry out her intentions. The second event is that Rodrigo is smitten by Estefanía’s beauty (1464, 1475-76). Shortly thereafter, the audience is apprised of the cause of Estefanía’s melancholy, as she soliloquizes about her love for a doctor (1497). When the doctor arrives, he proves to be Jerónima in disguise. As she examines Estefanía, Estefanía makes her love for the doctor clear to the audience, with asides, which form a secondary dialogue to her list of symptoms (1660-82). These asides add another level of meaning to the discussion of her health, and form part of the double discourse that we see throughout the play. In fact, this division of discourse acts as a parallel to the interior division that we have observed in Jerónima. This is not to say that these two elements are directly related; rather they are both part of the pattern of fragmentation that is increasingly seen through the work.

A jealous Gaspar challenges Jerónima on her height, age, and lack of beard, stating:

Aunque breve de persona,
sin autoridad de barba
y la edad no muy dotora,
suple lo limpio y pulido
las letras, que serán pocas,
de quien en lugar de textos
gasta el estipendio en ropa. (1750-56)

In effect, what Gaspar is challenging is Doctor Barbosa's performance of masculinity, in the sense that, "gender is instituted through the stylization of the body and, hence, must be understood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movements, and enactments of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self" (Butler, "Performative Acts" 402). While this challenge is an insult to a man, for a woman performing as a man, it is a much greater threat. She risks unmasking and having her performance revealed, a situation Butler calls her "*appearance of substance*" ("Performative Acts" 402).

Although, in this instance, Butler is speaking specifically on how gender identity is formed and maintained, the principle also applies to the performance of false, or alternate identities, as is the case in this play. Later in the same article, Butler discusses how this concept applies to cross-dressing, both on and off the stage:

In the theatre, one can say, "this is just an act," and de-realize the act, make acting into something quite distinct from what is real. Because of this distinction, one can maintain one's sense of reality in the face of this temporary challenge to our existing ontological assumptions about gender arrangements; the various conventions which announce that "this is only a play" allows strict lines to be drawn between the performance and life. On the street or in the bus, the act becomes dangerous, if it does, precisely because there are no theatrical conventions to delimit the purely imaginary character of the act, indeed, on the street or in the bus, there is no presumption that the act is distinct from a reality. ("Performative Acts" 410-11)

In the case of this, and similar plays, we have a doubling of the field of perception. Of course, for the reader or viewer, the cross-dressing is restricted to the realm of the theater and is thus safe, in the sense that it is non-real, and therefore non-threatening. However, within the play, this is not the case. Gaspar's challenge to Doctor Barbosa is based on a threat of the loss of his chosen spouse. Just as Butler uses the metaphor of the stage to

describe how gender is performed in life, we must consider how the performance of the performance of gender, is dealt with in this work. As a result, while the audience can sit and laugh at the irony inherent in Gaspar's insult, Jerónima has no choice but to react to this attack as a real and imminent threat, one that could have serious consequences.

Those who discovered a case of cross-dressing in their midst were deceived at that point where one normally encounters the first and most important criterion in relationships with others: the knowledge that one is dealing with a man or a woman. Unexpected direct confrontation with a woman in disguise very often provoked negative emotions. (Dekker and Pol 74)

Thus, Jerónima has very strong motivations to maintain and buttress her *persona* as Doctor Barbosa.

Jerónima responds to the insult by inverting Gaspar's argument and attacking his logic, in a way similar to that which Juana, as Don Gil, was able to present her lacks as signs of the predominant Gil. Jerónima argues that the signs which he reads as indications of weakness and lack of wisdom are actually not so. She begins her defense by saying: "No dan las ciencias los años" (1757). She then continues in this vein, citing various authorities and providing classical allusions to bolster her defense. Her point by point refutation of Gaspar's disparaging comments (1757-844) more than establish her abilities; they also show the audience that Jerónima is a truly intelligent and educated woman. This same inversion is evident when we learn the pseudonym which Jerónima has chosen: "Barbosa" (1898). Tirso further underlines the ironic nature of Jerónima's choice of name, as she compares her name to "el moreno Juan Blanco" (1899). Not only is she able to confront attacks by portraying her seeming weaknesses as strengths, but she consciously chooses an ironic patronymic for the doctor she has created.

Her choice of name has a further dimension: by naming herself Barbosa, she deliberately juxtaposes her name with her smooth-cheeked reality. While in a person so named from birth, this would be merely ironic, or even inadvertently comic, the fact that Jerónima has made this a calculated choice is indicative of her internal divisions. Not only does the incongruity between her name and face invite others to examine the similar gaps between her status as a doctor and her real qualifications, or to see beyond the masculine façade that hides her true sex, but it also reflects the internal contradiction that we have seen from the beginning of the play. She is educated, but a woman; aloof, but in love with Gaspar; and as we have seen, she has difficulty reconciling her emotions with her knowledge. She further embodies this split as she tells Doña Estefanía that ‘his’ sister, Doña Marta de Barcelos, will soon arrive in town.

By creating a new identity, this time a woman, she prepares a second avenue of attack. Not only will this permit her to interact with Estefanía in ways that the doctor cannot, but it will present her with a new voice with which to speak. However, this is also a further sign of the disintegration of her self. This tactic is similar to that used by Doña Juana, when she created Doña Elvira in order to convince Doña Inés of the truth of her version of the history of Don Gil. The difference, as we will see, is how much rein she gives to Doña Marta. Whereas Doña Elvira existed for a very specific purpose, Doña Marta will take on a seeming life of her own.

Before she takes leave of Doña Estefanía and her father, she asks two things. The first request is for Don Íñigo’s support in her attempt to obtain a prestigious academic position. This he does gladly, even offering to provide bribes to assure her success, an

offer she declines (1905-24). The other request she makes is based on her supposed concern for Estefanía's health, when she tells him:

...no la trate
en este tiempo de bodas
que, aunque a don Gaspar se inclina,
cualquiera acción imperiosa,
en tiempo que es tan enfermo
y en complexión melancólica,
cansa la imaginativa,
y es fuerza que descomponga
la sangre y dañe el cerebro. (1929-37)

Her reputation is enough to easily convince him to agree to her recommendations, thus effectively blocking Gaspar from his planned marriage. When Gaspar is told of the doctor's command, he immediately perceives it as a ploy to separate him from Estefanía and to allow the doctor to woo her (2033-82). While he is certainly correct in his estimation of the purpose for Jerónima's actions, he is completely unaware of the reasons behind them.

Jerónima further demonstrates her internal conflict as she expresses her feelings to Quiteria. She states that

nuevamente mi enemigo
por dama nueva se abrasa;
nuevamente está por mí
loca doña Estefanía,
y, nueva la pena mía,
es viejo mi frenesí.
Todo se imposibilita;
don Gaspar, ciego, apetece
voluntad que le aborrece;
su dama en esto le imita,
pues amándome, ya ves
cuán incurable es su mal;
amo yo con pena igual
y engañámonos los tres. (2085-99)

She portrays the situation as an impossible tangle, a Crete (2100), that not only has no exit, but which repeats itself. Her four uses of the words “nuevamente” or “nueva” within a space of five lines contrasts with the “viejo,” which ends the verse. The clear feeling of repetition is strengthened, as she declares that her frenzy is old. Her further analysis of the situation is as accurate as it is despondent. Each of those involved in the love triangle that she describes is chasing a lover who has no interest in him or her. Her conclusion is that they are all deceived. The word she uses, “engañámonos,” can be read to mean either that they deceive each other or themselves. In fact, both descriptions are accurate. The counsel she receives from Quiteria: “Si no la de algún poeta, / no la esperes en tu vida” (2101-02), is a metatheatrical reference which can be linked to the division between the real and the theater which was discussed in *El celoso prudente* and is equally disheartening.

In contrast to Juana in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, where the multitude of disguises and identities all serve to further her goals, Jerónima appears to be unsure of what her actions will bring about. Her ultimate goal is fairly clear: she wishes to win Don Gaspar. Yet, she lacks the coherent plan that was so characteristic of Juana’s assumption of the identity of Don Gil. Her creation of Doctor Barbosa, and now Doña Marta, while tactically astute, shows no hint of strategic planning, much less an overall plan. Quiteria’s characterization of Jerónima’s love as “ciego” (2104) is additional confirmation of the chaotic nature of Jerónima’s actions.

Quiteria’s diatribe continues as she exposes the dangers of Jerónima’s actions. Her argument is based on three points: honor, image, and role-play. The first of these, honor, is presented in terms with which we are already quite familiar. She says: “Don

Gonzalo [Jerónima's brother] está en Pamplona / peleando y cuanto gana / echando a perder su hermana" (2107-09). Her concern is for the damage to the family's honor that a reputation as a "wandering woman" might cause. In Quiteria's opinion, Jerónima's love for Don Gaspar is no excuse for the way she places her honor in jeopardy.

Her second point is based on Jerónima's actions in Coimbra:

...no hay hombre
que en viéndote no te nombre
el Hipócrates capón.
Visitas a bulto y ganas
dineros restituibles;
haces curas imposibles,
matas veinte, cuatro sanas;
...
Das en querer catedrar
de vísperas, o maitines,
con que médicos rüines
no te acaban de envidiar. (2116-22, 2131-34)

Not only does she feel that Jerónima is making a fool of herself, an emasculated Hypocrites as she puts it, but that she is overreaching in her ambitions. She presents Jerónima as a victim of her own image, a woman in a man's job, and even though others have failed to see through her disguise, there is some sort of awareness that Doctor Barbosa is somehow deficient. Despite this, Jerónima insists on aspiring to a higher post, which will cause more envy and thus, make her more vulnerable. This second point is linked to Quiteria's first argument in that it pre-supposes that Jerónima should limit herself to socially approved actions and occupations.

