Roy Norton

Merton College

A critical edition of Lope de Vega's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* with an introductory study

Doctor of Philosophy

A critical edition of Lope de Vega's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* with an introductory study

Roy Norton – Merton College

Doctor of Philosophy – Trinity Term 2013

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a first critical edition of Lope de Vega's saint's play *San Nicolás de Tolentino* (*c.* 1614) alongside an introductory study. The text is based on the sole seventeenth-century witness. The four modern re-prints/editions of the play have been consulted to help remedy defects in the *princeps*, which has been edited in accordance with the current practices of *comedia* editors. Variants are collated in a list following the playtext. Footnotes to the text explain the important complexities and obscurities of *San Nicolás* and some idiosyncrasies of Golden-Age literature generally.

The introductory study has six sections. The first pieces together a history of the veneration of St Nicholas in Spain, detailing the miracles and patronages that might have led Lope to compose this play of his own accord or that might have led to a commission. Internal evidence suggests strongly that any commission must have come specifically from the Discalced Augustinians. The second section examines Lope's possible sources, concluding tentatively that Critana's *Vida* is the most likely source. Sections 3 and 4 present an interpretation of the protagonists – Nicolás and the *gracioso* Ruperto. My comparison of Lope's Nicolás with the saint depicted in the hagiographies casts into relief techniques Lope used to prevent this prodigious miracle-worker from alienating the audience. The *gracioso* character, I argue, is intended to offer a model of Christian piety of a humbler kind: one significant factual departure from the hagiographic tradition places Ruperto at the forefront of the play's religious purpose. However, a couple of comically lewd scenes in Act 2 (unmentioned by previous critics) make for a complex *gracioso* struggling to resist temptation. I argue that Ruperto's inner turmoil might reflect Lope's own sense of unworthiness as he prepared for priestly ordination. Section 5 treats the supernatural in *San Nicolás*, demonstrating Lope's familiarity with early modern theories of supernatural phenomenology and concluding that, despite the typically allegorical names of Ira, Carne, and Inobediencia, for example, these figures are intended, not as literary abstractions, but as real spirits, incorporeal demons. The final section presents an analysis of the play's versification, which is largely in keeping with Lope's usual habits.

A critical edition of Lope de Vega's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* with an introductory study

Roy Norton – Merton College

Doctor of Philosophy – Trinity Term 2013

LONGER ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a first critical edition of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, a saint's play written by Lope de Vega around 1614. Lope wrote approximately twenty-five saints' plays but, despite the enthusiasm with which this sub-genre of the *comedia nueva* was reputedly embraced by the theatre-going public in Spain around the turn of the seventeenth century, there exist very few critical editions of these *comedias de santos* and they have inspired a relative dearth of critical studies. *San Nicolás de Tolentino* is in many ways a typical example of seventeenth-century saint's play dramaturgy as practised by Lope, and so a good critical edition should be a valuable contribution to *comedia* scholarship. In other ways, however – particularly in the carefully developed character of the *gracioso*, Ruperto – it is untypical and it permits the drawing of interesting hypotheses concerning Lope's rather humane evangelizing aesthetic.

The text of the edition is based on what my research has found to be the sole Golden-Age witness of the play, included in the *Veinticuatro parte perfecta de las comedias del Fénix de España frey Lope Félix de Vega Carpio* (Zaragoza: Pedro Verges, 1641), of which I examined nine copies, six in the Biblioteca Nacional de España, and three in the British Library. The four modern re-prints/editions of the play have been consulted to help remedy defects in the *princeps*, which has been edited in accordance with the current practices of *comedia* editors, taking into particular account the recommendations of the PROLOPE Group based at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and those of Professor Ignacio Arellano in his *Editar a Calderón* (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2007). Variants are collated in a list following the playtext. Footnotes to the text explain the important cultural and linguistic complexities and obscurities of *San Nicolás* and also some idiosyncrasies of Golden-Age literature generally. The footnotes cast light interestingly on the very substantial influence of Scripture and of patristic texts on Lope's dramatic craft during this period when he was preparing for his priestly ordination. They explain the play's engagement with matters of contemporary religious controversy, for example the efficacy of last-minute repentance or the perceived laxity of some monastic communities. Perhaps most usefully they explain and justify my editorial interventions, where I correct errors in the *princeps* (probably printers' errors in the main). The notes also explain why, often, the editorial interventions of earlier editors have been misguided, for instance, their taking the 'tornau, tornau' at the end of Act 1 as a misprint of the second-person plural imperative 'tornad', missing the point that the spelling is meant to replicate the meow of the cat mentioned immediately before in the dialogue. My editorial interventions have, I think, resulted in an improved playtext and the critical apparatus should ensure that readers can pick up on allusions (and often puns) that

might be easily overlooked by those unfamiliar with Hispanic culture of the period and, in particular, the conventions of the saint's play sub-genre.

The introductory study that accompanies the playtext has six sections. The first pieces together a history of the veneration of St Nicholas of Tolentino (lived *c.* 1246-1305, canonized in 1446) in medieval and early modern Spain, detailing the miracles and patronages that might have led Lope to compose this play of his own accord or that might have led to a commission. This section of my study represents the first attempt to place Lope's *San Nicolás* into its historical context and draws together fragments of historical data from an extensive range of sources, several unpublished and available for consultation only at Madrid's Biblioteca Nacional. It sets out evidence that suggests that Nicholas of Tolentino was relatively well known in Golden-Age Spain. Veneration of Nicholas was promoted in the Iberian peninsula from the fifteenth century by the growing Augustinian Order of which he was the first member to be canonized. For example, the 1554 *Historia*, a piece of Augustinian propaganda, in which the saint features prominently, was published in part to extend his reputation; and the church attached to the Augustinian Recollect priory in Granada is known to have contained no fewer than three visual representations of Nicholas, which would have increased the local public's familiarity with his iconography. Nicholas's reputation and popularity was founded upon his status as an influential advocate of the Holy Souls of Purgatory and his *panecillos* – miracle-working breads that, according to contemporary accounts, were credited with great wonders, such as the saving of the Galician town of Pontedeume from a devastating fire. Most famously Nicholas's intercession is said to have saved Córdoba from the plague in 1602. And one historian suggests, tantalizingly, that his intercession was credited with curing Philip II of a serious illness.

There exists evidence that at least four of Lope's *comedias de santos* were commissioned and the first section of my introductory study continues with an account of what is known about Lope's religious *comedias de encargo* and analyses the likelihood of *San Nicolás* also having been the product of a commission. Whilst no external evidence of this commissioning has been identified to date, evidence internal to the play suggests that, if it was commissioned, it was almost certainly paid for by the Discalced Augustinians rather than the Calced. This could lead one to doubt the claims made by earlier scholars that Lope's commission might have come from Madrid's Calced San Felipe priory. I explain how a more likely source of a hypothetical commission is the Discalced Convento de Recoletos Agustinos in Madrid, inaugurated, belatedly, in 1620: whilst there is no concrete evidence linking the commission of *San Nicolás* to this priory, Lope is known to have written a poem which honours Nicholas of Tolentino to celebrate the transfer of the Holy Sacrament to the priory church.

The second section of the study begins by considering the date of composition of the play, clearing up a point of confusion among scholars concerning the inclusion of the play in the second of Lope's *Peregrino* lists. It then sets out the state of the question of Lope's sources for *San Nicolás*, proceeding to examine the hagiographies that Lope might have used as the factual basis for his play. Twenty possible sources, in Latin, Spanish, and Italian, are considered. By calculating the percentage of factual details present in *San Nicolás* also present in the individual hagiographies (with results shown in tabular form), I conclude tentatively that, if Lope used a single source only, the most likely is González de Critana's

Vida y milagros del glorioso confesor san Nicolás de Tolentino (Barcelona, 1612), which shows a ninety-six per cent convergence with the apparently factual details contained in Lope's play. This confirms the findings of the 2011 study by Aragüés Aldaz, of which I became aware after I had reached my own conclusion. Usefully, the grounds upon which I reach the same conclusion as Aragüés are slightly different from his.

The identification of Critana's *Vida* as Lope's most likely source allows us to identify the elements of *San Nicolás* that are the product of Lope's imagination rather than the hagiographic record, for instance: all episodes that focus on the *gracioso*, Ruperto, and the *criada*, Celia; Ursino's romantic tryst with Laurencia; the emotive reunion between Nicolás and the souls of his parents, suffering in the fires of Purgatory; the 'allegorical' embodiments of evil (e.g. Inobediencia and Ira), the devil's henchmen; and the detail that the doctor who treats Nicolás at the end of Act 2 is Jewish.

Sections 3 and 4 of the introductory study present an interpretation of the protagonists of *San Nicolás* – Nicolás himself and the *gracioso*, Ruperto. Section 3 begins with a consideration of the evangelizing efficacy of the *comedias de santos* (which relied largely on their affective pull) and the grounds for their popularity (to an extent down to the inclusion of profane elements and the extensive use of theatrical *tramoyas*), in particular at the very start of the seventeenth century, around the time of the *Dictamen* that sought to prohibit immorality in the theatre. I proceed to examine Lope's use of the hagiographic record, considering what his careful deployment of it and his departures from it suggest about his dramatic intentions. My comparison of Lope's Nicolás with the saint depicted in the hagiographies casts into relief techniques Lope used to prevent, ultimately, this prodigious miracle-worker from alienating his audience. The Nicolás presented to the spectator in the opening scene, though, is an awkward, serious character whose sermonizing infuriates his more worldly friends. He is not, I argue, an individual to whom the spectator is likely easily to have warmed and there is evidence, which I set out and analyse, to suggest that Lope's presentation of sainthood in *San Nicolás* is subtler than the straightforward encomium of the prose hagiographies. Lope modifies the hagiographic record to maximize the chances of his protagonist fulfilling his edificatory function, initially conditioning the audience to find his piety frustrating, alongside his fictional friends, but ultimately leading the spectator to the realization that his sympathy with the less reputable characters (especially Ursino) was misplaced and guiding him to develop respect and then affection for the saint. I show that this process is a gradual one. In order to ease the spectator into an appreciation of the saint's benevolent humanity, Lope downplays a number of the miracles staged, altering details and providing muted responses from witnesses; only once time has been allowed to make the spectator comfortable with the protagonist's humanity does Lope deploy the play's more spectacular miracles, demonstrating the awesome otherness of Nicolás, who exists in a liminal world straddling heaven and earth.

Lope's techniques as a saint's play dramatist involved the supplementing of the hagiographic accounts on which he based his *comedias de santos* with features more usually associated with the secular drama of the period; sometimes these profane elements constituted entire secondary plots. If, despite Lope's imaginative re-casting of Nicholas of Tolentino, the spectator found the saint too intimidating a model of Christian piety, the *gracioso* – entirely imagined by Lope and a conventional feature of the secular theatre – was

created by the dramatist, I argue, as an alternative model of piety as well as the supplier of comic relief. Ruperto offers a template for Christian goodness of a humbler kind than Nicolás. Several details in the play suggest this. Most significant is one clear factual departure from the hagiographic tradition, which departure places Ruperto at the forefront of the play's religious purpose: as I demonstrate, Lope changes the historically attested subject of the sermon at the end of Act 1 (confirmed by all the hagiographies examined that mention it) to one that clearly speaks to the *gracioso* rather than the *santo*: the Parable of the Prodigal Son. The attempt to cast Ruperto as a self-aware, penitent sinner ripe for conversion is made even clearer by the description of the *gracioso* as an *oveja*, an allusion to the Parable of the Lost Sheep. I have identified, however, that a couple of Ruperto's scenes in Act 2 are filled with extremely vulgar erotic innuendo (now obscure and unmentioned by previous critics of the play), which sorely tempts him. This tension in the character of Ruperto makes for a realistically complex *gracioso*. I argue that Ruperto's inner turmoil might reflect in some way Lope's own sense of unworthiness as he prepared to become a priest around the time he was composing *San Nicolás.* The play suggests Lope might be an optimist, though: at the end of Act 3, the *gracioso* appears sober and devout. I suggest that, in this, Lope's saint's play evokes a compassionate strain of Golden-Age Spanish Catholicism often obscured behind the period's reputation for cold, reactionary fundamentalism rooted in accounts of the excesses of the Inquisition.

The penultimate section of the study considers the supernatural in *San Nicolás*, demonstrating Lope's familiarity with theories of supernatural phenomenology (present in Aquinas, Teresa of Ávila, and Manescal, for instance), a matter commented upon in the *comedia* by the devil, who, at a moment of extreme frustration, insists that, were he not a purely spiritual being (with no bodily existence) he would scratch out his own eyes! The study focuses in particular on the characters that are often described as allegorical. These figures can be understood in a variety of ways, depending on the diegetic level at which the action develops, but I conclude – through an analysis of the detail of their presentation in the playtext – that, despite the typically allegorical names of Ira, Carne, and Inobediencia, for example, usually indicative of abstract personifications, these figures are intended, generally in *San Nicolás*, not as literary abstractions – not as allegories properly so called – but as real spirits, incorporeal demons that play their part in the saint's *bellum intestinum*. In this, Lope's saint's play differs from the *autos sacramentales* of the period, in which such figures can coherently be understood as allegories.