Her final point has to do with Jerónima's decision to expand her use of role-play. While her lack of approbation of Jerónima's actions up to this point is clear, her argument against the use of multiple identities is based, not on what Jerónima should do, but on an attack against her abilities:

y para aliñarlo agora
finges que una hermana tienes
y que a recibirla vienes;
quiere verla tu señora
y, aunque a todos satisfacés,
nunca acabas de mirar
que en alguno te has de errar
si tantos papeles haces. (2139-46)

Quiteria's belief is that Jerónima, despite her current successes, will be unable to keep her various roles separate. Although Quiteria doubts the wisdom of Jerónima's decision to pretend to be a doctor, she does not doubt that she is capable of playing the role. She fears that Jerónima's disguise may be compromised, but her medical skills and knowledge are never in doubt. By challenging Jerónima's ability to maintain multiple disguises, she shifts her attack to an area of potential weakness. While Jerónima makes a competent doctor (despite the many jokes at the expense of doctors in general), she has no experience in deception, and as Quiteria makes clear, more roles mean a greater possibility of a fatal, identifying slip. Her warnings, although based on conventional social standards, will prove, Cassandra-like, to be accurate, yet unheeded, as Jerónima begins a flurry of role changes that eventually lead her into a mire of her own making: a "partial dissolution of Jerónima's personality into a stock farcical figure" (Halkhoree 99).

While Jerónima is reassuring her maid that everything will turn out well, they run into Gaspar and his servant, Tello. In a scene reminiscent of *La celosa de sí misma*, Don Gaspar is smitten by the beauty of the *tapada* Jerónima's hand. As they speak, Jerónima again uses her academic learning to help her create a new role, where "language itself is employed as one of the disguises" (Stoll, "Do Clothes Make the Man" 834). She speaks to Don Gaspar only in Portuguese, thus convincing him that she is a native of the region. Yet, Gaspar notes a certain similarity to his first encounter with the disguised Jerónima in

Seville. He tells her “no sé qué me hace acá / vuestro donaire; solo una / hablé en Sevilla, tapada, / que se os parece no poco / en el talle” (2237-41). As he pleads to see her face, she reveals her eyes and then tells him that her brother, the doctor, is coming, and she must go. Her parting act is to show him her full face. Jerónima’s actions are both a departure from the other acts of disguise that we have seen in the other plays, and a further expression of the internal division that I have been positing.

Jerónima has consistently taken a different approach to disguise than the other women in this study. Not only is she less goal-oriented in her use of disguise, but she is almost capricious in its employment as well. Each of the other women makes limited use of disguise with a specific purpose in mind. In *La celosa de sí misma*, Magdalena has disguise imposed on her by Don Melchor and only takes control of the created identity in an effort to redirect Melchor’s interest. Lisena’s occupation of Diana’s name in *El celoso prudente* is for the express purpose of being able to marry Prince Sigismundo. Even in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, Juana’s purpose is to win back her errant lover. Although she certainly appears to lose track of this goal, at least in part, it is her stated aim and the focus of her actions. In contrast, Jerónima chases after a man she does not know at all (a characteristic more commonly seen in the men of the *comedia*) and she multiplies identities without regard to the consequences. Quiteria’s warning is a commentary on this very tendency. And then, after having created a new identity, that of Doña Marta, she shows her face to Don Gaspar, who has already met her in Seville. The fact that he does not recognize her is a matter of luck.

What are we to make of Jerónima’s behavior? She is clearly less focused on questions of honor or gain than the other women. Of course, she is also in a situation in

which she has much greater control of her actions. She is not bound to her house (her father is dead and her brother is in Pamplona), she has not lost her honor, nor is she obligated to marry. Additionally, she is well educated. In short, Tirso has created something that almost appears to be a liberated woman. I use this phrase cautiously, since she certainly would not be considered so by a modern audience, but short of the *bandolera* or the widow character, each with its own set of restraints, she is as free as a woman could reasonably expect for the period. The fact that she is dressed as a man, and earning her own living, makes her much freer than the norm for the epoch. The result of this freedom is a sense of play that is absent in the other works. Doña Juana's mirth at the confusion she causes is the closest parallel, but her actions always occurred within the larger framework of her need to win Don Martín and thus redeem her honor. Because Jerónima is not acting under any such shadow, she is free to act much more capriciously than her sisters, with correspondingly lesser consequences if her game is discovered.

It is, perhaps, because her actions lack the tight focus caused by necessity found in the other women that her apparent internal division is so evident. In many ways, she is reminiscent of Doña Serafina in *El vergonzoso en palacio*, who loses herself in the various roles that she practices (1839-2164). Serafina, like Jerónima, has no need to portray other roles but, yet, she tells her maid: "no te asombre / que apetezca el traje de hombre / ya que no lo puedo ser" (1844-46). Her use of role-play is for entertainment and wish fulfillment, not because of necessity. Similarly, we will see that at the end of *El amor médico*, Jerónima will lose herself in the roles she plays and will need an outside force to end the game.

Her encounter with Don Gaspar has the desired results; he is so smitten that, just as he had dismissed Doña Micela at the beginning of the act, he now refutes Doña Estefanía (2314), a practice that causes Tello to comment: “¡bueno es que en un año mudes / tres mujeres? ¿Son camisas?” (2333-34). The act closes with Gaspar, Tello, and Rodrigo consulting with Jerónima-as-doctor. Not only has she managed to redirect Gaspar’s attention, but she has also become an authority figure who can effectively bar Don Gaspar from Doña Estefanía’s presence.

The concluding act begins with a further proof of her skill as a doctor, when the king himself makes her his wife’s personal physician and she gains the post that she had desired. With her authority firmly established, she encourages Rodrigo to court Doña Estefanía. After pontificating on the nature of love and assuring him that what he feels is real, she tells him:

No han hecho [las influencias del cielo] menor efeto
en ella, si he de regirme
por sus pulsos que pregonan
las prendas que en vos compiten
con las del que se os opone,
pues desde que os vio anda triste,
con don Gaspar intratable
y con vos menos terrible.
Dejadme a mí el cargo desto
que, aunque yo no vaticine,
no en balde impedí el hablarla
don Gaspar. Apercebidme
para guantes cuando estéis
en altura tan sublime
que con título de esposo
mis curas os maravillen. (2691-2706)

Her actions as Doctor Barbosa have all tended to work to the advantage of Jerónima. She has infiltrated the house of Gaspar’s love, interposed herself between the two, banned him from seeing her, and has now encouraged Rodrigo to court Estefanía. Likewise, the

creation of Doña Marta has served to lure Gaspar away from Estefanía and to pique his interest. At this point, it would seem that all she lacks is to convince Estefanía to accept Rodrigo and to have Gaspar give her his promise to marry. However, her continued use of disguise will act to hinder her own goals, as she become enamored of the game, and loses track of her aims.

The first evidence of this comes as Gaspar visits the doctor's house. He wishes to speak with Doña Marta, but instead runs into the doctor. Rather than encouraging Don Gaspar to court his sister, the doctor goes on the attack, going so far as threatening to shoot Gaspar if he continues to visit the doctor's house (2808). This action certainly seems counterproductive to Jerónima's goals, but when we recall her earlier words to Quiteria, when she first realizes her attraction to Don Gaspar, it is possible to argue that her actions are part of a strategy to cause him to desire Doña Marta even more:

En nosotras ya tú sabes
que, imperando la soberbia,
se rinde por sus contrarios;
hombre que nos menosprecia
téngase por bien querido;
finjase quien nos desea
desdeñoso, descuidado,
no nos mire, no dé quejas;
causarálas en su dama,
porque en balanzas opuestas,
aunque amor es simetría,
cuando se abrasan nos hielan
y helándose nos abrasan. (841-53)

Yet, it should be noted that this statement clearly indicates that she is speaking about women and not men: "nosotras." Furthermore, there is no indicator to hint that she feels this applies equally to both sexes, although in this, and other plays by Tirso, it does seem to work this way in practice.

At this point, it is important to make clear the separation between what we know of the character, based on the text, and the text as a whole. While Tirso may have written the play in such a way as to demonstrate that Jerónima's observation does, in fact, apply to both males as well as females, there is no evidence to indicate that Jerónima feels this way. This is not to state that this is not the case, just that there is insufficient evidence to make a claim either way. Thus, we must wonder at the reason behind Jerónima's actions.

Another possible reason for her actions comes from her role as the overprotective brother. When she sees Don Gaspar in front of her door she states:

¿Qué pretendéis vos aquí?
...
Andáis huyendo de mí
y rondándome la calle.
Sabéis que tengo una hermana;
no quitáis de la ventana
los ojos. (2787, 2790-94)

It is certainly possible that her aggressiveness is the result of the *persona* that she is projecting, which could indicate that she has begun to over-identify with it. In either case, Jerónima's actions here lack the sense of purpose that we have seen in the other plays. When we look at this scene in the context of the following uses of disguise, it becomes clear that whatever the superficial justification for her actions, they are at best non-productive, especially when Gaspar offers to marry Marta without requiring a dowry and cede Estefanía to the doctor (2875-96). Instead of accepting, or at least considering Gaspar's offer, Jerónima multiplies herself by telling Don Gaspar:

JERÓNIMA: Curo a cierta dama aquí
—por hoy perdone el secreto—
que os tuvo en Castilla un mes
hospedado.
GASPAR: ¿A mí en Castilla?
JERÓNIMA: Y de medio ojo en Sevilla

sé yo que os habló después
no sé yo en qué gruta o fuente. (2929-35)

Her decision to remind Don Gaspar of his time in Seville, and to link herself to the masked woman that he met there, acts as a partial revelation of her role-play, while it simultaneously multiplies the roles that she must perform. While this action, in and of itself, could be considered a tactic to make Don Gaspar more aware of Jerónima-as-Jerónima, and to prepare him for the eventual revelation of her true identity, her following comments do exactly the opposite. She tells Gaspar that she has learned that he has dishonored this unknown woman from Seville:

Pues si palabra la distes
por lo menos de marido,
si los dos Eneas y Dido
en amor y engaños fuistes,
si huyendo requisitorias
la dejastes agraviada,
si os siguió y apasionada
de que olvidéis sus memorias,
por vos a la muerte ha estado. (2943-51)

This accusation is followed by a recounting of his past in Toledo and his relation with Doña Estefanía. Her conclusion is a rhetorical question: “Según esta información, / ¿fiaros mi hermana puedo?” (2963-65). This attack, a combination of truth and pure fiction, leaves Gaspar completely dumbfounded. To further the confusion, Quiteria approaches with a note from Doña Marta that encourages him to continue to court her (3019-28). Before Don Gaspar has time to absorb this whipsaw series of events, Jerónima ups the ante. She returns to Gaspar, *tapada*. When he sees her, he assumes that she is Doña Marta, who, up to this point, he has only seen wrapped in a cloak. He asks his servant:

GASPAR: ¿No es doña Marta?