The final section of the introductory study presents a full analysis of the play's versification – an analysis of a kind that critics are often keen to see (one that goes beyond the supply of the typical synoptic table), but which is seldom supplied. My examination of Lope's versificatory techniques in *San Nicolás* demonstrate that these are largely in keeping with his usual habits (as defined by Diego Marín), though, interestingly, with sonnets used only for Nicolás's prayers, and the splendid *octavas reales* verse form reserved for the devil's menacing soliloquies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Study

1. The veneration of St Nicholas of Tolentino in Golden-Age Spain and the *comedia de encargo* p. 1

2. The date and sources of Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* p. 21

3. Lope's Nicolás: a case of hagiographiction p. 40

4. 'Con igual rostro recibe los menudos y la plata': Ruperto and Lope's devotional aesthetic p. 69

5. 'Si no fuera espíritu me rasgara los ojos': the supernatural in *San Nicolás* p. 87

6. The versification of *San Nicolás* p. 103

Critical Edition

A. A note on textual history and editorial criteria p. 127

B. List of abbreviations p. 129

C. *San Nicolás de Tolentino*:

- *Dramatis personae* list p. 130
- Act 1 p. 131
- Act 2 p. 165
- Act 3 p. 206

D. List of variants p. 239

E. List of notes p. 245

F. Appendices:

- 1: List of sources consulted p. 256
- 2: Table of factual details in *San Nicolás* also present in sources p. 258
- 3: Overview of action p. 262
- 4: Synopsis of versification p. 268
- 5: Illustration of verse-form usage p. 272

Bibliography p. 273

1. The veneration of St Nicholas of Tolentino in Golden-Age Spain and the *comedia de encargo*[*]

As Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* draws to a close, following the hero's glorious apotheosis, the prior of the Augustinian house at Tolentino, where Nicolás spends the final years of his life, directly addresses the audience, the 'senado', in the manner characteristic of *comedia nueva* endings. Word of Nicolás's death having spread, the locals are making their way to the priory in droves, intent on venerating their 'santo' and thereby initiating the cult that, historically, received official sanction with the canonization of Nicholas of Tolentino in 1446.[1] Although the prior of Lope's play is struck by the crowd's expressions of love for Nicolás, he considers them entirely fitting:

> Bien le debe Tolentino
> ese amor, ese cuidado,
> y toda Italia, y el mundo,
> pues con milagros tan raros
> en todas las partes dél
> conocen su nombre santo. (ll. 3072-3077)

The prior's claim that the name of St Nicholas of Tolentino (*c*.1246-1305) has universal recognition may strike the modern reader as exaggerated, even allowing for the

[*] The six sections of this introductory study focus on the topics that I consider most interesting and most helpful for an understanding of *San Nicolás* within the context of the *comedia de santos* tradition. Due to limitations of space, some topics conventionally treated in introductions to Golden-Age plays (for example, minor characters or imagery) are omitted. The footnotes that accompany the playtext deal with these topics where appropriate.

[1] The canonical process that led to Nicholas's canonization was initiated by papal bull *Pater luminum et misericordiarum* dated 23 May 1325, and between 23 July and 28 September of the same year 371 witnesses were examined (the figure is 365, if one excludes witnesses listed twice). The enquiry was complete by 5 September 1326 and the compendium of evidence was delivered to the pope soon after. However, Nicholas was not canonized until 5 June 1446. The delay is thought attributable to 'the struggle then going on between the Church and the Empire and other unfavourable circumstances' (Gutiérrez 1984, p. 123). Indeed, Pope Eugene IV, who eventually canonized Nicholas, believed that the saint had interceded to resolve one of these 'unfavourable circumstances', the Great Schism of the Western Church (Carmona Moreno 2005, p. 604). References in this thesis to 'Nicholas' are to the historical figure; Lope's fictionalized saint is referred to throughout as 'Nicolás'.

hyperbole to be expected of a panegyric play that could well have been commissioned, in part, as Augustinian propaganda. But the world that the modern reader inhabits is indisputably more secular and more sceptical of supernatural religion than the one for which Lope de Vega composed this saint's play, one of twenty-five he is thought to have written.[2] By contrast, Counter-Reformation Spain was steeped in the veneration and invocation of saints, traditional practices encouraged by the Roman Catholic Church, indeed prescribed by the decrees of the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent. For Lope and his Catholic contemporaries it was a matter of faith that 'the saints [...] offer up their prayers to God for men [and] that it is good and beneficial suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, assistance and support in order to obtain favours from God' (*Canons* 1978, p. 218). If the name of Nicholas of Tolentino is virtually unknown today, evidence pertaining to his cult in early modern Europe lends credibility to the prior's contention that the name was known 'en todas las partes [del mundo]' and was often invoked in past times, in Tolentino in 1305, the year of Nicholas's death, and beyond Tolentino, certainly in Spain, in the centuries that followed.

The same evidence also supports the notion that the prime basis for the considerable popularity of this medieval Augustinian friar was his fame as an invoker of what Lope's prior refers to as his 'milagros tan raros'; 301 miracles are verified by the record of the canonization process (Radi 2004, p. 31).[3] Two particular thaumaturgical specialisms were especially important in inspiring devotion to Nicholas. One was his ability to liberate souls from purgatory through intercession with God (highly desirable in

[2] Morley and Bruerton consider that twenty-five saints' plays are authentic Lope de Vega *comedias* (1968).
[3] Commenting on the reasons why so many pilgrims made the journey to Nicholas's tomb at Tolentino in the years immediately following his death, Radi affirms that their interest in the saint 'era generato più che dalla santità, riservata e umile [...], dal clamore dei suoi miracoli' (2004, p. 90), 'was generated, more than by his saintliness, reserved and humble [...], by news of his miracles'. (Translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.) Similarly, Carmona Moreno holds that 'El Santo de Tolentino estuvo rodeado desde el principio de un alo de taumaturgo, cosa que le hacía más atractivo entre la gente del pueblo [de la Aldea de San Nicolás]', referring to one of the first Spanish towns to bear the saint's name (2005, pp. 633-634).

a Spain afflicted by what has been described as an early modern 'salvation panic').[4] The other was the supernatural power with which Nicholas's *panecillos* were imbued. A gift to Nicholas from the Virgin Mary, these small discs of blessed bread could miraculously cure the sick and avert natural disaster (Iturbe Sáiz 2006, pp. 118-119). Unsurprisingly, both of these widely celebrated elements of Nicholas's hagiography feature prominently in Lope's saint's play: Act 3 ends spectacularly with a dramatization of the first, and Acts 2 and 3, of the second. Both of these elements of Nicholas's hagiography contributed to the saint's general reputation during the early modern period as an extraordinarily prolific miracle worker, a reputation that lies behind the epithet given to Nicolás by the prior in the final line of Lope's play: 'el santo de los milagros.'

In Spain, veneration of St Nicholas of Tolentino seems first to have taken hold – probably in the fifteenth century – in towns and villages lying in the vicinity of the Augustinian Order's numerous foundations.[5] One source from around 1604 – ten years before the likely date of the composition of Lope's play – gives 180 as the number of Augustinian houses present on the Iberian peninsula (the number having increased substantially since the mid-sixteenth century, when there were around 105).[6] Many of these had a chapel dedicated to Nicholas, who was the first member of that Order to

[4] The phrase was coined by Michael MacDonald (1981) and applied to Spain's Golden Age by Margaret Rees (1991). The various *cofradías* set up in his name tend to confirm that Nicholas's association with the souls of purgatory lies behind his significant following in early modern Spain. One of his hagiographers, Jerónimo Román, notes how 'por diversas partes del reino se hacen cofradías en nombre suyo para socorro de las ánimas', for instance (1590, fol. A3^{r}).

[5] Carmona Moreno suggests that the first Spanish town to name Nicholas as its patron could have been the Aldea de San Nicolás, which, he posits, grew up near a hermitage established by the Augustinians on the west coast of Gran Canaria, following a visit by the Order's missionaries, who accompanied Majorcan merchants on one of their commercial journeys to the Canary Islands, probably around 1452, though evidence is scarce (2005, pp. 632-633).

[6] Gutiérrez notes that there was a 'great increase in foundations and vocations after 1518' in Iberia (1979, p. 108). These figures come from Gutiérrez's history of the Augustinian Order; they are the sums of the figures he gives from the 1541 Seripando catalogue and the *c.*1604 Fabriani list for the Order's four Iberian provinces: Spain (eventually divided into Castile and Andalusia), Catalonia-Aragon, Portugal, and the Spanish territories falling within the province of Sardinia (1979, pp. 86-87, 90-94, 104 & 243). The figures may not be entirely reliable and they are controversial; Iturbe Sáiz estimates the number of Augustinian houses existing in Spain between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries at 'oltre 200', 'over 200' (2006, p. 117).

receive the supreme honour of canonization, and so a potent symbol both of God's favour towards the Augustinians and of the great intercessory influence that at least one of its members had with God. As the Augustinians' first saint, Nicholas was vastly important to the Order's identity and the Order was keen to promote his cult, partly, surely, as a means of raising the profile or asserting the prestige of the whole Augustinian family: 'se le ha considerado como el hijo más grande de san Agustín, el modelo acabado del fraile mendicante agustino, más aún, como el icono de la identidad carismática agustiniana' (Benítez Sánchez 2008, p. 885).

Around these monasteries and convents, and particularly in the churches attached to them, the laity would have enjoyed the regular sight of prints, paintings and sculptures of Nicholas (these being particularly numerous in Golden-Age Spain, according to Iturbe Sáiz) and they would have learned something of the saint's life and miracles from them.[7] Mujica argues that iconographic depictions of this kind (she is discussing the case of Teresa of Ávila) were influential in raising public awareness of a saint's life and miracles, more so, even, than written hagiographies (2008, p. 187), and the homogeneity and idiosyncrasy of Nicholas's iconography in Spain must have made the saint easily recognizable (Iturbe Sáiz 2006, p. 117).

Knowledge of Nicholas gleaned by the faithful from visual representations would have been supplemented orally, in particular during the course of the laity's dealings with members of this mendicant order whose *frailes* (not cloistered monks, but friars able to circulate more freely) were responsible, jointly with the secular clergy, for ministering to

[7] The Tridentine decrees instruct that 'great profit is derived from all holy images, not only because the people are thereby reminded of the benefits and gifts bestowed on them by Christ, but also because through the saints the miracles of God and salutary examples are set before the eyes of the faithful, so that they may give God thanks for those things, may fashion their own life and conduct in imitation of the saints and be moved to adore and love God and cultivate piety' (*Canons* 1978, p. 219). Iturbe Sáiz considers that the quantity and variety of images of St Nicholas present in Golden-Age Spain's Augustinian houses was especially impressive (2006, p. 117). In the church attached to Granada's Recollect priory, for example, there were at least three images of Nicholas of Tolentino: one on the choir lectern; a carved statue on the side of the tabernacle; and a medium-sized portrait displayed in the main body of the church (Barrios Rozúa 2001).

the people by preaching and administering the sacrament of reconciliation.[8] It seems likely that personal devotion to Nicholas would have been encouraged among the laity by local *agustinos*, proud of their Order's paragon.[9] And formal veneration would have reached its annual climax around Nicholas's feast day, 10 September, with special masses, cycles of prayer, processions and the blessing of his miracle-working *panecillos*, all commonly organized by the many local *cofradías* dedicated to him. It is likely too that devotional materials bearing images of, and prayers to, St Nicholas would have been printed (and made available for purchase at low cost) to coincide with these festivities.[10] This, then, is likely to represent the general pattern for the spread of devotion to St Nicholas of Tolentino in Spain, a devotion that continued to expand across the peninsula (and to the New World) during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as new Augustinian foundations were inaugurated, for example: San Felipe el Real in Madrid in 1547; the house at Segovia in 1548; La Magdalena and Santa Isabel la Real in Madrid in 1560 or 1574 and 1589, respectively; the Colegio de Nuestra Señora de la Encarnación, known as the Colegio de Doña María de Aragón, founded in 1590; the *convento de san Agustín* in Madrid in 1592; the monastery at Felanitx, Majorca in 1603; the discalced monastery in Granada's Albaicín in 1613; Queen Margarita's foundation for discalced nuns – Madrid's Monasterio de la Encarnación – founded in 1611 and consecrated in 1616; and the first monastery in Madrid for the friars of the Order's reformed branch, the *agustinos recoletos*,

[8] According to Ricardo Arias, the typical Spaniard of the Golden Age gained theological knowledge from sermons, monstrances, catechisms, poetry, emblem books, and sacred music *inter alia* (see Morrison 2000, p. 8).