TELLO: No y sí;
no, porque es carta cerrada
y sí, porque el sobrescrito
muestra que es suya la letra.
GASPAR: Todo mi amor lo penetra. (3073-77)

This exchange highlights a key concept that links these plays. In each play, Tirso has taken pains to present the disruption between signifier and signified through the use of disguise.

The great weakness of most of the characters that become victims of disguise is that they assume that there is a clear, direct, and legible connection between what they see and the reality underneath. Tello's comment goes right to the center of this difficulty. The person they see both is and is not Doña Marta. She is, because the signs that they can read, in this case her covering wrap, point to the person previously identified as Doña Marta. At the same time, Tello admits that they cannot actually "read" the interior, since it is "sealed." It is this gap that allows the women in this study to act. The assumption that what you see is what is actually there, fails to consider the possibility of deception or multiple layers of disguise. In Jerónima's case, she has created multiple layers of disguise. Instead of simple erasure, she has opted to reveal a false identity, one of two that currently exist beneath her cloak, which can be worn over her true self, and which has yet to appear to Don Gaspar. As the play reaches its climax, Jerónima will continue this practice of layering, and she will use it to simultaneously embody multiple roles. The assumption of a one-to-one correspondence between names and identity blinds Gaspar to the true situation. As he and Tello ponder the situation, they comment:

TELLO: En el aire la mujer
es la propia de Sevilla.
GASPAR: Y en el mismo es semejanza
de la hermana del doctor. (3129-32)

However, they fail to connect the two, despite the hints given. In fact, neither expresses any doubt that the two “different” women are not what they claim.

Doña Estefanía has the same difficulty. After meeting Doña Marta she comments: “que os parecéis / a vuestro hermano! Tenéis / su misma fisonomía; / ninguna diferencia hay / en los dos” (3144-48). In a parallel to her actions with Don Gaspar, Jerónima adds a new complication. Just as she added another female identity for Gaspar to deal with, she now tells Estefanía that the doctor is in love, not with her, but with her cousin, Leonor. This action, similar to Juana’s decision to court Doña Clara in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, is a needless complication. The only justification I can imagine is that it puts pressure on Estefanía to act quickly. However, there are no indications that this is needed. Estefanía has consistently shown her interest in her handsome doctor and has not shown any reservations regarding him.

The results of Jerónima’s various manipulations begin to manifest themselves as Rodrigo declares his love to Doña Estefanía and tells her that it was the doctor who encouraged his ambitions (3227-56). Estefanía is duly shocked and disabuses him of the notion. Shortly thereafter, Jerónima returns as the doctor, only to be chastised by Doña Estefanía for his actions, actions that Jerónima has deliberately led Estefanía to believe are real. Jerónima’s response places the doctor aspect of her disguise in direct conflict with her identity as Doña Marta: “¿Luego a todo lo que os dijo / mi hermana de mí, dais fe?” (3364-65). Estefanía’s response is the logical result of what she has been told:

¿Pues no he de darla? ¿Es testigo
vuestra hermana apasionado?
¿Paréceos que habrá fingido
engaños en daño vuestro,
si participa los mismos?

No os han de valer traiciones. (3366-71)

Jerónima has deliberately played her various roles against each other in a seemingly inexplicable self-betrayal. To further the confusion, when Estefanía attempts to end the interview by calling for help, the doctor reveals himself to be Doña Marta. This reversal is explained as an attempt to verify Estefanía's love for the young doctor (3383-86), what she calls a "sacasecretos" (3417). The only pragmatic advantage that Jerónima gains is a confirmation that Estefanía is not interested in Don Gaspar; an admission that could have been achieved through less baroque means.

As the conversation continues, the situation steadily degrades, and Jerónima is forced to scramble to keep Estefanía in the dark. After obtaining Estefanía's consent to marry the doctor, she attempts to hurry the formal betrothal by playing on her jealousy, telling her that Estefanía's cousin, who Marta has just assured her is not a competitor, is in fact on the point of promising herself to the doctor (3464-66). When this does not produce the desired result, Jerónima again switches *personas* and returns to her identity as Doctor Barbosa. At this moment she claims that 'he' had spoken to her disguised as his sister:

...dos veces os visito;
una en nombre de mi hermana
y otra agora en nombre mío;
como mujer la primera
y ésta en traje masculino. (3498-502)

In doing so, Jerónima has moved her use of disguise away from her exterior and incorporated it into her own body. From her initial use of erasure and disguise, she has now progressed to the point that her identity changes based only on her words, not on her

dress. When she, dressed as the doctor, claims to be Doña Marta, she convinced Estefanía, in part, by her use of Portuguese:

*¿No os dije yo que ò doutor
tiña aquí perto seus mimos?
Terceira dos seus amores
vos roguei serdes porque isto
naom hé ser alcobeiteira,
è por derradeiro sino
¿não vos dise que a meu hirmão
tiña de chamar marido
vosiñoría o Lianor? (3405-13)*

It is now her language, a marker of difference, that is used to convince Doña Estefanía of her identity. Not only are the words those of Doña Marta, but the means of conveyance, i.e., the format, link them to Doña Marta's identity.

Likewise, when Jerónima needs to convince Estefanía that she is the doctor who pretended to be Marta playing the role of the doctor, she returns to language, this time including Latin, to convince her once again:

*Naom vos agasteis, sol miño,
meus ollos, meu coraçao,
miña gloria, meu feitizo,
mana miña, cravo de ouro;
eu sou vosso raparigo.
Satis sit; crucior pro te,
usque ad animi deliquium.
A requiebros castellanos,
portugueses y latinos,
¿qué desdén será bastante
a enojarse y resistirlos? (3512-22)*

This is convincing enough to gain Estefanía's promise to marry him (3530-31). When Gaspar arrives on the scene, Jerónima pulls him aside, and in a reversal of her actions with Estefanía, she reveals herself as Marta, telling him: "No juzguéis por los vestidos / la persona. Doña Marta / soy" (3554-56). She likewise uses language to convince Gaspar

of her identity. When he expresses doubts about her claim to be Marta in her brother's clothes, she responds: "*¿Es porque mudo de estilo / y no os hablo en portugués? / Pois catai os ollos miños, / que onte vistes hum a hum, / à boca, os dentes è o riso*" (3566-70). Her speech is once again so convincing that Gaspar immediately promises his hand in marriage (3571).

At the point of the culmination of her triumph and the realization of her goals, Jerónima still fails to suspend her game. Instead of revealing the charade, she continues her deception, having Estefanía and Rodrigo promise to marry, under the pretext that it is needed to protect their secret engagement (3587-90). Estefanía, who just has seen the promised betrothal between Doña Marta and Don Gaspar, is confused, but agrees. It is only the intervention of Quiteria that ends this spiraling game of identity hopping and manipulation. As the only person with a knowledge of Jerónima's true identity, and the last remaining link to her past, it falls to her to act as the voice of authority and restore order. Despite Don Íñigo's accusation that she is insane, she tells Jerónima that the time for games has passed:

Ya se acabaron
las Martinas y Martinos.
Tu hermano murió en Pamplona
deshojando francos lirios
y su mayorazgo heredas.
Tus deudos y sus amigos
en Sevilla te echan menos
y últimamente han sabido
que asistes en esta corte.
En busca tuya tu tío
viene, extrañando disfraces,
y está ya en casa. (3603-14)

The re-imposition of reality is abrupt, and the news that her brother, Don Gonzalo, has died acts as a harsh reality check. The juxtaposition of Jerónima's games, and I have used

the term deliberately, with the exterior reality of her familial duties, as well as the reminder of mortality, is reminiscent of the contrast between the parents and children seen in *El celoso prudente*. However, there are some essential differences. The most obvious of these is that this juxtaposition only occurs, in *El amor médico*, as the play concludes. In contrast, in *El celoso prudente*, the viewer is constantly reminded of the conflict between the younger group, concerned with love and games, and the fathers who worry about issues of alliances and dynastic security. This constant shift between the games of one group and the concerns of the other serves to keep the audience aware of the consequences of Lisena's, Diana's, and Sigismundo's actions. There is never a complete surrender to the illusion that their *enredos* and games are free of consequence. *El amor médico* has a very different approach. Throughout the work, there is almost no intrusion by the realities of the greater world into the realm of Jerónima's games. Quiteria's worry that Jerónima will be unable to maintain her disguise is as close as the play comes to reminding the reader/viewer of a world where actions have consequences. Jerónima and her games exist in a play world that is free of the constraints of reality.

In the other plays examined, the women who made use of the various permutations of disguise had very real, and pragmatic, reasons to act as they did. Although the situations created may have been humorous, the underlying motivations were deadly serious and dealt with some of the critical concerns of the epoch: freedom to choose whom to marry, worries of faithfulness, loss of honor, and, in each instance, financial security. This is not the case for Jerónima. She has no issues of honor, faithlessness, or financial concerns to worry her. Her decision to chase Gaspar is almost whimsical, and despite her statements avowing her love, the text focuses much more on

her games than on any relationship that may exist between them. As McKendrick notes: “Jerónima’s character has undergone no metamorphosis” (237). She has proven herself capable and assertive, but love has not changed her.