[9] Gutiérrez holds that '[Nicholas] and St Rita of Cascia are the saints whose names are most commonly attached to the churches of the Order throughout the world' (1984, p. 125). Carmona Moreno's comments suggest that this general observation held true in Spain during the late Middle Ages: '[e]n los conventos agustinianos, que eran ya [por 1452] numerosos en España, sobre todo en los dominios de Castilla y Aragón, los hijos de San Agustín mantenían ferviente culto a San Nicolás' (2005, p. 633).

[10] The *Gozos a san Nicolás* held by the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (catalogue references: VE/1445/2; VE/1445/70; & VE/1445/71) are likely to be typical examples, though these are nineteenth century.

initially founded back in 1592, but finally inaugurated in 1620.[11] So, during Lope's lifetime, centres of devotion to the saint were growing in number and in geographical spread. This is likely to have increased the saint's fame. Nicholas's profile must have been further enhanced by the many miracles attributed in Spain to his intercession, including several during the early part of the seventeenth century, the decades of Lope's career when he produced the vast majority of his *comedias de santos*. (Indeed, according to Morley and Bruerton's estimates, only one of Lope's saints' plays, *San Segundo*, definitely pre-dates the 1598 *Real Cédula*, which prohibited the performance of profane plays (Garasa 1960, pp. 5-6).) Three miracles may stand as typical examples.

Nicholas's most famous Spanish miracle was worked in Córdoba in 1602. Plague struck that city on 21 September 1601 and had ravaged the population for nearly a year when, on 10 September 1602, the clergy joined in solemn, expiatory procession through the streets, holding aloft a large crucifix and a statue of St Nicholas, with two baskets of his blessed *panecillos* carried behind. According to contemporary accounts, the figure of Christ, initially nailed to the cross, broke free and reached out towards the statue of Nicholas, embracing him tenderly as a sign that the saint's intercessions on behalf of Córdoba had pleased God, who would grant Nicholas's prayer for an end to the plague. The plague did end and it is said that those suffering its effects were cured by the

[11] Details pertaining to the foundation of these houses can be found, variously, at: San Felipe el Real (Araujo-Costa 1952, p. 18); the house at Segovia, for which permission was granted in 1548 (Gutiérrez 1979, p. 89); La Magdalena and Santa Isabel (Sánchez Hernández 1986, p. 48 & Martínez Cuesta 1995, pp. 161-162); the Colegio (Sánchez Hernández 1986, p. 49); San Agustín in Madrid (Sánchez Hernández 1986, p. 45); Felanitx (Benítez Sánchez 2008, p. 899); the Granada Discalced monastery (Barrio Rozúa 2001, p. 151); the Monasterio de la Encarnación (Sánchez Hernández 1986, p. 50 & Pinelo 1931, p. 115); and Madrid's Convento de Recoletos Agustinos (Díaz Moreno and Lopezosa Aparicio 1999, p. 189). Gutiérrez holds that, in the province of Spain (that is, once divided from Andalusia, the kingdom of León, the two Castiles, the Basque regions and Navarre) 'the Augustinians [...] multiplied their institutions throughout [the sixteenth] century', a century he refers to as their 'golden age' in Spain (1979, pp. 87-88). Whilst the Order began to split in 1588, with the *recoletos* given their own Prior General in 1602 (Rubio 1986, p 27), Nicholas of Tolentino continued to be venerated by both the Calced and the Discalced Orders.

panecillos distributed to them by the clergy.[12] Recognizing the role played by Nicholas in defence of the populace, the city council ordered that a special standard be raised:

> un estandarte blanco, bordado de oro, y en él la imagen de María Santísima, con su hijo en sus brazos y, a sus pies el glorioso san Nicolás de Tolentino, y a sus lados algunos niños, manifestando con esto los muchos enfermos [que] había sanado. (Salvá 1735, p. 57)

Later, Córdoba's *jurados* resolved that the city would, in perpetuity, go in procession to the Augustinian priory on Nicholas's feast day, to celebrate the miracle with a special mass and a sermon. More than a century after this miracle was merited by the saint, Salvá reports that 'se guarda su día y fiesta como si fuese día de apóstol o de los más festivos' (p. 58). The miraculous efficacy of these little discs of bread is depicted in Act 2 of Lope's play, when the first, the prototype *panecillo*, cures Nicolás of a serious bout of *calenturas*. The hagiographies that Lope is likely to have used as his sources record an abundance of similar miracles.

About five years after the Córdoba miracle, on 11 August 1607, a terrible fire threatened the Galician town of Pontedeume, where devotion to Nicholas can be traced back to 1538. Faced with the town's impending destruction, friars from the Augustinian house that was at its heart processed their statue of Nicholas through the streets. When they reached the fire, they threw in some *joya* or relic of the saint and the fire was miraculously extinguished. Nicholas's Galician miracle, unsurprisingly, increased the devotion to him that already existed in Pontedeume and this devotion was formalized on 16 May 1622 (an auspicious year for the Church in Spain (see below for details of the

[12] The precise date of the miracle appears to be uncertain. Salvá gives 1 July 1602 (1735, p. 56). News of the miracle was spread in particular by Cristóbal de Busto's *Compendio de algunos milagros que Dios ha obrado en Córdoba por intercesión de san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Valladolid: 1604). Aragüés Aldaz suggests that the Córdoba miracles might explain, in part, 'el nuevo relieve que el culto al santo adquirió en nuestra Península en los primeros años de la centuria' (2011, p. 15). González de Critana's 1612 *Vida* also gives details concerning the various miracles alleged to have occurred in Córdoba in the opening years of the seventeenth century. Interestingly, Critana's list of the local clergy that gathered to opine upon the authenticity of some of these miracles includes a certain Luis de Góngora, 'racionero' (fol. 87^{r}).

1622 canonization celebrations)), when the town council made the saint of Tolentino its official patron, alongside St James the Greater, resolving solemnly:

> prometemos y juramos, por Dios Nuestro Señor y Santa María su madre bendita y por los santos cuatro evangelios y la cruz, en los que corporalmente ponemos la mano derecha, que desde el presente día en adelante, para todo tiempo jamás, habremos y tendremos, y esta Villa habrá y tendrá, por protector y abogado suyo al glorioso san Nicolás de Tolentino. (*San Nicolás* 1997, p. 35)

In a similar context, the value of Nicholas's intercession is again depicted dramatically in Lope's play, towards the end of Act 3: Nicolás's faithful servant, the *gracioso* Ruperto, throws one of the saint's *panecillos* into the fire that has engulfed some local houses. The flames are quenched instantly.

Finally by way of example, Nicholas's miraculous *panecillos* were credited with saving Lastur and Arbizkoa (Guipúzcoa) from disaster in 1625, when the nearby river flooded and threatened to drown the towns' inhabitants. Almost certainly introduced to their patron, St Nicholas, and to his powers of intercession by the friars of the Augustinian house at Éibar, the locals deployed a *panecillo*, which immediately halted the waters' swell (Carmona Moreno 2005, p. 636).

Whether through the visual representations of Nicholas present in their churches, through contact with Augustinian friars eager to encourage devotion to their Order's first saint, or through news of recent miracles spread both in print and by word of mouth, Lope and his contemporaries, particularly his urban contemporaries, had ready access to knowledge of the life and miracles of Nicholas of Tolentino. In Golden-Age Spain, though, the saints were not just traditional objects of veneration, but also the choicest subjects of leisure time reading, piety and entertainment centred around the same popular heroes. Lope and his contemporaries, then, had access to knowledge concerning the saints,

but, also, importantly, a very lively interest in it.[13] The Church encouraged this interest in its saints, believing it to be spiritually nourishing for its flock.[14] A particular religious foundation, though, might also promote interest in an individual saint to whom it had a special connection, believing that, in addition to the spiritual benefits already mentioned, it might advance its own cause in the competition for economic resources, political influence, and religious capital in the form of dedicated *devotos*.[15] Individual religious foundations were apparently willing to take specific and costly action to raise the profile of a saint. The prior and friars of the Augustinian priory at Burgos, for example, evidently thought that their connection to Nicholas of Tolentino was an asset worthy of active exploitation.

The title of the book that the Burgos friars published in 1554, the *Historia de cómo fue hallada la imagen del santo crucifijo que está en el monasterio de santo Agustín de Burgos*, makes it clear that they rated the 'imagen del santo crucifijo' as their prime asset. That is unsurprising because this tangible object was considered to be unique and it was the priory's private property. Although intangible and only theirs because of the Augustinian connection, the friars evidently felt, though, that Nicholas of Tolentino's name and reputation was worth publicizing too: Nicholas is the subject of the latter part

[13] 'The number of sixteenth-century books about saints and pseudo-saints indicates a wide reading, not only among playwrights, but among the reading public [...]. The seventeenth century saw even more growth in the popularity of works about the saints. Simón Díaz's topical bibliography of seventeenth-century publications lists 250 items under *santos* and 17 more under *martirios*' (Morrison 2000, pp. 89-90). Morrison goes on to note that there was a sudden growth in the popularity of hagiographic works at the end of the sixteenth century: of the eighty sixteenth-century books about saints he has identified (and the list is not exhaustive) 'almost exactly half were published in the last dozen years of the century. The burgeoning popularity of works about the saints' lives was thus coincident with the beginning of the career of Lope de Vega' (p. 90). Morrison's reference is to Simón Díaz's *Impresos del siglo XVII: bibliografía selectiva por materias de 3500 ediciones príncipes en lengua castellana* (Madrid: CSIC, 1972).

[14] The Church's bishops and all those charged with the care of souls were commanded by the Tridentine decrees concerning the saints 'above all [to] instruct the faithful diligently in matters relating to [the] intercession and invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use of images' (*Canons* 1978, p. 218).

[15] Ferrer Valls notes that *fiestas* of the kind organized in Valencia to celebrate the canonization of Luis Bertrán earned the commissioning parties great prestige 'en una época en que la imagen y la apariencia era uno de los recursos más eficaces para mantener el poder' (1986, p. 172).

(approximately one sixth) of this book, dedicated to the famously avid collector of relics, the Prince of Asturias, at the date of publication very soon to be King Philip II of Spain.[16]

Nicholas's allegiance is left in no doubt: the title to the section narrating his life and miracles is 'La vida, canonización, y milagros del bienaventurado san Nicolás de Tolentino, fraile profeso de *la orden del bienaventurado y famoso doctor de la Iglesia, san Agustín*' (emphasis added). The point is reinforced by the words of the colophon, where the saint is described as 'san Nicolás de Tolentino, fraile profeso de *la orden de nuestro padre y doctor de la Iglesia, san Agustín*' (again, with emphasis added). That the *Historia*, including the section on St Nicholas, is in essence a piece of Augustinian propaganda is patent: the friars very obviously intended that the royal dedicatee, inspired (or perhaps shamed) by this publication, would visit their priory, become a *devoto* of their crucifix and of their saint, and provide material assistance, of which they carefully demonstrate a particular need.

That is the course of action Philip's royal predecessors would have undertaken after all.[17] Some were regular visitors to the house at Burgos; they came 'encomendándose [al crucifijo] con grande fe y religión, ofreciéndole muchos dones y favoreciendo su casa con privilegios y otras muchas limosnas dignas de su largueza y devoción' (fol. 3). And surely their largesse and piety cannot have exceeded Prince Philip's, the point being unsubtly developed with reference to specific examples. Philip's great-grandmother, Isabel la Católica, showed great devotion to the relic, 'dio un ornamento muy rico' and thereafter 'en cualquier aflicción luego se encomendaba al santo crucifijo' (fol. 16). The daughter of Alonso III of Portugal, the Infanta Doña Blanca, was equally faithful in her veneration and she demonstrated her loyalty to the *agustinos* of Burgos by fighting tenaciously on their

[16] A copy of the *Historia* is held by the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (catalogue reference R/9794). The section concerning Nicholas begins at fol. 133^{r} and ends at fol. 159^{r}, the final page.

[17] This tactic of cowing the king with stories of his ancestors' great virtues and noble actions is a common one, to judge from the techniques of the many *arbitristas* who dedicated their works to the monarch.

behalf in a dispute relating to the friars' claim to the legal title to some nearby land (fols 22-27). With the passing of such benefactors, though, the monastery is said to be struggling. In particular, the little hermitage that abuts it collapsed twenty years before and has been left in this sorry state ever since. A pity since it was formerly inhabited by a holy man, a miracle-worker named Julián, later the Bishop of Cuenca and a prime candidate to be the Augustinians' next saint, the reader might easily conclude. A true Catholic prince such as the book's dedicatee would not hesitate in remedying this need. And until the Burgos foundation can boast its own home-grown saint, Philip, it seems, is invited to venerate Augustinian Nicholas, a great thaumaturge who would look with favour upon a dutiful prince in need of powerful intercessory prayers.[18] If Iturbe Sáiz is right, Philip already knew the name Nicholas of Tolentino: Nicholas was credited with a miracle that saw the young prince cured of a pestilence, Iturbe claims, though he provides no further details (2006, p. 123).