Jerónima is exactly the same person as she was at the beginning of the play. She has demonstrated her medical and linguistic knowledge, and in so doing has run mental circles around those with whom she has contact, but she has only confirmed capacities that we already knew she possessed. From the beginning of the play it is clear that Jerónima is both well educated and headstrong. Unlike Doña Juana in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, she does not showcase previously unknown skills as she plays the role of doctor. At the beginning of *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* the audience does not know whether Juana will be able to successfully disguise herself as Don Gil, much less accomplish her goals. In fact, Caramanchel constantly seems to be on the cusp of piercing her disguise. In contrast, Jerónima’s abilities never seem to be in doubt. Similarly, in *El celoso prudente* and *La celosa de sí misma* the protagonists are never assured success. They all fail to control events as completely as Jerónima. In the first case, Lisena and Diana only believe that they control events, whereas in the second, Magdalena is constantly susceptible to others redefining her masked body. Jerónima does not display any of these characteristics. The sense of risk and uncertainty present in the other plays is absent.

Instead, the source of uncertainty in this work is the result of the increasing fragmentation of Jerónima’s identity. From the beginning of the play, she has been presented as a divided being. The initial division, woman and scholar, soon gives way to the conflict between learning and passion, a division she explicitly invokes in the final

segments of the first act. This division only magnifies itself as it takes on corporeal form in the doctor, and later, in her other disguises. As the play concludes, although Jerónima gains the spouse she desires and abandons the charade, there is no resolution of her internal divisions. In fact, they are more pronounced than at the beginning of the play. She has not reconciled her academic tendencies with her desire for her newly acquired husband, but rather, harking back to her earlier statement: “Dame tú un rey don Fernando / Que.../ me deje estudiar” (130-32), has, in essence, betrayed herself, since there is no indication that Jerónima will be able to continue her studies. If we focus on Jerónima as a divided character, there is no resolution to the play. In this case, her unrestrained use of disguise has betrayed her by providing an external expression for her internal divisions.

In *El amor médico*, Tirso does not spend much time examining how women in a closed society are able to avoid observation, restrictions, and societal limits. While the other heroines make use of disguise to act outside of the bounds of society, in this play, Tirso focuses instead on the question of disguise per se. As we see here, and to a lesser degree in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, disguise, when used without an acceptable justification, leads to confusion and chaos. In making this statement, I point to how Tirso presents disguise as a tool that can be either used to right wrongs or to sow confusion. It appears that, for Tirso, disguise must be used with a specific goal in mind in order to be effective. Jerónima’s unrestrained use of multiple disguises leads to the partial dissolution of her original personality. From this, we must speculate that Tirso perceived disguise, when used as an end in and of itself, to be a danger. Here, as in the other works in this study, disguise is presented as a way to create a space in which to act. The gap between the signifier and the signified, or the lack of connection between the two, is an

uncontrolled area, one which permits women to step out of the restrictions of their societal role and to act in ways that would otherwise be impermissible. However, warns Tirso, there are dangers in this space as well. When these women make use of disguise as a way to right wrongs that they would be otherwise unable to change, they are successful. Juana is able to net Martín, Magdalena is able, to a degree, to meld herself and the countess, and Lisena is able to marry Sigismundo, although almost at the cost of her sister's life. In each instance, the goal is justifiable in terms of honor, love, and marriage. Yet, Tirso is certainly no radical feminist, nor an anarchist. While his writings demonstrate an awareness of the social limitations placed on women and seem to promote a rethinking of societal norms, he is careful to limit the acceptable use of this space. Verification of the motives of a potential spouse, or recapturing lost honor may be tricky scenarios requiring intelligence, wit, and daring, but they are not problematic; they pose no threat to the basic stability of society. In fact, these uses of disguise arise as a reaction to a malfunction in the mechanics of society (Hotchkiss 97). Although at times these women seem to challenge the accepted order and destabilize society, they do so with a specific, and socially acceptable, goal in mind. In each case, disguise has a justifiable motive and is abandoned once the character's goal is reached. By so doing, Tirso is able to simultaneously represent the unstable nature of identity and the societal strictures that are reliant upon it, as well as to restore order, at least superficially.

In contrast, there is much more tension visible when disguise is used as an end in and of itself. It is when Juana begins to play with Doña Clara's affections that her magnificent manipulations begin to fray and that the identity of Don Gil fragments against her will. In the end, she is able to pull off her designs, the play is a comedy after

all, but her needless games court a chaos beyond her control. The situation in *El amor médico* is similar. Jerónima has no real justification to involve herself in any aspect of disguise at all, and even less in the swirling confusion that marks the final minutes of the play. In Jerónima's case, the use of masculine disguise is a convenience rather than a necessity. It permits her to travel freely to Portugal and to practice medicine, but she has no clear need to cross-dress.

Jerónima's actions lack the focus and control present in the other women in this study. Her manipulations also lack the logical sequencing that we see from Doña Juana, the caution that was a hallmark of Doña Magdalena, or the purpose that we saw in Diana and her sister Lisená. As a result, Jerónima's use of disguise in this play seems somewhat haphazard and unjustifiable. Additionally, the high stakes that mark the other plays and give the heroines motivation are lacking. This lack is replaced by frenetic energy that manifests itself in Jerónima's constant game playing. In fact, it seems that at the end of the play, she weds Gaspar in spite of her actions, rather than as a result of them. She is never punished for her use of disguise and cross-dressing, but her reward, to call it that, is to marry and be forced to deal with the very restrictions that she complained of at the start of the play.

Without the need that drives disguise in the other plays we have examined, *El amor médico* provides an opportunity to focus on disguise in and of itself. Disguise works as an end to a clear goal in the other plays, but in Jerónima's case, her initial desire to win the love of Gaspar is soon overshadowed by her fascination with role-play and disguise. Starting with the second act, when she appears as the young Doctor Barbosa, her actions are better described as part of an attempt to hinder Gaspar and his plans for

Estefanía, than as an attempt to win his love. While the two elements are not mutually exclusive, her focus on the former, rather than the latter, undermines her claim that she wishes to wed. Disguise, and the freedom that it provides, consumes the other aspects of the play, and it is disguise that occupies Jerónima's mind and energies.

Perhaps the most notable aspect of disguise in this play is how elaborate and established Jerónima's *persona* becomes. Doctor Barbosa not only takes on a Don Gil-like reality, but gains royal favor and a prestigious post in the process. The tangibility of this disguise is remarkable. Jerónima has crossed the boundary between wearing a disguise and creating a new life for herself. In this, she more closely echoes real life examples of female-to-male cross-dressing, such as Catalina de Erauso, than she does the theatrical maiden who wears a mask as a temporary convenience. Despite the predictable restoration of order, and identity, the final impression is that the true Jerónima, in the guise of Doctor Barbosa has been banished, and that the woman presented at the end of the play is the mask.

CONCLUSION

In each of the plays studied here, Tirso de Molina provides us with a representation of an aspect of disguise. While these pieces are connected by the use of disguise, as well as a female protagonist and the need to circumvent the restrictions of the society of the period, the realization of each is distinct. Together, they form a larger pattern, one which can provide us with a new perspective when we consider how disguise is employed in Tirso's *comedias*. As a result, these plays present us with an expanded understanding of how female disguise, in the works of Tirso de Molina, acts to free the female character who chooses to disguise herself, as well as an awareness of the dangers that arise from this act. From Doña Magdalena's tentative steps to make use of the identity created by Don Melchor in *La celosa de sí misma*, to Jerónima's enthusiastic embrace of the possibilities enabled by her deception in *El amor médico*, we see a wide variety in the way disguise is used within the various plays. As we review each play, I will highlight the unique aspects of disguise in that work, as well as how it contributes to the whole.

Magdalena, in *La celosa de sí misma*, can easily be described as a reluctant heroine. For her, disguise is not a desired escape from a potentially disastrous situation, nor is it a means to find greater freedom. Rather, disguise is something forced upon her by a whim of fate. Although Magdalena enables the creation of disguise, i.e., erasing herself by wearing an obscuring cloak to pass, this is never intended to be any sort of deception. As the play begins, Magdalena is simply involved in the process of erasure. Her elimination of identity is an extension of the protection of the paternal household, a

protection that she never shows inclinations of abandoning. Magdalena is no rebel, and Melchor's initial approach is, to her, nothing more than a game. It is only when she discovers that her husband-to-be is the same man who approached her earlier that she considers the possibility of using his imagination to her benefit. However, her attempts are better characterized by her failures than successes. It is Melchor who creates such a powerful imaginary image that he rejects the very person beneath the cloak. Magdalena is only able to play the part that he created for her, without controlling the role that she embodies. This problem is further exacerbated by the creation of the Countess of Chirinola, a name invented by a servant. Finally, when a rival appears, despite the differences between the two women, Magdalena is unable to convince Melchor that her version of the countess is the one which he loves. This difficulty comes to a head as she acts against her own interests while disguised as the countess. Time after time, Magdalena reacts to events. She never seems to master the identity overlaid on her erased body. First Melchor creates it, then Santillana, the servant, names it, later Ángela imitates it, and finally she, in the guise of the countess, acts against herself. It is only at the moment of unmasking that Magdalena gains power over herself and her situation.

This particular pattern of disguise is one which highlights the power of imagination and the possibilities created by the unknown body. Typically, as is the case for the other plays in this study, the woman resorts to disguise as a means to obtain an otherwise unreachable goal. However, Magdalena is adopted by disguise rather than vice versa. Because she is not the creator of the new identity, she is forced to constantly adapt herself to the expectations of Melchor. Since disguise operates in the realm of the unknown, the undefined, it is inherently instable. Without the benefit of having created

the role herself, she founders. She can neither be the perfect woman that Melchor envisions, nor can she act differently from the expectations he has established for her. Magdalena has been trapped into a disguise that provides her no advantage. The man attracted by her disguise is the one she is already to wed. She, through Melchor's imagination, provides her own blocking character. Because this is the case, disguise is non-productive. There is no goal associated with disguise in this play other than to eliminate, or at least assimilate, the identity of the countess. The competition provided by Ángela is the result of the very openness created by disguise. Without the figure of the countess, there would be no opportunity for Ángela to act on her feelings for Melchor.

Disguise, as presented in *La celosa de sí misma*, is an opening into chaos.

Magdalena relies upon the maintenance of an established society with a comprehensible and predictable pattern. She expects to marry the man her father has selected. When she discovers Melchor's preference for an imaginary construct that overlays her real self, she becomes aware of the yawning gap between reality and imagination. Without control, disguise can lead to unexpected and uncontrollable results. This discovery highlights an irony inherent in disguise. Disguise steps outside of the boundaries of normal life and practice, yet, to be effectively used, it still requires control. Disguise is not necessarily anarchy; it is frequently the subversion of established customs by those who do not have the power to openly flaunt convention.

In contrast, the presentation of disguise in *El celoso prudente* is focused on the dangers that can be associated with its careless use. Unlike Magdalena, Lisena and Diana choose to initiate the use of disguise. However, their use is incomplete. They initiate their deception as an effort to allow Lisena to marry the prince, Sigismundo. The endeavor

begins when their father finds a letter from Sigismundo to Lisena, and Diana claims the letter as hers. From this moment, the sisters enter into a world of quasi-disguise in which Lisena's true identity is hidden beneath her sister's name. Because disguise is primarily useful for its capacity to avoid naming and thus expand the person's ability to act, the decision to misdirect, rather than to sever the chain of naming, eliminates one of its key advantages. This results in Diana's abrupt marriage to Sancho and his subsequent suspicions. Although disguise is not the central focus of the play, its use is what drives the work. Both Lisena's continuing hopes and Diana's peril are the result of the way in which they employ disguise. Had Lisena simply made use of erasure, or created a name, there would be no suspicion cast on Diana. Sancho would have had no reason to doubt his wife's fidelity, and an entire facet of the play would not have existed. Of course, this problem is exactly what Tirso wished to examine. By having the younger group make incomplete use of disguise, Tirso is able to examine the question of honor, misperception, and the clash of two worldviews.

It must be emphasized that the entire play hinges on the danger inherent in partial disguise. Without this element, there is simply no play. This use of partial disguise serves to emphasize the baroque theme of deception. With few exceptions, almost every character in the play is deceived to some degree. The king, Fisberto, and Sancho are the most obvious examples, but Sigismundo suffers his moment of deception as he listens to the equally deceived marquis, Enrique. Diana is also forced to deal with her husband's dissimulation as he starts to suspect her loyalty. This deception even extends to the false confidence the lovers show that their plans will all come off perfectly, without any negative consequences. In each case, the fault lies in the various characters' assumption

that they perceive the entire situation correctly; only Don Sancho questions his perceptions. This false confidence and the near tragedy it causes act as the center of the play. Disguise is the enabling element for this misperception, as well as a constant reminder that appearances are not reality, and that misunderstandings are not always a source of humor.

El celoso prudente reveals the power of disguise in the form of a negative example. The near tragedy of the play, the central tension that drives the action, is the result of incomplete use of disguise. By portraying a foolish application of disguise, Tirso emphasizes the either/or nature of disguise. The very center of disguise is the uncertainty and erasure that it promotes. It permits prohibited or discouraged actions by refusing to identify. This refusal enables the person who uses disguise to act with impunity, knowing that they cannot be held responsible for their actions unless their disguise fails. By neglecting to make use of the erasure that disguise provides, Lisena and Diana fail to take advantage of the anonymity that would have enabled their proscribed actions and thus they open themselves to the consequences of their games.

The most masterful use of disguise belongs to Doña Juana in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. Not only is she able to play multiple roles with ease, she also successfully crosses the gender divide and performs masculinity so well that she enamors Doña Inés, the lady her faithless lover is courting, as well as Inés's cousin Doña Clara. Unlike Magdalena and Lisena, from the beginning of the work, Juana has a clear concept of what she desires to accomplish, as well as how to achieve this goal. Her use of disguise is equally well planned and executed. Forearmed with knowledge of what Don Martín is doing, she is able to plan a counter-strategy that involves the usurpation of his disguise.

As Don Gil, Juana is able to outperform Martín to such an extent that she inspires him to imitate her imitation. Her addition of the *persona* Doña Elvira, a simulacrum of her real self, provides a second voice which verifies the assertions of her Don Gil personality. In each case, her use of disguise is focused and effective.

Juana's use of disguise presents us with a view of its possibilities. Tirso provides the reader with a number of variations which further emphasize the possible uses of this deception. Don Martín initially uses disguise at the behest of his father and changes little more than his name. His disguise is meant to be accepted as real, with no hint given to Inés or her father that there is any deception. The letter of introduction from his father is a prop to further this goal. Juana's introduction of a competing Gil destroys the illusion and inserts an element of uncertainty into the situation. Although Juana and Martín's audience, Inés and others, still believes in the existence of a Don Gil, the presentation of a second claimant to the name reveals the presence of deception. From this point on, disguise works on two levels simultaneously. The initial creation still exists. With the exception of Martín, Juana, and their servants, all the characters continue to believe that there is, in fact, a real Don Gil. The second level is the masquerade. It is now common knowledge that there is a false Gil. This contention, over possession of the identity of Don Gil, obscures the first act of disguise and occupies the characters' energies for the majority of the play.

Juana's ability to create convincing characters of both genders allows her to achieve her desires and emphasizes the power of disguise. From the safety of her anonymity, she acts as the director both for her creations and the other characters in the play. In Juana's case, the motivation for disguise is less for the chance that it provides to

avoid consequence than it is for the freedom to act that comes with its use. Because her identity as Juana is removed from the view of the other characters, with the exception of her trusty co-conspirator Quintana, she is free from the expectations and limitations associated with that identity. As Don Gil, she is free to court Inés, and later Clara, while as Doña Elvira she is free to confess her dishonor. As a man, Juana is able to enter and act in the larger world. She can present herself assertively in a way that Juana would never be allowed. As a woman, she is allowed access to Inés and is able to plead her case, destroying Martín's hopes.

However, Tirso also presents a negative side to disguise. Despite the power that Juana gains through her use of disguise, she is still reliant on the other characters' belief in the veracity of Don Gil's existence. Should this belief fail, her ability to manipulate events would likewise cease. Disguise is built upon deception and is maintained through a collective belief in that deception, as the night scene demonstrates when four separate characters attempt to claim Don Gil's identity. In response to the threat of losing control over Don Gil, Juana is forced to assert that she is the real and true Don Gil. Her need to control this identity is clear, since Inés has promised her love to the 'true' Don Gil. Should Martín reclaim this identity, he would have a chance to win Inés.

Disguise what allows action. Juana is free to act to redeem her honor and to punish Martín precisely because she creates characters that fulfill her needs. Where Don Gil is unable to penetrate, Doña Elvira enters freely. As a fictionality, Don Gil de las calzas verdes can promise everything that Inés desires, without having to comply with those promises at the end. Where Magdalena lacked control of her fictional identity, Juana, despite challenges to her dominance, is always the master of Don Gil. Likewise,

unlike Lisena and Diana, she is careful to disassociate herself from her creations and their actions, thus keeping her self-as-Juana safe from adverse consequences. It is Doña Juana who best exemplifies the potential of disguise.

Of the women in these plays, Jerónima stands out both for her education and for the whimsical nature of her actions. While Jerónima makes even more extensive use of disguise than does Juana, she lacks the focus that Juana's situation gave her. Juana, despite the pleasure she found in her machinations, had a vitally important reason to dress herself as Don Gil. Her lover had abandoned her, and she needed to regain him or face the consequences of her lost honor. Jerónima is in no such peril. Her decision to follow Gaspar is based on pique and her feelings of attraction, not on need. Although her choice of a masculine disguise is logical given the circumstances, it is not necessary in the same way it was for Juana, who had to thwart Martín's courting of Inés. The addition of various female disguises and erasures—a messenger, the doctor's sister, and a third woman—are mostly superfluous. This multiplication of disguises without a clear need is a tendency that scholars have criticized in Tirso. I tend to view this complication as a deliberate choice by the author in an attempt to highlight his fascination with illusion and with the complexity of the human personality. Either way, Jerónima's actions and use of disguise appear frivolous.

I believe that Jerónima's capricious use of disguise is linked to her loss of self. In the works studied here, Tirso's presentation of disguise is one which has allowed those in a position of limited freedom to act outside of the strictures of their culture to either right wrongs, as did Juana, or achieve some other justifiable goal. Although Lisena and Sigismundo are willing to let a dynastic alliance slip to pursue their love, Tirso provides

an alternative to the king's plan that would permit the satisfaction of the demands of both love and politics. Likewise, Magdalena's use of disguise is a reluctant one, which only serves to help convince her betrothed to accept her. Jerónima represents what can be considered to be an unjustified use of disguise. In a period where women were strictly regulated and efforts to maintain stability were ever more important (see Perry, *Gender and Disorder*), this use of disguise can easily be considered a threat to society.

The way in which Jerónima is unmasked is indicative of this position. Unlike our other heroines who revealed themselves at a point when doing so acted to their advantage (Lisena and Juana when their goals had been achieved, and Magdalena when it would serve to convince Melchor to accept her), Jerónima is forcibly unmasked by a servant who ends her game with the news of the death of her brother. Not only is her disguise exposed, rather than her taking the initiative to reveal herself, it is done before her game is completely played out. Despite the fact that she still marries Don Gaspar, the play's ending is unsatisfying. Jerónima is the victor only because she achieves a marriage. Yet, she marries a man who has shown little previous interest and who has given no hint that he will allow her to continue her studies. Because Jerónima has flaunted the rules of society, she, of the women in this study, is the one who ends the play in the least felicitous situation. This connects to the results of her disguise as well. Jerónima delights in the multiplication of her disguises. Unlike Juana, who does so with clear strategic goals in mind, there is no clear justification for Jerónima's actions. Although disguise facilitates her pursuit of Gaspar, there is no need to do so. Considering her actions, we can argue that her use of disguise is more aimed at permitting her to practice medicine than to do anything else. Furthermore, her games with Estefanía are just that: games.