The Augustinians of Burgos chose to promote the veneration and invocation of their saint by publishing a book dedicated to their crown prince. Other foundations sought to do the same, often in co-operation with the civic authorities, by commissioning Lope, the period's most prestigious playwright, to compose *comedias de santos* – dramatized versions of the popular (usually prose) *vidas de santos*, often made more entertaining with the addition of elements (sometimes entire secondary plots) familiar from the secular *comedia nueva*. Four of Lope's saints' plays are known to have been commissioned, to promote veneration of their saintly heroes, to encourage general piety and to raise or

[18] Belief in the efficacy of the saints' intercession with God was firmly rooted in Golden-Age Spain. Morrison explains that 'el español creyente contaba entre la innumerable serie de sus santos los mejores y más poderosos medianeros entre los hombres y la justicia divina' (2000, p. 10).

bolster the profile of the commissioning institutions. *La limpieza no manchada* is the earliest of the four plays.[19]

Lope's 'comedias de encargo'

La limpieza no manchada is an unusual saint's play whose heroine is St Bridget of Sweden, but whose real focus is the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception.[20] This triumphalist play was commissioned by the University of Salamanca in 1618 to mark its decision to adopt a statute requiring graduands to swear to defend that doctrine (still controversial at the time) and it was performed by Baltasar de Pinedo's company of actors in Salamanca's 'patio de las escuelas mayores' on Monday, 29 October of that year (Profeti 2008, p. 235).[21] Honour is heaped upon the commissioning institution, whose allegorical embodiment – Universidad – is rewarded on stage when the personification of Spain – España – orders that she be given a crown of diamond stars. Universidad is praised as España's 'honor y corona', as the 'Madre de tantos ingenios | Que has dado tantos Catones | A los Rëales consejos | Del soberano Filipo' (Vega, *La limpieza*, p. 81), in this case Philip III. Finally, before an audience comprising many of Spain's great potentates, España expresses the hope that heaven will reward the University's zeal in her sons in a very practical way: '¡Plega a Dios que ocupen todos | Lo que merecen, pues

[19] In addition, Garasa claims that several of the *loas* included in Lope's *Comedia de san Segundo* point to that play having been commissioned by the authorities of the city of Ávila, where the saint is venerated (1960, p. 54).

[20] For Elizabeth Howe the play is 'a curiously hybrid work that suffers from a lack of coherent plot, story line, and continuity of character. It is a jumbled attempt that bespeaks haste and carelessness of composition' (1986, p. 45). Howe's observations are not wrong, but the attraction of the saints' plays resulted from conventions and an aesthetic different from the ones that governed the secular *comedia*.

[21] Details of the Salamanca celebrations can be found in the *Relación de las fiestas que la Universidad de Salamanca celebró desde el 27 hasta el 31 de octubre del año de 1618 al juramento del nuevo estatuto* (Salamanca: Antonia Ramírez, 1618), which would evidently have promoted the University to a wider audience.

vemos | Que con tan santa Abogada, | No puede faltarles premio!' (p. 84), a clear example of how the saint's play could combine the dual aims of promoting religious knowledge and piety, on the one hand, and of promoting the commissioning institution's temporal interests, on the other.

In 1622, as part of the *Corte*'s celebrations of the quadruple canonization of the Spaniards Francis Xavier, Ignatius of Loyola, Isidore of Madrid and Teresa of Ávila, the Ayuntamiento de Madrid commissioned Lope to write a pair of *comedias* about the city's patron: *La niñez de san Isidro* and *La juventud de san Isidro*.[22] These two-act *comedias* were staged, with unprecedented splendour, by Vallejo (*La niñez*) and Avedaño (*La juventud*) in Madrid's Plaza del Alcázar, watched by Philip IV and his family, probably on 15 May 1622.[23] Details of these *fiestas*, of which Lope's plays formed an essential part, are recorded in the playwright's own *Relación de las fiestas que la insigne villa de Madrid hizo en la canonización de san Isidro* (Madrid: viuda de A. Martín, 1622), a valuable source of information concerning the manner and circumstances in which the saints' plays were staged, with the texts of the two San Isidro plays reproduced at the back (Profeti 2008, pp. 235-236).

Finally, in 1629, the Mercedarian Convento de Nuestra Señora de la Merced commissioned Lope to write a play about their founder, St Peter Nolasco. Whilst the play is not explicitly dedicated to the king, Philip IV, his wife and his sister are known to have

[22] In her article on Valencia's celebrations for the canonization of San Luis Bertrán, Teresa Ferrer Valls notes how '[e]n los últimos años del siglo XVI y principios del XVII empezaron a proliferar de manera abrumadora festividades públicas financiadas por la Ciudad – a las que contribuían tanto particulares, nobles en especial, como los Oficios y órdenes religiosas – y dedicadas a celebrar la beatificación o canonización de religiosos íntimamente ligados a la Ciudad que los festejaba. Al calor de estas celebraciones surgió un género bien definido y codificado, el de las comedias "a lo divino" o comedias de santos' (1986, p. 156).

[23] The presence at these very public functions of society's elites made the commission of a saint's play an especially attractive prospect for Lope, an opportunity to impress the monarch and his advisors (and perhaps even to persuade them to name him royal chronicler). In his study of the professionalization of Lope's career, García Reidy explains in relation to the commissioning of saints' plays that '[l]a proyección que ello suponía para el poeta entre los cortesanos y la posibilidad de apelar y alabar directamente al monarca a través de los versos de la comedia era algo que no tenía precio para un dramaturgo con aspiraciones de mecenazgo como Lope. De ahí que las implicaciones que este tipo de representaciones podía tener para un dramaturgo iban mucho más allá de lo que era lo habitual para comedias destinadas [a] los corrales' (2009, p. 335).

attended a performance in Madrid arranged by Roque de Figueroa's company, early in May 1629, as detailed by López Remón's *Relación*. The king, the object of lavish praise in *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco*, is also encouraged, it seems, to emulate the close political collaboration that the play's king, James of Aragon, enjoys with his leading clerics, Peter Nolasco and Raymond of Peñafort (see Norton 2011). This kind of preferment might constitute the temporal benefit the Mercedarian *comisarios* hoped to win through the commissioning and staging of this Lope *comedia*.

It is possible that Lope was commissioned by some Augustinian community to write *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, but no external evidence for this has so far been uncovered. It would be an exaggeration to say that a commission were probable, though: with documentary proof of commissioning available for only four of the twenty-five saints' plays that Lope wrote, there is as yet insufficient evidence to permit the conclusion that all or even a majority of these were *comedias de encargo*.

Against the presumption that all saints' plays, including *San Nicolás*, were commissioned stands Profeti's insistence that many of them were in fact written for, and successfully staged in, the commercial theatre. Especially popular in the *corrales*, she argues, plausibly, were those *comedias* that dramatized extreme cases, of reformed bandits, penitent prostitutes and Muslim converts, for example (2008, pp. 239-243).[24] Also, the four Lope saints' plays we know to have been commissioned either make direct or indirect reference to their *fiesta* contexts and/or are mentioned in *relaciones* that

[24] Ferrer Valls believes that there was a dual system for the production of *comedias de santos*: 'no todas pero sí algunas de ellas se explicaban como encargo de una ciudad u orden religiosa' (1991, p. 189). Aragone Terni considers a majority to have been written for particular occasions (and, so, presumably commissioned): '[l]e commedie *de santos* [...] erano nella maggior parte condizionate da determinate circonstanze (canonizzazioni, beatificazioni, anniversari ecc.) e venivano a costituire, mi sembra, la più mercantile delle forme drammatiche' (1971, p. 56), 'the *comedias de santos* [...] were in the main conditioned by determined circumstances (canonizations, beatifications, anniversaries etc.) and came to constitute, it seems to me, the most marketable of the dramatic genres'.

provide evidence of their commissioning.[25] There appear to be no such references in *San Nicolás* and there is no known *relación* describing *fiestas* that included a performance of the play.

However, if one were minded to argue that *San Nicolás* is likely to have been commissioned (probably by some foundation belonging to the Augustinian Recollects) one would point to the multiple references made in the play text to the *agustinos descalzos* and their virtues.[26] The absence of a *relación* of the kind that recorded details of the two Isidro plays, for example, does not prove that *San Nicolás* was not commissioned. The absence of such a work could, hypothetically, be explained by the lower profile, the lesser cost of the putative Augustinian celebrations that might have involved the commissioning

[25] Express reference to the play's place within the context of public celebrations is made in Act 3 of *La limpieza no manchada*. Two allegorical characters, Duda and Cuidado, name and laud the individual *comisarios* responsible for them (p. 94). Towards the end of *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco*, set in the thirteenth century, an angel announces news of the glorious future the Mercedarian Order will enjoy and refers, very clearly, to the 1629 *fiestas*. Many years will pass before a time when:

> de accidentales
> Glorias te adornarán propios y extraños,
> Para que participe
> De tu sol otro sol, cuarto Felipe.
> Hallaráse presente
> Carlos su hermano, el cardenal Fernando,
> Y en más lucido oriente
> Dos Reinas, dos estrellas, que reinando
> Isabel y María
> Á una obedezca España y á otra Hungría. (p. 30A)

All four Lope saints' plays that we know to have been commissioned are treated in published *relaciones* (detailed above).

[26] The holy priory to which Nicolás takes his friends and where Peregrino is converted is said to be 'un convento agustino | de *descalzos* ermitaños' (ll. 270-271, with emphasis added). Fray Rogerio, the great preacher who converts Nicolás himself and whom the assembled crowd reveres as a second St Paul (l. 595) is to be recognizably dressed as an *agustino descalzo* (stage direction before l. 580), and we are told that members of the crowd approach him and kiss his distinctive black habit (l. 773). When Rogerio is discussing Nicolás's desire to join the community, the friar warns him 'Es estrecha | nuestra Orden' (ll. 815-816) (in contrast to the unreformed Order, perhaps?). Finally, Nicolás makes it clear to his parents, as he announces his decision to leave the world, that the cause was 'cierto *descalzo* agustino | destos que ermitaños llaman' (l. 878-879, with emphasis added). Lope makes multiple references to the Discalced Augustinians, then, which is especially interesting because, as noted above, the separation between the Calced and Discalced communities was initiated only in 1588; so, references to the *agustinos descalzos* in Lope's play, set in late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth-century Italy, are anachronistic; they speak not of Nicholas's time, but to Lope's own. Indeed, it is extremely common for Golden-Age plays to reflect (to an extent and sometimes indirectly) the society that spawned them rather more than the historical societies that sometimes provide their fictional settings. Discussing Golden-Age saints' plays, Garasa approves of such anachronisms because 'tenían la virtud de aproximar los hechos y personajes más diversos por su época y procedencia a la sensibilidad contemporánea' (1960, p. 8).

of *San Nicolás*. Alternatively, it could be that there is a *relación* that modern scholars have yet to identify. As for the absence of references to a festival context in the text of the play, there are no such references in the Isidro plays, which we know for certain to have been commissioned. And it is possible that Lope's St Nicholas play did once contain some such references, but that by the date of its publication in 1641, nearly three decades after the probable date of its composition, the scribe who prepared the *original* for the printing press decided that the text would be more appealing to potential purchasers with all out-of-date material expunged. Finally, concerning the play's appeal to a *corral* audience, if Profeti is right and the typical spectator was gripped by the dramatic conversions of an Enrico, a Baltasara or a Rosambuco, characters who exemplify the three categories of 'extreme cases' listed above, the baser elements of a *corral* audience, the *mosqueteros*, might have struggled with the plot of *San Nicolás*, a play that Christophe Couderc judges to be 'bastante aburrida' (2008, p. 73).[27] Spectators more discerning and patient than the stereotypical *mosquetero* might have appreciated that the conversions dramatized in *San Nicolás* are subtler, less obviously dramatic, than those in *El condenado por desconfiado*, *La Baltasara* and *El santo negro, Rosambuco* (see in particular the section of this introductory study that focuses on Ruperto, the *gracioso*). If the play was commissioned by the Augustinians, the uneducated groundlings might not have been the audience segment they were hoping to impress.