Despite the similarities of her actions to those of Juana with Inés, Juana's dealings were not nearly so baroque, nor so frivolous. As Jerónima enmeshes herself further and further in her games and exchanges of identities, she loses her self. In the final scenes where she switches back and forth between her disguise as Doctor Barbosa and his sister, her changes are so frequent and frenzied that it is not only Estefanía who is completely at a loss in attempting to decide who stands before her, but perhaps Jerónima herself.

The audience, as well as Jerónima herself, can be forgiven for losing track of which role she is playing at any given moment. This is not to denigrate Jerónima's intelligence or skill in her manipulation of events, but the chaotic nature of the scene and the division and multiplication of Jerónima's disguises points to the chaos that disguise can provoke. The rationale for Jerónima's use of disguise, her less-than-happy ending, and her seeming loss of self are all connected. Despite Tirso's seeming love of complexity and confusion, he draws the line at the use of disguise that, by the standards of the period, is morally unjustified. *El amor médico* seems to warn, behind its entertaining façade, that circumventing the rules may be allowed, but only if done for a good reason.

This analysis may seem to trend to the gloomy, closed nature of evaluation common in the New Historicism; however, this closure, this return to normalcy, is a conditional one. These plays do not end with all questions answered and all difficulties solved. To the contrary, there are as many openings at the end as at the beginning. The problems may be different, but they do not cease to exist. My point in discussing how Jerónima's loss of self is connected to her purpose for disguise is not to take a moral stance nor to present Tirso de Molina as a champion of order restored. Rather, my point is

to indicate that Tirso presents chaos as a constant presence at the edge of disguise. These plays show that Tirso viewed disguise as a powerful tool, but not a particularly safe one. Additionally, it appears that he sets boundaries on what he considers justifiable use of disguise and warns of its misuse.

We must then ask ourselves, what is the ultimate purpose of disguise in these works, and what are the consequences of its use? In each of these plays, the use of disguise is connected to a woman's need. Magdalena feels pressed to discover the true character of her fiancé before she is stuck with a man who has no interest in her. Although her actions come only after Don Melchor inadvertently doubles her identity in the opening moments of the play, she still makes use of his creation for her own ends. Lisena and Diana make the decision to misdirect their father and the other authority figures in their proximity to assure Lisena's marriage to the Prince. Likewise, Juana, although much more active and pro-active than the aforementioned women, takes on the identity of Don Gil out of necessity. Should she not re-win Don Martín, she is destined for the convent and dishonor. Jerónima is the seeming exception and is indeed unique. Her actions are not driven by need, but by desire. Yet, once she begins to use disguise, she is unable to relinquish her new identities. Although her decision to chase Don Gaspar is based on less serious underpinnings, she is equally dependent on disguise to allow her to act and achieve her goal.

In each case, it seems that disguise and cross-dressing, despite its disruptive nature, is approved. This is not to say that Tirso is advocating social disobedience; this is the stage after all, and the women are 'safely' contained at the end of each play. However, it is significant that all the women achieve their goals, manipulate the

masculine power figures that surround and supposedly contain them, and only return to the patriarchal order of society after their goals have been reached. Once again, the case of Jerónima must be considered in a distinct light. She represents an extreme use of disguise and therefore brushes against the borders of acceptability.

There are many possible reasons for this portrayal of successful subversion. It could be that this is simply a reflection of Baroque taste and a tried and true method of presenting the era's fascination with the complexity and uncertainty of life. Another possibility is that disguise in general, and cross-dressing as a subset of disguise, serves as a means to represent a psychological split. Furthermore, I believe, as Dawn Smith also argues ("Women and Men" 256), that this is a way to portray women as capable, intelligent beings. The purpose of disguise in each of these plays is clear. It provides the woman with a way to circumvent society without coming out in actual rebellion. The fact that Tirso allows a smooth, or at least relatively smooth, return to order hints that he does not view women's disobedience to be a crime worthy of punishment, a defiance of a divinely ordained natural state, or a threat to the stability of society.

Tirso is consistently fascinated with the way in which society functions and with individuals' relationship to it. His works champion justice over law, right over tradition, and the divine over the human, and constantly represent the way in which the fabric of society is manipulated. It is perhaps no surprise then that wronged or desperate women receive sympathetic treatment. Yet, Tirso was not blind to the damage done by some of his female characters. This is, in my view, why Jerónima is the misfit. Her actions, although similar to others, are the result of somewhat selfish and whimsical motivations. The ending of the play justifies this interpretation as her game is interrupted by the harsh

reality of her brother's death. This is not to imply that her actions had a causal effect on her brother, but the contrast of her brother dying in service to the king while she sows chaos for her personal entertainment is clear.

The question that naturally follows regarding the consequences of female disguise is more difficult to answer with any certainty. One obvious conclusion is that Tirso views people as more than simply the societal role they play, the exterior. Juana is clearly more than the wronged woman, as her ability to shift from one identity to the other demonstrates. Jerónima may be unusual as an educated woman, but she is hardly an aberration of nature, as her self comparison to Queen Isabella indicates. These characters are certainly more than the sum of the identities that are assigned to them or those which they take upon themselves.

The nature of the endings in these plays also presents us with another possibility. In each case, the resolution is rapid and, at times, improbable. The focus in each of these plays is the *engaño* not the *desengaño* provided as an afterthought at the end of the work. The appearance of a male character, who only exists to provide a spouse for Doña Clara in *Don Gil*, exemplifies the untidy nature of the tidy endings for each play. In *La celosa de sí misma*, the resolution is accomplished in a mere fifty lines. Don Melchor never comes to an understanding of his own mental creation; neither does he learn to distinguish between the two women who vie for the identity of the Countess of Chirinola. Although Magdalena wins Melchor at the end, he has not changed. He is still the same quixotic dreamer who lives in a world of his own imagination. Disguise has helped her reach her goal but has not solved any of her problems. In *El celoso prudente*, disguise not only fails to solve any problems, but is almost the cause of a tragic mistake. Likewise, in

Don Gil de las calzas verdes and *El amor medico*, disguise helps the heroines to achieve their desires, but fails to solve the problems these women face. Juana has restored her honor, but in exchange she is burdened with Don Martín. Similarly, Doña Jerónima has exchanged her medical pursuits for a husband who has never shown interest in her as herself. It seems clear that disguise, while a successful tactic, is in no way a panacea.

The very fact that disguise does not help to provide tight endings can be seen as significant. Just as disguise is a way to circumvent the restraints of society and provide an alternate path of action, it seems that the apparent restoration of order at the end of these plays is fragile and partial, leading us to alternate interpretations of the text. Not only do the previously unresolved difficulties continue to exist, but we also must speculate that the women always have the choice of returning to disguise to, once again, resolve future problems. This is, in fact, what disguise allows. It not only permits the heroine to take on the role of a character with greater freedom to act, but the constant threat of a return to disguise forecloses appropriation by the dominant society, since disguise works from within to destabilize and change. Because, as Jung asserts, we constantly live in a form of partial disguise, due to our need for the *persona*, it is impossible to banish the possibility of disguise from society.

Disguise has further value in its ability to allow women to exploit pre-existing roles. If we compare *El amor médico* and *El celoso prudente*, we see examples of how this can occur. In each case, the key to success for the women who make use of disguise is to occupy a different role. In *El celoso prudente*, the motivation for the action is the love between Lisena and Prince Sigismundo. This relationship is partially revealed when the father, Fisberto, discovers a love letter from Sigismundo. Since writing can be

associated with the Symbolic Order (Pendzik 176), this scene can be interpreted as a betrayal of female desire by the Symbolic Order. However, we immediately see a subversion of this Order by Diana, as she claims to be the recipient of the love letter. Diana steps into an already existing role. The role of *dama* to Sigismundo has already been established by the letter, which is a tangible representative of the Symbolic Order. This discovery cannot be denied, but because that role has not been defined, Diana can slip into the space provided and thus free her sister from the consequences. Likewise, in order for Sigismundo and Lisena to marry, the acquiescence of the Princess Leonora is needed. Because she is already in love with Alberto, she is amenable to the ploy. Since Sigismundo is obliged to marry Leonora, Lisena is able to occupy, with Leonora's permission, both her name and the role of princess, thus gaining the king's blessing on their marriage.

In addressing this use of deception and disguise, the first thing that demands our attention is that the desired outcome is reliant on a number of conditions which are, for the most part, beyond the control of Lisena and Diana. Without the solidarity of Leonora, made possible by her love for Alberto, Lisena and Sigismundo would have had to look for another way to achieve their marriage goals. In addition, the play constantly teeters on the edge of tragedy. The role-playing which allows Lisena to marry is the same which threatens the life of her sister. It is only the forbearance of Sancho that keeps tragedy at bay. Because of this, the use of disguise is revealed as problematic. The problem that occurs is that in occupying the identity of another known person, e.g., when Lisena, dressed as Diana, speaks to Sigismundo in the second act, the freedom gained by one is lost by the other. We see a similar occurrence in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, when

Juana takes over the identity of Don Gil and Martín is mistakenly identified as Don Gil de las calzas verdes. In *El celoso prudente*, this means that the use of alternate identities creates a conflict between women in which they have surrendered the power over Diana's life to Sancho. By allowing her role, and that of Lisena, to become confused, Diana inadvertently portrays herself as unfaithful. The value of disguise is that it creates more possibilities for action. Simple appropriation of another's identity is revealed as problematic at best. In contrast, in *El amor médico*, we see that Jerónima creates roles that are not occupied by anyone else, which enables her to act freely.

As we discuss *El amor médico*, it is important to stress that the roles which Jerónima creates are new only in the sense that they are unoccupied; the *social* role already exists. Jerónima is not defying the system so much as using its strictures to her advantage. After falling in love with Gaspar, Jerónima decides to follow him to Portugal in order to win his love. While she has already interacted with him while her identity was withheld, she does not claim a new personality until her arrival in Coimbra. Once there, she assumes two identities. The primary identity is that of a young doctor who treats Estefanía, the object of Gaspar's desire. Her second identity is that of Doña Marta, sister to the doctor, which allows her to play the roles available to a woman within the city, including the role of causing Gaspar to fall in love with her.

Unlike Diana and Lisena, there is never any danger for Jerónima as she occupies these various roles. She is able to switch from one to another with ease, and in so doing, is able to control the events of the play to a remarkable degree. But, we are still faced with the question of whether these actions actually constitute freedom, or if Jerónima is succumbing to a male dominated order. There is no doubt that she achieves her desire.

Whether that desire is inscribed within patriarchy is another matter. In this case, at least, Jerónima is a woman who challenges the standard roles for women. Early in the play she asks rhetorically: “siempre ha de estar las mujeres /sin pasar la raya estrecha / de la aguja y la almohadilla?” (107-09). She is a woman who pushes the boundaries, but is intelligent enough to know that correct tactics are necessary to achieve her goals. The question which remains to be resolved is what constitutes a feminist act and what is submission to patriarchy? In my mind, subversion is a legitimate method of achieving aims within a society when that society disallows more open methods of action.

In each of the plays examined here, disguise has a dual use. Firstly, it provides an opportunity to act. This space, whether it is a hidden face or a masculine identity, is one which cannot exist if the protagonist is accurately named. Disguise is an escape. Secondly this anonymity provides the means for subversion. By occupying pre-existing social roles (such as suitor, lover, or scorned woman), without being responsible for her actions performed in that role, the heroine can act and circumvent societal regulation; bending events to her own ends. Of course, the degree of freedom to act is dependent on the type of disguise used and the effectiveness of the role-playing that this entails. However, the very existence of female disguise provides a haven for women who are otherwise faced with chafing societal restraints. Even though disguise is not a license to sow chaos, since the woman beneath the mask must always maintain anonymity if she hopes to avoid punishment, it opens previously closed paths; the very fact that disguise is an eternally open option means that society cannot completely enclose women.

The use of disguise is a common phenomenon in the theater of early modern Spain, yet it has received relatively little attention, in and of itself. While many studies

include the use of disguise in their discussion of other topics, there has been little analysis of how it actually functions within the works. In this study, I have attempted to highlight both how female disguise in Tirso de Molina functions, and what this means for the women who use it as a recourse. Functionally, disguise had been shown to exist on multiple levels, each of which has its own individual characteristics. Disguise allows a space to act, an area free of observation and naming, and thus acts as an unclaimed space which allows the woman to act outside of her socially prescribed role. This space is one which is used to change the course of the protagonist's life. Through disguise these women are able to right wrongs, reclaim lovers, verify fidelity and enact their fantasies. Disguise is an escape for women who feel restricted by society. Additionally we have seen how disguise allows for a shared creation of reality and the disguised and the spectator share in the task of shaping the character created by the mask.

This re-evaluation of disguise opens a neglected area of inquiry for the *comedia*. Because it is such a common phenomenon, critics may wish to consider whether other *comedia* authors present female disguise differently than does Tirso. Furthermore, the concepts presented can serve as an alternative to the presently dominant model which views cross-dressing in psycho-sexual terms. I believe that many such instances are better read as attempts to resist, subvert, and modify society. Finally, considerations of the space provided by disguise are needed. How does this unknown space relate to the mysterious and alluring Other? How does it provoke desire? How does it relate to the interstitial spaces that are revealed through criticism based on deconstruction? By focusing on the way in which women take advantage of previously existing patterns and adapt them to their needs by creating an interruption in the supposedly smooth flow of

society, Tirso urges us to gain a further understanding of how we relate to society, naming, and identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Lionel. *Metatheatre: A New Form of Dramatic Form*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1963.
- Ashcom, B. B. "Concerning 'La mujer en hábito de hombre' in the Comedia." *Hispanic Review* 28 (1960): 43-62.
- Arellano, Ignacio. "La máquina del poder en el teatro de Tirso de Molina." *Crítica Hispánica* 16 (1994): 59-84.
- . *Siete siglos de autores españoles*. Kassel: Reichenberger, 1991.
- Arellano, Ignacio, and Blanca Oteiza, eds. *Varia Lección de Tirso de Molina: Actas del VIII Seminario del Centro para la Edición de Clásicos Españoles*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Tirsonianos, 2000.
- Baker, Susan. "Personating Persons: Rethinking Shakespearian Disguises." *Shakespearean Quarterly* 43 (1992): 303-16.
- Blue, William R. "Effects of the Baroque: The Displacement of the Subject." *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures* 1 (1992): 7-23.
- . *Spanish Comedies and Historical Contexts in the 1620's*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1996.
- Brannigan, John. "Introduction: History, Power and Politics in the Literary Artifact." *Wolfreys* 417-27.
- Bravo-Villasante, Carmen. *La mujer vestida de hombre en el teatro español (Siglos XVI-XVII)*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería, 1976.
- Bushee, Alice H. "The Five Parts of Tirso de Molina." *Hispanic Review* 3.2 (1935): 89-102.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury 401-17.
- . "Sexual Inversions." *Stanton* 344-61.
- Canónica, Elvezio. "Del *Vergonzoso en palacio* a *El amor médico*: El camino hacia la ironía de Tirso de Molina frente a Lope de Vega." *Versants: Revue Suisse des Litteratures Romanes/Rivista Svizzera di Letterature Romanze/Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Romanische Literaturen* 17 (1990): 103-18.

- . "Tirso contra Lope: Imitación irónica de *La portuguesa* y *Dicha del amor forastero* en *El amor médico*." *Revista de Literatura* 52 (1990): 375-407.
- Casalduero, Joaquin. "Sentido y forma de *El vergonzoso en palacio*." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 15 (1961): 198-216
- Cascardi, Anthony J. *The Limits of Illusion: a Critical Study of Calderón*. New York: Cambridge U P, 1984.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha: Edición del IV Centenario*. Ed. José Manuel Blecua, Guillermo Rojo, José Antonio Pascual, et al. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2004.
- Chittenden, Jean S. "Daughters and their Fathers in Tirso's *Comedias*." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández 129-36.
- Cixous, Hélène. "Conversations" *Newton* 225-33.
- Conboy Katie, Nadia Medina, and Sarah Stanbury, eds. *Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia, 1997.
- Connor, Catherine. "Marriage and Subversion in Comedia Endings: Problems in Art and Society." *Stoll* 23-46.
- D'Antuono, Nancy. "Tirso de Molina and Italy: *La celosa de sí misma* and Its Italian Counterpart." *Romance Languages Annual* 10 (1998): 525-28.
- Dekker, Rudolf M., and Lotte C. van de Pol. *The Tradition of Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1989.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. "Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism." *Wilson and Dutton* 45-56.
- Donahue, Darcy. "The Androgynous Double and its Parodic Function in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández 175-82.
- Donovan, Josephine. "Beyond the Net: Feminist Criticism as a Moral Criticism." *Newton* 211-15.
- Ebert, Teresa L. "The Romance of Patriarchy: Ideology, Subjectivity, and Postmodern Feminist Cultural Theory." *Cultural Critique* 10 (1988): 19-57.
- Eiroa Rodríguez, Sofía. *Estudios de teatro del siglo de oro: Técnicas dramáticas de Tirso de Molina*. Murcia: U de Murcia, 2002.

- Elliott, John H. *Imperial Spain: 1469-1716*. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- Epstein, Julia, and Kristina Straub, eds. *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Erauso, Catalina de. *Historia de la Monja Alférez, Catalina de Erauso, escrita por ella misma*. Ed. Ángel Esteban. Madrid: Cátedra, 2002.
- . *Lieutenant Nun: Memoir of a Basque Transvestite in the New World*. Trans. Michele Stepto and Gabriel Stepto. Boston: Beacon P, 1996.
- Felman, Shoshana. *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1987.
- Fernández, Xavier A. *Las comedias de Tirso de Molina: Estudios y métodos de crítica textual por Xavier A. Fernández*. 3 vols. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 1991.
- Figure, Paul. "El disfraz varonil y la mujer en el teatro: su génesis, evolución y elaboración dramática en la obra de Tirso de Molina." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández 137-44.
- Forbes, F. William. "Tirso and the Feminine." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández 111-16.
- Forte, Jeanie. "Realism, Narrative and the Feminist Playwright." Keyssar 19-34.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1995.
- . *Fearless Speech*. Ed. Joseph Pearson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001.
- Fox, Dian, Harry Sieber, and Robert ter Horst, eds. *Studies in Honor of Bruce W. Wardropper*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1989.
- Freedman, Barbara. "Frame up: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, Theatre." Keyssar 78-108.
- Frye, Ellen "Meta-Imitation in the Comedia: *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*." *Comedia Performance: Journal of the Association for Hispanic Classical Theater* 1 (2004): 126-42.
- Galoppe, Raúl A. *Género y confusión en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Pliegos, 2001.
- Gijón, Esmeralda. "Concepto del honor y de la mujer en Tirso de Molina." *Tirso de Molina: ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. 480-655.