As the above list of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century inaugurations of Augustinian foundations indicates, there was no shortage of events for which a play about St Nicholas might have been commissioned. Micozzi, who assumes that *San Nicolás* was commissioned, suggests that the key to establishing the exact date and circumstances of

[27] The hagiographic plot was not necessarily the most important element of a Golden-Age saint's play. Indeed, Profeti considers the plots to have been merely 'instrumental' (2008, p. 237). Perhaps more important, especially to any *mosqueteros* in attendance, were the secondary plots involving the *gracioso*'s jokes and his strikingly incongruous profanities, on the one hand, and, on the other, the spectacular effects that were characteristic of the saint's play sub-genre, *género de alta tramoya*.

the play's composition might be found in documents she believes could be held by Madrid's Archivo Histórico Nacional, documents pertaining to the Congregación de San Nicolás de Tolentino, founded in 1609 at the Augustinian Convento de San Felipe, which stood just off Madrid's Puerta del Sol (1996, p. 110). Indeed a factual nexus does link the San Felipe priory, Nicholas of Tolentino and Lope de Vega. The saint's fame in seventeenth-century Spain was certainly enhanced by the San Felipe community: Nicholas is the subject of *El santo milagroso agustiniano, san Nicolás de Tolentino*, a long heroic poem written by one of its friars, Fernando de Camargo y Salgado, and published in Madrid in 1628 with a laudatory sonnet and a set of *décimas al lector* by the *Fénix* included.[28] Moreover, Lope is thought likely to have numbered among the literati who would congregate on the *lonja* and *gradas* of San Felipe, close to the Puerta del Sol.[29] To date, however, no evidence has emerged that links that monastery to Lope's St Nicholas play.

If San Felipe was not the foundation for which *San Nicolás* was commissioned, perhaps it was Madrid's Convento de Recoletos Agustinos, finally inaugurated in 1620, after many years of set-backs.[30] Indeed, given that the references in Lope's play are specifically to the *agustinos descalzos*, this might be the more likely link, since San Felipe belonged to the Calced Augustinians.[31] It is unlikely that a non-*descalzo* community would have commissioned a play incorporating praise of an Order that was, to a large

[28] Lope's sonnet – 'Canta Camargo a Nicolás' – and his *décimas* – 'Lector, no hay sílaba aquí' – can be found at fols ††$^{5r-v}$ of Camargo y Salgado 1628.

[29] Sánchez Hernández writes that '[l]a lonja y las gradas de San Felipe constituían uno de los principales mentideros de la villa, al que acudían Cervantes, Quevedo, Villamediana, Lope y Calderón, entre otros' (1986, p. 48).

[30] The priory, which was located on the east side of today's Paseo de los Recoletos, was dissolved in the 1830s as part of Mendizábal's policy of *desamortización*. The site was purchased at auction in 1837 by a certain Juan Álvarez Mendizábal. Part of it is now occupied by the Biblioteca Nacional de España (Díaz Moreno and Lopezosa Aparicio 1999, p. 206).

[31] Sánchez Hernández confirms that the monastery of San Felipe, the first Augustinian house to be established in Madrid, 'estuvo habitado por frailes agustinos *calzados*' (1986, p. 48, with emphasis added).

extent, independent from 1602.[32] Once again, there is a link between this Convento de Recoletos, St Nicholas and Lope: Lope wrote in honour of the saint in the context of the public *fiestas* that celebrated the transfer to the monastery of the Holy Sacrament on 27 August 1620.[33] These *fiestas* were attended by the members of Madrid's Ayuntamiento, among other dignitaries of the *Corte* (Iturbe Sáiz 2006, p. 198) and the author of one, brief, account describes how:

> Entre lo «mejor y más noble» [de la Corte], sin duda se encontraría Lope de Vega, quien para la ocasión realizó una oración para «el certamen en los Recoletos Agustinos cuando mudaron el Santísimo Sacramento a la Capilla Mayor nueva». (Díaz Moreno and Lopezosa Aparicio 1999, p. 189, quoting from Fray Andrés de Nicolás's 1664 *Historia general de los religiosos descalzos*)

The *oración* that Lope composed for the occasion, published posthumously in 1637 in the *Vega del Parnaso* compendium, makes explicit reference to Nicholas of Tolentino. The lines Lope devotes to him tend to confirm that in Lope's estimation too Nicholas ranked highly among the Augustinian saints: an otherwise cursory list of saints' names ends with several lines devoted to Nicholas:

> Y el santo, que era sol, y como noche
> Con estrellas bordaba el negro manto,
> Por quien trocara el día
> Su color y alegría,
> Que donde resplandece
> El sol de Nicolás, Dios amanece. (1637, fol. 132^{v})

[32] Rubio explains that the *agustinos recoletos* (known alternatively as *agustinos descalzos*) emerged in Spain in 1588, determined to achieve 'una vida de mayor separación del mundo con el fin de darse a una vida de mayor dedicación espiritual y también de mayor austeridad'. The Provincial Chapter of 1588 (at which Fray Luis de León was present as a *definidor*) first licensed the *recoletos*. These *recoletos* were granted permission to form a province independent of the main Calced Order in 1602 (although complete independence was not granted until 1912) (1986, pp. 26-27).

[33] Of course, the date of these celebrations is later than both the 1614 composition date posited by Morley and Bruerton and the January 1615 date by which it is believed that Lope's play was in the hands of a troupe of actors in Seville (see the section below on the dating of the play). Lope might conceivably have been commissioned to write the play to celebrate some earlier stage in the *Recoletos*' foundation process, which took many years, rather than the final transfer of the Holy Sacrament.

But the *Historia* that recounts the events of the *fiesta* mentions no *comedia.*[34]

Or if a commission from the Convento de Recoletos Agustinos does not lie behind Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, perhaps the play was commissioned to form part of the celebrations for the inauguration of Queen Margarita's Real Monasterio de la Encarnación, the Augustinian house for discalced nuns that stands just off the Plaza de Oriente, then the Plaza del Alcázar. This august institution was inaugurated with great pomp and circumstance by the Archbishop of Toledo and in the presence of the king and the royal family on 29 July 1616. This convent had impressive royal connections, having been founded upon the personal initiative of Philip III's Queen Margarita and with a *pasillo* or *pasadizo* linking it to the royal palace. It houses a sixteenth- or seventeenth-century painting of Nicholas of Tolentino, probably by Juan Bautista Maíno (1581-1649), and in front of it, since the 1960s, there has stood a statue of Lope de Vega.[35] But there is no evidence linking the Encarnación with Lope's play, again, despite the existence of a brief account of the inaugural festivities in Pinelo's *Anales de Madrid*.

We cannot currently be certain, then, whether Lope was commissioned to write *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. If he was, then the commissioning party is likely to have provided him with guidance on the play's contents and with written materials to enhance the knowledge of Nicholas that Lope would probably have acquired alongside the general populace in the manner described above.[36] If Lope himself selected Nicholas as his subject

[34] There is a precedent for a *comedia de santos* being written to celebrate the transfer of the Holy Sacrament to a new religious foundation: in 1617 Luis Vélez de Guevara composed *El caballero del Sol* to celebrate the event commemorated in P. de Herrera's *Translación del Santísimo Sacramento de la Iglesia Colegial de la villa de Lerma* (Madrid, 1618) (Ferrer Valls 1986, p. 166).

[35] Details of the inauguration are given by Sánchez Hernández (1986, p. 55) and of the painting by Martín González (1978, p. 493).

[36] Ferrer Valls notes that many saints' plays were commissioned from a playwright 'al que proporcionaban muchas veces el material – la hagiografía – y la puesta en escena' (1991, p. 189). The document she uncovered relating to the commissioning, around 1617, of a pair of *comedias nobiliarias* – pure aristocratic propaganda for one particular branch of the house of Villahermosa-Ribagorza – is valuable as evidence of the considerable input commissioners sometimes expected to have. Sixty folios in length, it is entitled 'El

for a *corral* play – perhaps seeing in the saint's long (at times idiosyncratic) record of miracles great potential for the exploitation of theatrical *tramoyas*, or perhaps seeing in this impossibly pious friar a great paragon of virtue in whose shadow a *gracioso*'s harder-fought, more ambivalent conversion might be worked out (as to which, see the section below on the *gracioso* figure) – then he could have selected his own sources from an impressive gamut of hagiographies treating the saint's life and miracles. Carlos Alonso's extensive bibliography on Nicholas of Tolentino lists sixteen general hagiographies of the saint (many running to several editions) published before the year of Lope's death, of which ten were published before 1614, the year Morley and Bruerton give as the probable date for the composition of Lope's play.[37]

sumario de lo que contiene la historia de la comedia del duque don Alonso y desta casa, y el primer borrador que se hizo para formar y dar a entender a Lope de Vega todo lo que ha de contener la historia de la comedia y deste borrador se sacó el otro en limpio que se ha dado a Lope de Vega para que la disponga en verso'. This 'sumario' provides specifications relating to, *inter alia*, individual speeches, scenery, music, costume, and the appearance and gestures of the actors (pp. 190-192).

[37] Alonso [undated] and Morley and Bruerton 1968, pp. 392-393.

2. The date and sources of Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino*

The date of composition

From their analysis of the verse forms used by Lope in *San Nicolás*, Morley and Bruerton estimate that the play was composed between 1613 and 1615, 'probably 1614'. They base this estimate, first, on the play's relatively heavy use of *sueltos pareados* and of *silvas* of the third order, which they consider indicative of a date no earlier than that of *La dama boba* (1613) and, second, on the proportion of *romances*, which suggests a date of composition around 1615. In addition, they mention a document that seems to show that the play was in the hands of a troupe of actors on 21 January 1615 (1968, p. 393). (For a detailed analysis of the play's versification, see the final section of this introductory study.)

The document in question is a contract between, on the one hand, Pedro de Valdés, a *comedia* actor and *autor* from Valladolid, who ran his own company between 1613 and 1625, with some interruptions (Rennert 1904, p. 171), and, on the other, Juan de Saavedra, the agent acting for the landlord of Seville's *casa de comedias* (Amezúa 1935-1943, II, p. 327).[38] In this contract Valdés covenants to stage 'representaciones, autos y entremeses' in Seville between Easter Sunday and Corpus Christi of 1615. The contract entitles Valdés to a legal remedy in the event that the city's authorities permit any *autor* other than him to stage any of the *comedias* he lists, 'que parecieren ser mías'. Second in this list of twenty-

[38] The contract is reproduced at pp. 200-202 of San Román, 1935.

eight plays is one entitled *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. This is almost certainly the Lope play with which we are here concerned.[39]

Even if, in fact, the St Nicholas play listed in the Valdés document is not Lope's, then we still have strong grounds for believing that Lope must have written his *San Nicolás de Tolentino* no later than 1618, when the second of the *Peregrino* lists was first published. A play entitled *San Nicolás* does feature in the P^2 list (but not in P) and so, for the purposes of considering the sources on which Lope might have drawn in composing his play, it would seem legitimate to limit our examination of the substantial corpus of relevant hagiographic material to those items published before 1618.[40]

[39] Of the twenty-eight plays listed in the Valdés contract, the majority, eighteen, seem to correspond to *comedias* whose authorship is claimed by Lope in the 1618 *Peregrino* list. Lope is not known to have written any other play about a saint called Nicolás (although he did write several poems about Nicholas of Tolentino (see footnote 29 above), as well as at least one addressed to St Nicholas of Bari – the 'Décimas a San Nicolás, que dio su casa para esta fiesta' – written for the 1608 *Justa poética* in Toledo (Castro 1918)). Whilst La Barrera's *Catálogo* does refer to two further plays with a San Nicolás as their eponymous hero (1968, pp. 94 & 180), the first, *San Nicolás el magno*, can be dismissed for our purposes, since its author, Clavero de Falces y Carroz, was not born until between 1609 and 1614 and so would have been too young to write a play featuring in the 1615 Valdés document. The second, Antonio Grati y Álava's *El hijo del águila, san Nicolás de Tolentino*, is not so easily dismissed, because details of the date of the play's composition and even of this minor dramatist's birth and death are elusive. Given that Grati is such a minor figure, though (there is only one more play attributed to him, *No habrá mal donde hay mujer*, published in the eighteenth century), and given that a substantial majority of the plays in the Valdés contract seem to be Lope's, it does seem overwhelmingly likely that the *San Nicolás* referred to is indeed Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino*.

[40] There is some confusion surrounding the inclusion of *San Nicolás* in the P^2 list. Morley and Bruerton confirm that a play entitled *San Nicolás* is included in P^2 (1968, p. 392). Menéndez Pelayo, meanwhile, begins his *observaciones preliminares* relating to Lope's *San Nicolás* by stating that the play is not included in P^2 and that, therefore, it must be considered later than 1618 (1890-1913, IV, p. xcii). Sainz de Robles repeats this assertion, reaching the same conclusion as Menéndez Pelayo (1946-1955, III, p. 235). Most recently, Micozzi draws attention to this controversy, declaring it to be a matter that, in 1996, she was investigating (1996, p. 110). Morley and Bruerton were correct: the British Library's copy of the 1618 Madrid edition of *El peregrino en su patria* (shelfmark 12491.a.19) does indeed list 'San Nicolás' at folio ¶¶4^{v} (numbered by hand as folio 12 in the copy cited). It seems likely that Menéndez Pelayo consulted a defective copy of the Madrid 1618 *Peregrino*, missing folio ¶¶4 (or otherwise a later edition based on a defective copy of the 1618 one). These defective copies, of which one is held by the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, omit ninety-nine titles, including *San Nicolás* (see Morley 1930, p. 356, for a discussion of the defective copies and editions).

The foundational sources of St Nicholas's hagiography and their early modern elaborations

The two earliest written sources relating to St Nicholas of Tolentino were composed virtually simultaneously, approximately twenty-one years after the saint's death on 10 September 1305. On 5 September 1326, at Avignon, Pope John XXII was presented with the first, the report of the papal investigation into Nicholas's life and miracles, the *Processus canonizationis sancti Nicolai a Tholentino*. Also in 1326, Nicholas's first biographer and erstwhile monastic confrere, Pietro da Monterubbiano, completed his *Historia beati Nicolai de Tolentino*, edited and published by Mombrizio in Milan in 1480 and by Surio in Cologne in 1576 (Radi 2004, p. 28).[41] (Monterubbiano's Latin *Historia* was translated into Italian by Remigio di Firenze in 1356.) It is from either or both of these two sources that the vast majority of the information contained in all later hagiographies of St Nicholas flows.[42] Unless Lope's research for *San Nicolás* was extraordinarily extensive, though, it is unlikely that he would have consulted the first of these sources: according to Radi, a modern hagiographer of the saint, before the records of the papal investigation were first published, by Gandolfo in Rome in 1704, the original codices and a small number of manuscript copies were available for consultation only at archives in Siena, Bologna, Tolentino and the Vatican (2004, p. 31).

[41] Mombrizio's publication is entitled *Sanctuarium: vitae sanctorum*, and Surio's, *De probatis sanctorum historiis*.

[42] Radi confirms the primordial status of these two sources: '[l]e fonti alle quali attingere conoscere la vita e la spiritualità di san Nicola sono soltanto due, anche se molto importanti: la *Vita* scritta in latino da fra Pietro da Monterubbiano, suo coetaneo e confratello, e gli Atti del processo di canonizzazione del 1325' (2004, p. 27), '[t]here are just two sources upon which one must draw to learn about the life and spirituality of St Nicholas, though they are very important: the *Vita* written in Latin by Fra Pietro da Monterubbiano, his contemporary and confrere, and the acts of the 1325 canonization process'. Micozzi too confirms that it is from 'el "Processus canonizationis fratris Nicolai de Tolentino" (1325) y la "Historia beati Nicolai de Tolentino", *de donde proceden las demás biografías*' (Micozzi 1996, p. 107, with emphasis added). Aragüés suggests that to these one needs to add, *inter alia*, Guglielmo Godivo's *Rubbricae examinationes et recollectiones sumptae de processu super vita Nicolai de Tolentino* (2011, p. 10). Aragüés's article contains a very helpful account of the development of the hagiographic tradition relating to Nicholas of Tolentino.

Monterubbiano's biography was certainly more widely available: various manuscript copies and printed editions, in both the original Latin and in *toscano* translation, were produced from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries (Radi 2004, p. 31).[43] However, Monterubbiano's *Historia*, if indeed it was consulted by Lope, could not have been the sole source for his *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, since several factual details concerning the saint's life that are found in Lope's *comedia* (and which cannot be Lope's own invention, since they are also given in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century hagiographies of St Nicholas available prior to the likely date of Lope's *comedia*) are not present in that first biography. For example, the miracle of the transformation of bread into flowers (ll. 1200-1241 of the play) is not recorded by Monterubbiano, nor is the miracle whereby the saint procures water from a stone (ll. 2593-2696). So, if we assume that Lope did not consult the rare manuscript records of the canonization process, it is likely to be the case that he used more recent, published sources that draw on the rare trial materials either in addition to or in place of Monterubbiano's hagiography.

The trouble is that, because of Nicholas's great popularity spanning several centuries, medieval and early modern hagiographies of the saint are numerous: there are dozens, possibly even hundreds of written sources that Lope might have consulted when preparing his *comedia* and a glance at Alonso's bibliography shows that Spanish writers seem to have been second only to the Italians in the production of works venerating St Nicholas. Micozzi observes quite rightly that St Nicholas of Tolentino was:

> objeto de gran veneración popular en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII e inspira un número nada exigüo de biografías, composiciones poéticas y libros devocionales que brindan a Lope abundante material para su comedia. (1996, p. 110)

[43] Lope had the linguistic ability to read both the Latin and Italian versions: in a letter to the Duque de Sessa (that Amezúa dates mid-1613), Lope claims to be a 'buen lector de latín, italiano y francés' (1935-1943, III, p. 122).

In his useful (but incomplete) *Saggio bibliografico*, Alonso lists sixteen stand-alone biographies of the saint available before Lope's death in 1635, and many of these exist in multiple editions and translations. Frigerio's *Vita*, for example, was published eight times between 1578 and 1610.[44] As well as these general hagiographies of Nicholas, there are others that treat a particular facet of the saint's life and miracles, for example, the blessed bread or his patronage of the Holy Souls. And, in addition to these hagiographies that focus on Nicholas alone, there are several *Flores Sanctorum* compilations, as well as histories and chronicles of the Augustinian Order, that include sometimes extensive chapters on Nicholas. (A chronological list of the sources consulted for the purposes of this edition appears at Appendix 1.)

'Estado de la cuestión' and beyond

The question of the sources of Lope's *San Nicolás* has been touched upon briefly by Menéndez Pelayo, Sainz de Robles, Micozzi and, very recently, thoroughly and persuasively, by Aragüés Aldaz, whose conclusions I shall discuss below. Menéndez Pelayo and Sainz de Robles mention Ribadeneira's *Flos Sanctorum* as a likely source for Lope, and Menéndez Pelayo goes as far as to reproduce in full Ribadeneira's hagiography of Nicholas in his *observaciones preliminares* to the Real Academia Española edition of *San Nicolás*. Ribadeneira's candidacy as a likely source is an obvious one, as his collection of *vidas de santos* was certainly among the best known, with several editions

[44] I describe Alonso's *Saggio* as incomplete because it does not, for example, detail the 1590 Valencia edition of Jerónimo Román's *Vida*, to which I refer below.

published around the turn of the seventeenth century and many re-prints produced during its course.[45]

Ribadeneira's *santoral* does devote a section to St Nicholas, but it is certainly not an extensive narrative and, whilst the details it contains are factually consistent with Lope's play, much of the historical information concerning the saint's life and miracles that we find in *San Nicolás* is completely absent from this *Flos* account.[46] Ribadeneira makes no reference, for example, to either of the historical figures on whom Lope bases his Fray Peregrino and Gentil Ursino characters; we know these are based on historical figures because these are mentioned in other hagiographic sources that pre-date Lope's play. These secondary characters are important to Lope's depiction of the evolution of Nicolás's sanctity (see the section below that deals with Lope's presentation of his protagonist). Similarly, many of the miracles that Lope either dramatizes, or refers to in set-piece monologues, in his play do not feature in Ribadeneira's work, including the two that, as we have seen, were omitted by Monterubbiano, as well as several others besides, for instance, the institution of the blessed *panecillos* by the Virgin Mary.[47] Indeed, the relative poverty of the biographical and thaumaturgical detail contained in this *Flos Sanctorum* does seem to have struck Menéndez Pelayo too (as does the dreariness of the detail offered by Ribadeneira compared to the ebullience of Lope's play). Despite reproducing

[45] Morrison writes that the 'Villegas and Ribadeneyra editions of [the *Flos*] are probably the two greatest single sources for Lope de Vega's *comedias de santos*' (2000, p. 87). This statement probably relies on Menéndez Pelayo's conclusions in his *observaciones preliminares*, but, as we shall see, his conclusion regarding *San Nicolás* is almost certainly incorrect. Morrison details that Ribadeneira's *Flos Sanctorum* was first published in Madrid in 1599, with a second part following in 1601. He explains that Ribadeneira's work was re-edited in: Madrid, 1610; Barcelona, 1623, Barcelona, 1630 (in Latin); Barcelona, 1643; and again in Barcelona in 1705. In 1604 Ribadeneira's *Libro de vidas de santos que comúnmente llaman extravagantes* was published (2000, p. 87). Aparicio Maydeu, though, suggests that Ribadeneira's *Flos Sanctorum* was edited in 1616 too (1999, pp. 37-39). Indeed, it is the Madrid 1616 edition of his *Flos* that I have examined in the preparation of this edition. So, Morrison's list appears to be incomplete.

[46] My evaluations of how likely each of the hagiographies considered is to be Lope's source for *San Nicolás* are largely grounded on an analysis of the percentage of factual details given in the play that appear in each of these various sources. A table of the results is reproduced at Appendix 2. It will be clear from this that, far from being Lope's most likely source, the Ribadeneira *Flos* is one of the least convergent of the texts considered.

[47] Interestingly, the institution of the *panecillos* is included in the later 1643 version of Ribadeneira's *Flos*, which must be an expanded edition.

Ribadeneira's account *verbatim*, then, the venerable scholar concludes, in light of the poverty of the *Flos*, that it seems '[i]ncreíble [...] que de tal hagiografía haya podido salir una comedia' (1890-1913, IV, p. xcv). Sainz de Robles also notes the brevity of Ribadeneira's account and concludes that 'fue, pues, precisa toda la maestría del Fénix, y también toda su poderosa imaginación, para con tan escasos datos componer una divertida e interesante pieza escénica en tres actos' (1946-1955, III, p. 235). As we shall see, it is certainly not the case, as Sainz's words might lead us to conclude, that Lope's only resource other than Ribadeneira was his powerful imagination, although that undoubtedly played an important part; and it does indeed seem incredible that Lope could have based his factually detailed play on Ribadeneira's bare account, as both Menéndez Pelayo and Sainz de Robles leave us to suppose. Our conclusion must be that Ribadeneira cannot have been Lope's sole source. Indeed, given the relative sparsity of its account of Nicholas's life and miracles, there is no reason why we should consider it likely even as one of several sources used by Lope, except that it is probably the best known *santoral* of Golden-Age Spain.

In her brief, preliminary discussion of the possible sources of *San Nicolás*, Micozzi draws attention to what was arguably the next best known Castilian *vidas de santos* collection, when she notes that Menéndez Pelayo omits, in his *observaciones preliminares*, to mention the Villegas *Flos Sanctorum* as a further potential source for Lope's play. The two *Flos* accounts, Ribadeneira's and Villegas's, are similar in terms of their length – both short – and in terms of the detail they contain – limited, although the virtues and miracles each narrates are different, to some extent, as the table at Appendix 2 illustrates. There seems to be no obvious reason, though, why we should consider Villegas any more likely as a source for Lope than Ribadeneira. According to my analysis, only forty-six per cent. of the factual details considered are present in Villegas, this being only

slightly better than Ribadeneira's forty-two per cent. The two miracles that have so far led us to conclude that neither Monterubbiano nor Ribadeneira can have been Lope's sole source are also missing from Villegas's work, which does not mention Peregrino or Gentil Ursino either. And unlike Ribadeneira even, Villegas omits mention of the episode from Nicholas's childhood where he saw the face of the child Christ in the Eucharistic Host and of the miracle of the restored *lámpara* (both found in Lope's play, at lines 1132-1139 and 2827-2854, respectively). The narrow scope of the Villegas *Flos* would have provided Lope with a relatively small proportion of the hagiographical detail he incorporates into his play, and so we should have no qualms in rejecting this *santoral* too as a significant source for Lope's play. Similarly, whilst Lope might, just conceivably, have found inspiration to write his play about St Nicholas in the two short Alonso de Ledesma poems Micozzi mentions (without actually claiming that they might be sources), these really are far too brief to have provided him with any substantive material for it at all (1996, p. 110).[48]

Aside from Navarro's 1612 hagiography, the only other potential source that Menéndez Pelayo and Sainz de Robles mention is Camargo y Salgado's long poem *El santo milagroso augustiniano san Nicolás de Tolentino*, published in 1628. Despite Don Marcelino's tentative conclusion that the composition of Lope's *San Nicolás* was, on balance, likely to have post-dated publication of that poem (an assumption probably arrived at following his consultation of a faulty copy of the 1618 *Peregrino*), Sainz de Robles argues that it is unlikely that Lope's play was written so late.[49] Although he does

[48] The first poem – 'Pareces transfigurado' – is at folio 37^{r} of Ledesma's *Epigramas y jeroglíficos a la vida de Cristo* (Madrid: Juan González, 1625), available at the British Library with shelfmark 11450.aaa.27. The second poem – 'Sois cual linterna encendida' – is available in a modern edition of Ledesma's 1612 *Conceptos espirituales y morales* (1969, pp. 229-230). Lope might have known the first poem by way of a manuscript copy circulated prior to the posthumous 1625 publication of the *Epigramas*.

[49] Briefly, Menéndez Pelayo (who, of course, did not have the great benefit of Morley and Bruerton's *Cronología*) reasoned that, had Lope's play pre-dated Salgado's poem, Salgado would almost certainly have made some reference to the play within his work, and he would not have claimed to have been the first to have written verse in Castilian about St Nicholas of Tolentino. Several reasons why Salgado might have

not say as much, his belief was presumably influenced by Morley and Bruerton's hypothesis concerning the likely date of composition of *San Nicolás*. Their dates have been proved remarkably accurate, where they have been tested by evidence come to light subsequent to the publication of the *Chronology*'s original English edition in 1940, and so it seems that Sainz's decision to doubt the relevance of Salgado's poem, published in its entirety thirteen years after Valdés was apparently preparing to stage Lope's play in Seville, seems a sensible one that we should support.