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Halkhoree, P. R. K. *Social and Literary Satire in the Comedias of Tirso de Molina*. Ed. José M. Ruano de la Haza and Henry W. Sullivan. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1989.
- Hernández García, Carmela. *Fondo y forma del teatro del siglo de oro*. Madrid: La Avispa, 1998.
- Hesse, Everett W. *The Comedia and Points of View*. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica, 1984.
- . *La mujer como víctima en la comedia y otros ensayos*. Barcelona: Puvill Libros, 1987.
- . "The Nature of the Complexity in Tirso's 'Don Gil'." *Hispania* 45 (1962): 389-94.
- Hornby, Richard. *Drama, Metadrama, and Perception*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1986.
- Hotchkiss, Valerie R. *Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing in Medieval Europe*. New York: Garland, 1996.
- Hull, Suzanne W. *Women according to Men: The World of Tudor-Stuart Women*. London: Altamira, 1996.
- Hunt, Lynn. "Foucault's Subject in the History of Sexuality." *Stanton* 78-93.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass. "Fetishizing Gender: Constructing the Hermaphrodite in Renaissance Europe." *Epstein and Straub* 80-111.
- Jung, Karl Gustav. *Aspects of the Feminine*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. London: Ark Paperbacks, 1986.
- . *The Essential Jung*. Ed. Anthony Storr. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.
- . *Four Archetypes : Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster*. Trans. R. F.C. Hull. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Kamen, Henry. *Spain 1469-1714: A Society of Conflict*. New York: Longman, 1991.
- Kennedy, Ruth L. "The Dates of *El amor médico* and *Escarmientos para el cuerdo* (Tirso's supposed trip to Portugal in 1619)." *Reflexión 2: Primera Revista de Cultura Hispánica en Canadá*. 1 (1972): 11-33.
- . *Studies in Tirso, I: The Dramatist and his Competitors, 1620-26*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Department of Romance Languages, 1974.

- Keyssar, Helene. "Drama and the Dialogic Imagination: *The Heidi Chronicles* and *Fefu and her Friends*." Keyssar 109-36.
- , ed. *Feminist Theatre and Theory*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1996.
- . "Realism, Narrative and the Feminist Playwright." Keyssar 19-34.
- Kimbrough, Robert. "Androgyny Seen Through Shakespeare's Disguise." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 17-33.
- Larson, Catherine. "New Clothes, New Roles: Disguise and the Subversion of Convention in Tirso and Sor Juana." *Romance Languages Annual* 1 (1989): 500-04.
- Lauer, Robert A. and Henry W. Sullivan, eds. *Hispanic Essays in Honor of Frank P. Casa*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Lindauer, Martin S. *The Psychological Study of Literature: Limitations, Possibilities and Accomplishments*. Chicago: Nelson, 1974.
- Lipmann, Stephen. "Metatheater" and the Criticism of the Comedia." *Modern Language Notes*. 91 (1976): 231-246.
- López Estrada, Francisco. "La arcadia de Lope en la escena de Tirso." *Ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. 303-20.
- Macedo Soares, José Carlos de. "Tirso de Molina." *Tirso de Molina: ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. 671-86.
- McDonald, Cathy. "The Semiotics of Disguise in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Theatre." *Journal of Literary Studies/ Tydskrif Vir Literatuurwetenskap* 1 (1985): 57-77.
- McInnis, Meghan E., and McInnis, Judy B. "Still the Oedipal Bind: An Analysis of Don Juan de Marco and Its Sources." *Hispanófila* 132 (2001): 69-86.
- McKendrick, Melveena. *Theatre in Spain: 1490-1700*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- . *Woman and Society in the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age: A Study of the Mujer varonil*. London: Cambridge UP, 1974.
- Molina, Tirso de. *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. Ed. Alonzo Zamora Vicente. Madrid: Castalia, 1990.
- . *El amor médico*. Ed. Blanca Oteiza. Navarra: GRISO; Madrid: Estudios, 1997.

- . *La celosa de sí misma*. Ed. David Hildner. Electronic file at <http://www.trinity.edu/org/comedia/textlist.html#Tirso>. Dated 2003.
- . *Obras dramáticas completas*. Ed. Blanca de los Ríos. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Madrid: Aguilar, 1989.
- Newton, K. M., ed. *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1997.
- O'Connor, Thomas Austin. "Is the Spanish Comedia a Metatheater?" *Hispanic Review*, 43 (1975): 275-89.
- . "Metatheater and the *Comedia*: A Further Comment." *Modern Language Notes*. 92 (1977): 336-38.
- . *Love in the 'Corral': Conjugal Spirituality and Anti-theatrical Polemic in Early Modern Spain*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Oteiza, Blanca. "¿Conocemos los textos verdaderos de Tirso de Molina?" Arellano and Oteiza 99-128.
- . "Recepción de Tirso de Molina en el siglo XIX: *El amor médico* y *Celos con celos se curan*." *Estudios* 189-190 (1995): 213-35.
- Palomo Vázquez, Pilar. "La creación dramática de Tirso de Molina: Comedias de enredo." 1998. Electronic file at <http://www.ucm.es/info/especulo/numero8/palomo3.htm> Dated 1998.
- Parr, James A. "Selected Evidence for Tirso's Authorship of *El burlador de Sevilla* y *convidado de piedra*." Lauer and Sullivan 156-64.
- Penado Rey, Manuel. "Tirso de Molina: Aportaciones biográficas." *Tirso de Molina: ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. 19-122.
- Pendzik, Susana. "Female Presence in Tirso's *El burlador de Sevilla*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 47.2 (1995): 165-81.
- Perry, Mary Elizabeth. "Behind the Veil: Moriscos and the Politics of Resistance and Survival." Sánchez and Saint-Saëns 37-53.
- . *Gender and Disorder in Early Modern Seville*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.
- "Prague, Defenestration of." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. 2006. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. 13 Jan. 2006
<<http://search.eb.com.proxy.library.vanderbilt.edu/eb/article-9061173>>.

- Progoff, Ira. *Jung's Psychology and Its Social Meaning*. New York: Doubleday, 1973.
- Ramet, Sabrina Petra, ed. *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Rhodes, Elizabeth. "Gender and the Monstrous in *El burlador de Sevilla*." *MLN* 117.2 (2002): 267-85.
- Robbins, Ruth "Introduction: Will the Real Feminist Theory Please Stand Up?" *Wolfreys* 49-58.
- Romera-Navarro M[iguel]. "Las disfrazadas de varón en la comedia." *Hispanic Review* 2.4 (1934): 269-86.
- Sánchez, Magdalena S., and Alain Saint-Saëns. *Spanish Women in the Golden Age*. Westport: Greenwood P, 1996.
- Simerka, Barbara. *Discourses of Empire: Counter-Epic Literature in Early Modern Spain*. University Park: Pennsylvania State U P, 2003.
- . "Homosexuality and Dramatic Conflict: A Reconsideration of Early Modern Spanish Comedy." *Hispanic Review* 70.4 (2002): 521-33.
- Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.
- Smith, Dawn L. "*La celosa de sí misma*; A Comedy in Spite of Itself." *Romance Languages Annual* 10 (1998): 827-31.
- . "Women and Men in a World Turned Upside-Down: An Approach to Three Plays by Tirso." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 247-60.
- Solà-Solé, Josep M., and Luis Vázquez Fernández, eds. *Tirso de Molina: Vida y obra: Actas del I Simposio Internacional sobre Tirso*. Madrid: Revista "Estudios", 1987.
- Stanton, Domna C. *Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992.
- Stoll, Anita K. "Cross-dressing in Tirso's *El amor médico* [Love, the Doctor] and *El Aquiles* [Achilles]." *Stoll* 86-108.
- . "Do Clothes Make the Man? Gender and Identity Fluidity in Tirso's Plays." *Romance Languages Annual* 10 (1998): 832-35.

- . ed. *Gender, Identity, and Representation in Spain's Golden Age*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2000.
- Straub, Kristina. "The Guilty Pleasures of Female Theatrical Cross-Dressing and the Autobiography of Charlotte Charke." Epstein and Straub 142-66.
- Strier, Richard. *Resistant Structures: Particularity, Radicalism, and Renaissance Texts*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- Stroud, Matthew D. *The Play in the Mirror: Lacanian Perspectives on Spanish Baroque Theater*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1996.
- Sullivan, Henry W. "Love, Matrimony and Desire in the Theatre of Tirso de Molina." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 37.1 (1985): 83-99.
- . "Sibling Symmetry and the Incest Taboo in Tirso's *Habladme en entrando*." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 261-78.
- . *Tirso de Molina and the Drama of the Counter Reformation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1981.
- . "Tirso de Molina: Dramaturgo andrógino." *Actas del quinto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*. Bordeaux: U de Bordeaux, 1977. 811-18.
- Thacker, Jonathan. *Role-Play and the World as Stage in the Comedia*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2002.
- Tirso de Molina: ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. Madrid: Revista "Estudios", 1949.
- Urzáiz Tortajada, Héctor. *Catálogo de autores teatrales del siglo XVII*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 2002.
- Varey, J. E. "Dona Juana, personaje de *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, de Tirso de Molina." Fox, Sieber, and ter Horst 359-69.
- Vázquez Fernández, Luis. "Apuntes para una nueva biografía de Tirso." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández 9-50.
- Vega Carpio, Félix Lope de. *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*. http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/servlet/SirveObras/01159174321149352989924/p0000001.htm#I_1. Accessed July 29, 2004.
- Vega, Germán. "Tirso en sueltas: Notas sobre difusión impresa y recuperación textual." Arellano and Oteiza 177-220.

Velasco, Sherry. *The Lieutenant Nun: Transgenderism, Lesbian Desire, & Catalina de Erauso*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2000.

Vossler, Karl. *Lecciones sobre Tirso*. Madrid: Taurus, 1965.

Wade, Gerald E. "Tirso de Molina." *Tirso de Molina: ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del Padre Maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. 205-21.

Weimann, Robert. "Textual Authority and Performative Agency: The Uses of Disguise in Shakespeare's Theater." *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 25 (1994): 789-808.

Wilson, Edward M, and Duncan Moir, eds. *A Literary History of Spain: The Golden Age Drama 1492-1700*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971.

Wilson, Richard. "Introduction: Historicizing New Historicism." Wilson and Dutton 1-18.

---, eds. *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*. London: Longman, 1992.

Wolfreys, Julian, ed. *Literary Theories: A Reader and Guide*. New York: New York UP, 1999