St Nicholas's virtues and miracles are not faintly sketched in Lope's play, rather they are abundant and precise and so the playwright's sources must have been much more comprehensive than the mere outlines provided by the *Flores Sanctorum* and the Ledesma poems we have considered so far. They must also have been sources readily available to Lope, as there is no evidence that he habitually spent any considerable amount of time or money hunting down obscure tomes to ensure his plays could say the very last word on the subjects they treated. These two criteria – completeness and availability – make the next source that we shall discuss a more likely one than any of Ribadeneira, Villegas or Ledesma. In terms of availability, a hagiography written by an acquaintance of Lope must rank highly as a potential source for his play, and Patrizia Micozzi notes Lope's good relations with the Augustinian Order in general, and with Alonso de Orozco in particular (since 2002 an Augustinian saint, like Nicholas himself). As Micozzi points out, Lope's relationship with Orozco is well documented: on 30 June 1619, Lope gave evidence at Orozco's own beatification trial and swore that he had known the friar 'desde que tuvo uso

failed to mention Lope's play and why he might have considered himself the first to have written Castilian verse about the saint can be envisaged (ignorance or the exclusion of dramatic verse from his definition, for example) and so Menéndez Pelayo's tentative conclusion should not, in itself, lead us to doubt the *Cronología* dating. Besides, Aragüés has shown that, even though it was published in 1628, Salgado had composed his poem quite some time before and part of it had been published earlier in New Spain (2011, p. 5). A cursory comparison of Lope's play and Salgado's poem suggests, though, that neither work is very obviously influenced by the other. Aragüés considers that the poem, among other texts he lists, 'no parece haber desempeñado papel alguno en la fábrica de [*San Nicolás de Tolentino*]' (p. 6).

de razón, hasta que murió, de vista, trato y comunicación' (Vázquez 1988, p. 111). (From this Micozzi hypothesizes, quite credibly, that Lope's links with the Augustinians may have given rise to a commission for his St Nicholas play, although, as we have seen, proof of such a commission has yet to be found.) Surprisingly, Micozzi does not mention Orozco's writings as a potential source for Lope's play, though; by reason of the relationship between Lope and Orozco alone, Orozco's writings are surely worth examining.

Alonso de Orozco's *Crónica de san Agustín y de los santos, beatos y doctores de su orden*, first published in Seville in 1551, may well have been familiar to Lope. A cursory glance reveals that the two chapters that deal with Nicholas of Tolentino contain a more detailed account of the saint's life and miracles than either of the Ribadeneira or the Villegas texts. The *Crónica* describes the violent death of Nicholas's nephew, Gentil, including the explanation of how Gentil avoided damnation when his uncle's virtues and prayers cancelled out his own sins (see ll. 468-473 of *San Nicolás*). Similarly, the visit to Nicholas paid by Peregrino's ghost and their journey through purgatory is recounted with relative precision (ll. 2697-2799). As mentioned above, both of these important stories are entirely omitted from the accounts provided by Ribadeneira and Villegas. Orozco's *Crónica* also includes a full account of the circumstances of the saint's birth and of his early childhood which, in Lope's play, constitute the pre-history narrated in the potted biography presented by the Labrador character (ll. 1080-1199) and, furthermore, Orozco's text is a precedent for Lope's assertion that Nicholas's birth satisfied his parents' desire for an heir, that, before his birth, his parents were 'afligidos | de no tener sucesión' (ll. 1091-1092) (see Orozco 2001, pp. 150-151, where the point is given some emphasis). This

is an elusive detail found only in one other of the sources considered.[50] In addition, unlike Ribadeneira and Villegas, Orozco mentions the miraculous healing, by Nicolás's intercession, of the woodman (the Labrador in *San Nicolás*), who injures himself during the course of his labours. Finally by way of example, Orozco's *Crónica* includes reference to the devil's attempt to provoke an angry reaction in Nicholas by stealing the *paño* with which he is about to mend his *túnica* (both words used by Lope are used by Orozco (2001, p. 157), whereas Ribadeneira and Villegas omit this episode.

In terms of the factual details of Nicholas's life and miracles, Orozco's *Crónica* does, then, overlap with Lope's play to a considerable extent and can therefore sensibly be considered a possible source of our *comedia*. Indeed, my data analysis shows a seventy-five per cent. convergence between Orozco's account and the factual details selected from those contained in Lope's play. However, the *Crónica* does not mention all of the historical details given in *San Nicolás*. For example, Orozco does not provide as much detail as Lope does concerning the pilgrimage undertaken by the saint's parents to the tomb of Nicholas of Bari, or concerning the supernatural vision they had of that St Nicholas. And, crucially, Orozco does not mention either the miracle of the spring or the miracle of the transformation of bread into flowers, both of which Lope exploits to dramatic effect in his play. Once again, then, we must concede that, despite Lope's friendship with the author, Orozco's text is inadequate as the sole source for Lope's *San Nicolás*.

[50] I am excluding from this number the Burgos Augustinians' *Historia* and the Millán *Flos*, which I will not consider at all in this discussion concerning Lope's possible sources for *San Nicolás*. As the table at Appendix 2 suggests, these two texts are virtually identical to Orozco's and probably borrow from him directly (or alternatively all three derive from a common source), although the *Historia* and Millán omit the section at the end of Orozco's *vita*, concerning Nicholas's canonization (2001, pp. 166-171). It is possible that Lope had access to the *Historia* or to Millán rather than to Orozco's *Crónica*, but we might tentatively assume that Lope's relationship with this Augustinian makes his text the most likely of the three to have caught the playwright's attention. The other hagiography that provides the detail of the parents' desire for an heir is Navarro's *Vida*, which is discussed below.

If the ties of friendship that linked Lope with Orozco provide a reason why the *Crónica* might have been known to the playwright, the next possible source we shall discuss is chronologically closer to Lope's composition of *San Nicolás*. It is one that Micozzi sensibly suggests might be worthy of consideration (1996, p. 110). Published in Barcelona in 1612, Bernardo Navarro's *Vida y milagros de san Nicolás de Tolentino* is even fuller than Orozco.[51] It contains a greater proportion of the details found in Lope's play than any of the other sources discussed so far, ninety-two per cent. Unlike the sources thought most likely by Menéndez Pelayo and Sainz de Robles, it does contain accounts of both the miracle of the transformation of bread into flowers (ll. 1200-1241 of Lope's *comedia*) and the miracle of the spring (ll. 2596-2696). Navarro's *Vida* even specifies the species of bird roasted for the saint's fortification, a species upon which Lope agrees – a *perdiz.* The two *San Nicolás* miracles just mentioned, and the detail that the roasted bird was a partridge, are not even found in Monterubbiano's foundational fourteenth-century biography. The logical reason for this must be that, whilst Navarro does (directly or indirectly) borrow very heavily from Monterubbiano, these elements stem ultimately from another foundational source, probably from the records of the *Processus*. Indeed, Navarro explains in his prologue that he did have access to a hagiography by Iacomo Alberici, an author whom he believes he is quoting when he writes that Alberici had sight of 'el libro grande en el cual está el examen y el proceso hecho de la vida de san Nicolás por los obispos de Senegaglia y de Cesena' (fol. 6^{v}), though in fact, as Aragüés notes, these are in

[51] Navarro's *Vida* seems to borrow heavily from the Italian hagiography by Ambrogio Frigerio, the *Vita gloriosissima e miracoli eccelsi del beato confessore Nicola di Tolentino*, first published in Camerino in 1578. Indeed, Navarro lists Frigerio among his numerous sources (1612, fol. 6^{v}). It also includes, as the third of its three *libros*, Cristóbal de Busto's account of the miracles witnessed in Córdoba at the turn of the seventeenth century and attributed to the saint's intervention: *Milagros del glorioso san Nicolás de Tolentino de la orden de san Agustín*, published separately in Valladolid in 1604. I do not consider Busto's text in any detail, since Lope's play does not mention the Córdoba events.

fact Frigerio's words (2011, p. 15).[52] A biography such as Navarro's, close in date to Lope's play and drawing on (in fact often merely translating from) a wide range of well-researched hagiograpies such as Frigerio's that, in turn, draw on both foundational sources, unlike the other candidates discussed so far, is very likely to be of the kind that Lope used for his play, as it seems probable that Lope would sooner have gathered his material from one single, detailed source than laboriously harvested it from multiple sources (although maybe that is too facile a caricature our playwright).[53]

Yet again, though, Navarro's *Vida* falls just a little short of containing absolutely all the biographical detail on Nicholas that we find in Lope's play. It does not specify, as Lope does, that, towards the end of his life, the saint was seen dressed in a black Augustinian habit from which light shone as if it were embroidered with golden stars (ll. 2929- 2961) and neither does Navarro's account of the way in which the model for Lope's Labrador character personally benefited from the saint's intercession match Lope's play: 'casi me rompí la pierna' (l. 1186), the Labrador recounts. Navarro, just like Monterubbiano and Orozco, states that '[c]ortando leña un hombre llamado Tomás diose con la segur una mala herida en un *pie*' (fol. 13^{r}, with emphasis added).[54] The only sources that I have considered in which both of these details correspond to the action and dialogue of Lope's play are Jerónimo Román's 1590 *Vida y milagros del bienaventurado san Nicolás de Tolentino* and Juan González de Critana's 1612 *Vida y milagros del glorioso*

[52] It seems, from Alonso's *Saggio*, that Alberici became the editor of the Frigerio *Vita* from the Milan edition of 1603, which Alonso describes as being 'a cura di Giacomo Alberici', presumably quoting from the book's title page. Aragüés shows that the Frigerio text was revised and 'adornada' by Alberici (2011, p. 14).

[53] Aragüés confirms that Frigerio draws on both Monterubbiano, the *Processus* and an additional unnamed source related to the *Processus* (2011, p. 14).

[54] Aragüés bases his rejection of Navarro as Lope's source in part on the absence of the first element, the starry habit (2011, p. 17). It is conceivable, though (and, at p. 18, Aragüés concedes the episode's links to the saint's iconography), that Lope could have gleaned this missing element from some pictorial depiction of the saint showing him dressed in such a habit, for example, the one printed in Orozco's *Crónica* or the prayer card one Iturbe Sáiz reproduces in his article (2006, p. 121).

confesor san Nicolás de Tolentino.[55] Both confirm, like Lope, that the woodcutter injured his leg rather than his foot (fol. [D7]^{r} & fol. 20^{r}, respectively). (They also have the advantage of being straight biographies, without the kind of lengthy devotional and scholastic digressions which make Navarro's *Vida*, at times, rather tiresome reading.)

Whilst Román's *Vida* does contain the two elusive details just mentioned, the convergence with Lope's play shown by my analysis – ninety per cent. – is lower than Navarro's *Vida*, omitting, as it does, reference to the miracle of the spring and that of the bread turning into flowers, and also the explanation of the reason why the devil chooses to steal from Nicholas the *paño* with which he is mending his *túnica*: to incite anger in the saint. The highest level of convergence with Lope's play – ninety-six per cent. according to my (admittedly imperfect) analysis – is that shown by the Critana text, which Micozzi pointed to as worthy of investigation back in 1996 (p. 110).[56]

Critana's text is dedicated to 'la insigne Cofradía y Cofrades de S. Nicolás de Tolentino y ánimas de purgatorio', the *Congregación* referred to in the discussion relating to the priory of San Felipe, above. The level of convergence between this source and Lope's text speaks for itself; several elusive facts, absent in each case from a majority of the sources considered, are found together in Critana. Unlike Navarro, Critana – possibly by mistake – provides a source for the detail that Lope's Labrador injured his leg rather

[55] Aragüés explains that Román's *Vida* was first published as part of his *Crónica de la orden de san Agustín* in 1572 before it was published separately in 1590 and re-published in 1600 (2011, p. 12). It is the 1590 version that I have examined.

[56] My analysis is (at this stage inevitably) imperfect. I have not had access to (or probably even identified) all the sources Lope might plausibly have used when composing his play. The selection of factual details for the analysis is, to an extent, arbitrary, although I have tried to mitigate the possible impact of this by including a large number of facts from Lope's *comedia*. Finally, whether or not any given source includes the precise fact in question can sometimes be a matter of opinion; there are difficult decisions to be made, especially when the phrasing of the sources makes it hard to decide whether the fact is detailed with sufficient clarity to justify a finding that it corresponds to the equivalent fact in Lope's *San Nicolás*. My conclusions in this section of the introductory study are tentative and I hope in future to be able to refine them following further research. The recent publication of Aragüés's study is very helpful and any future studies produced by other scholars should help to give a clearer picture of the dizzying range of resources concerning St Nicholas of Tolentino that were in theory available to Lope around 1614.

than his foot. Critana describes the injury as 'una gran herida en una pierna' (fol. 20[r]).[57] Also, as Aragüés points out, Lope does not take up the name of the woodman given by Navarro – Tomás. (Román and Critana do not give the man's name.) The miracles of the metamorphosis of bread into flowers and of the spring are both found in Critana. So is the detail that the bird roasted for Nicholas to eat was a partridge. And Critana, again unlike Navarro, includes a passage describing the episode when rays of light were seen streaming from Nicholas's black habit (fol. 24[r]).[58] Unlike Navarro, who uses *gaya* and *nezga* (apparently Catalanisms) (fol. 84[v]), Critana uses the words *paño* and *túnica* when describing the occasion when the devil meddled with Nicholas's sewing (fol. 10[r]), and he also uses the word *hebdomadario* to discuss the saint's duty as celebrant of the daily conventual mass when the soul of Peregrino visits him (fol. 11[r]). Lope uses all three of these words. Whereas Navarro describes the celestial embassy that brought Nicholas the miraculous *panecillos* as comprising the Virgin Mary, St Augustine and St Monica, Critana, like Lope, excludes Monica (fol. 27[v]). And whereas, in Navarro, Nicholas is said to have seen Christ in the Eucharistic Host (fol. 13[r-v]), Critana's description of the episode is closer to Lope's in that it specifies that the Christ he saw in the Host was 'un niño hermosísimo' (fols 3[v]-4[r]). Finally, whereas several of the sources refer to the use of *panecillos* in miraculously extinguishing several fires, only Critana's provides a precedent for the fire (in this case in Antequera) having been exacerbated by wind (fol. 77[r]), which ties in with Lope's description of the fire at the end of Act 3 being particularly savage because 'aire y fuego están unidos' (l. 2989).[59]

[57] I suggest that this might have been a mistake (perhaps copied from Román) not only because it contradicts the detail provided by the majority of sources, including the foundational Monterubbiano (p. 655C) but also because later in Critana's text, in a long section narrating Nicholas's miracles, the author returns to the story of 'un hombre haciendo leña' and describes how the man 'se cortó un pie' (fol. 144[v]).

[58] Aragüés believes that Critana gleaned this detail from Román's hagiography (2011, p. 17).

[59] However, Román rather than Critana descibes a firefight in which the local friars intervene, as in Lope's play (fol. [F1][r]). This episode of Lope's play, then, can support the contention that the playwright drew on both Critana and Román.

Aragüés, who argues persuasively for his conclusion that Critana's *Vida* is the most likely source for Lope's play (possibly in conjunction with Román) bases his opinion, helpfully, upon different grounds.[60] First, Aragüés argues that various episodes in Lope's play develop in a way similar, in terms of content and concision, to the way they develop in Critana's *Vida*. For example, the miracle of the patridge and the institution of the *panecillos*, rolled into a single episode by Lope, appear contiguously in Critana, although the latter makes it clear that the Virgin and Augustine actually appeared to Nicholas the following night. In Navarro's account, these two episodes are separated by two long chapters (2011, p. 23). Specific details too point, for Aragüés, to the conclusion that Critana is Lope's source. The monastery known in Navarro and the hagiographies belonging to the 'iter italicum' as Valmanente or Valdemanente becomes Valizanes or Villazanes in Román, Villaçanes in Critana and, so Aragüés argues, from there, Villacanes in Lope (l. 2165).

All this allows us to make a strong case for Critana being Lope's source. This cautious conclusion is not incontrovertible, though. There are a number of small differences between Lope's *San Nicolás* and Critana's *Vida*. Whereas Lope and several hagiographers, including Navarro, give the saint's last words in Latin – the famous 'In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum' (ll. 3057-3059 and fol. 140^{v}), Critana's Nicholas utters the words in Spanish (fol. 30^{v}). Of course, these words, Jesus's last (Luke 23. 46), are so well known that Lope would have had no difficulty at all translating them from Spanish into Latin had he wanted to. Perhaps a more serious discrepancy lies in the absence from Critana's text (as far as I can tell) of the precise explanation Lope gives for the saint's parents having been desparate for a child: they were 'afligidos | de no tener sucesión' (ll. 1091-1092). Whereas Navarro (and Orozco) explain the anguish of parents

[60] Aragüés argues that Critana's *Vida* is the 'fuente casi indudable de la comedia' (2011, p. 7).

who lack an 'heredero' (fol. 8[r] and p. 150, respectively), Critana does not seek to explain this anguish (fol. 2[r]).[61] Again, though, this need not lead us to play down the likelihood of Critana's *Vida* being Lope's source. The desire for an heir is a constant one among noblemen of Nicholas's and of Lope's times and Lope could easily have supplemented Critana's account with this perhaps rather predictable detail. Finally, of all the hagiographies read in the preparation of this edition of Lope's play, it seems that only Román's *Vida* mentions a famine of the kind that afflicts the local people at the start of Act 2 of *San Nicolás* (fol. D2[r]). Critana's *Vida* does not.[62] However, once more, Lope could quite plausibly have invented this detail (an obvious one to add to the story if the effect desired is the magnifying of the importance of the saint's charity) and Román provides no details concerning the famine he mentions that make it likely that his was a vital source for Lope; in fact, none of the sources explains that the famine takes place in the context of the Guelph-Ghibelline conflict.

So, in agreement with Aragüés, our tentative conclusion must be that, if Lope used only one hagiographic source when composing *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, Critana's *Vida* is the most likely one of those considered. It would not be surprising, though, if Lope had used a couple of or even a few sources, and there is at least one combination excluding Critana that could have provided Lope with the same information, according to my analysis – Navarro and Román.[63] Alternatively, Lope may not have used printed sources at

[61] In both cases, the word 'heredero' is not stated to be the parents' own, but rather it appears as part of the authors' explanations of the parents' desire for a child.

[62] Aragüés points to another factor that might make the use of Román likely (for him alongside Critana): only Román claims that Nicholas's merits saved Gentil from purgatory (rather than hell) and in Act 3 of Lope's play we do indeed find Ursino's soul suffering in purgatory alongside those of Nicolás's parents and Floro (2011, p. 25). Aragüés does not consider Lope's recourse to Román the only possible explanation for this, however.

[63] Aragüés considers this unlikely because, he claims: (i) not a single episode present in Navarro (or the Italian tradition on which he draws) not also present in Critana finds its way into Lope's play; and (ii) Lope does not echo any of the 'abundantes notas de erudición' that authors such as Navarro include in their hagiographies, even though there is plenty of erudition in Lope's *comedia* (2011, p 20). I wonder if the absence from Critana of the suggestion that the saint's parents desired an heir, a point made in Navarro's text among others, allows us to question the first limb of this claim. All the texts discussed are of the kind that

all. It is possible that, instead, a commissioning party might have provided Lope with a *borrador* of the kind about which Ferrer Valls has written.[64] Our tentative conclusion, though, will allow us to identify elements of *San Nicolás* that are the product of Lope's imagination rather than the hagiographic record.

The non-historical content in 'San Nicolás'

While Sainz de Robles must be wrong when he attributes all the detail in *San Nicolás* not contained in Ribadeneira to Lope's 'maestría' and 'poderosa imaginación', Lope's imagination was certainly responsible, not just for the play's poetry, but also for a significant proportion of its content, in particular what might be termed the play's racier moments. Clearly, none of Lope's sources refer to the *gracioso*-types in *San Nicolás*, Ruperto and Celia. An examination of the sources also reveals that Gentil Ursino's affair with Laurencia and his Calisto-style death are likely to be the products of the playwright's romantically inclined imagination. So too are Peregrino's vision of hell and the emotive scenes in which Gentil Ursino's soul is tried before the Juez Divino and Nicolás sees the souls of his own parents suffering the torments of purgatory. The 'allegorical' embodiments of evil (for example, Inobediencia and Ira) who consort with the devil do not appear in the hagiographies of the period and nor does the Christ-like pilgrim who rewards Nicolás for the charity he shows him in Act 1 with the starry habit the saint dons at the end of Act 3. Finally, there is the doctor who prescribes that Nicolás should eat meat to regain his strength in Act 2. Whilst the sources do mention the attendance of doctors, none

one might expect the library of a large cathedral chapter to have possessed. We know that Lope spent part of March 1614, preparing himself for his priestly ordination, at Toledo cathedral where he counted the dean and the 'arçediano' among his friends (Amezúa 1935-1943, II, p. 318).

[64] See footnote 36 above.

specifies the doctors' race or religion. Was Lope's decision to make his doctor Jewish a reflection of the historical fact that, up to 1492 Jews, and after then *conversos*, were prominent among physicians, or was it merely a device intended to appeal to the intolerant instincts of some elements of Lope's audience, as it appeals to Ruperto's? Ruperto will be dealt with in the section below that focuses on the *gracioso*. Before that, I shall discuss the play's eponymous hero and the literary use to which Lope put the hagiographic data he gathered from his sources.

3. Lope's Nicolás: a case of hagiographiction?

The flourishing of the *comedia de santos* during the first two decades of the seventeenth century is usually put down to the confluence of certain historical and cultural circumstances to which saints' plays were well suited. These circumstances are relatively well known. The general populace of Golden-Age Spain seems to have felt a powerful affection for the saints, and the Counter-Reformation Church was explicit in encouraging this, calling on artists of all kinds to collaborate with it in keeping the saints constantly before the eyes of the faithful, as models of Christian living and as influential intercessors with God. Spain's religious buildings were (and still are) full to bursting with paintings, statues and relics of the saints. And prose hagiographies – the famous *vitae sanctorum* or *vidas de santos* – were very popular among the literate, with the illiterate learning about the saints' lives from the sermons that they were expected regularly to hear.[65] So it is unsurprising that the Golden-Age dramatists tapped into this rich, plentiful and attractive subject matter. It also stands to reason that the number of saints plays being composed increased precisely at the turn of the seventeenth century.[66] It probably is not a coincidence that the initial flourishing of this sub-genre coincided with official attempts to regulate the theatres as a condition to their reopening following on from the closure of the *corrales* between November 1597 and April 1599.[67] The *Dictamen* issued in 1600 and

[65] See note 13 for details of the boom in the publication of books about saints in the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries.

[66] Morrison holds that '[i]t was soon after 1600 that the number of plays dealing with the adventures of saints became so great that they came to be considered a separate class, called *comedias de santos*' (2000, p. 27).

[67] Permission to stage theatrical performances was suspended temporarily in 1597 upon the death of the Infanta Catalina Micaela de Austria, the Duquesa de Saboya. In May 1598 Philip II yielded to the *moralistas* and the temporary suspension was confirmed as indefinite, the only occasion during Lope's lifetime that the moralists succeeded in closing the theatres on moral grounds (rather than because of plague or a royal death). Madrid's theatres were opened again in April 1599 to celebrate the betrothal of Philip III and Margarita de Austria (Morrison 2000, p. 30).

approved, with some modifications, by the Council of Castile, sought to prohibit plays whose subject matter was corrupting or licentious and to forbid immodest dances, gestures and words.[68] Whilst it is clear that in the long run this decree, and several others like it, had limited impact, it seems plausible that the sudden and marked increase in the production of saints' plays was the result of an initial movement by dramatists to adhere to the new regulations, at least superficially, or maybe to hedge their bets by producing this new kind of decorous play alongside the kind that had become the staple fare of theatregoers by the turn of the seventeenth century. However, the fact that these saints' plays continued to be written and performed in considerable numbers well beyond the turn of the century, by which time it would have been clear that there was in reality little obstacle to the performance of secular plays of doubtful morality, must, in part, be down to the saints' plays having, to some degree, pleased their audiences.[69] And the evidence suggests that these *comedias de santos* were not just staged as part of set-piece celebrations but that they were put on alongside secular offerings in the public theatres where the success of a play mattered for financial reasons.[70]

The principal aim of the *comedias de santos* was undoubtedly religious edification and they could achieve this aim very effectively.[71] One of Lope's own characters in *Los locos por el cielo*, Terencio, explains the affective pull of religious theatre and confirms

[68] The undated 'Dictamen' issued by a committee of eleven theologians declared that plays should be permitted, provided, *inter alia*, that 'la materia de que se tratase no fuese mala ni lasciva, y en la buena o indiferente no se mezclasen bailes, ni meneos, ni tonadas lascivas ni dichos deshonestos, ni en lo principal ni en los entremeses'. In 1600 the Council of Castile resolved to approve the Dictamen subject to various modifications that did not affect the proviso quoted (Cotarelo y Mori 1997, pp. 163B-164A & 208A-209A).

[69] If Morley and Bruerton's dating is applied, then fourteen of the twenty-five *comedias de santos* they attribute to Lope date from 1610 or later. Morrison writes that '[t]he popularity of the dramatized saint's life in Spain lasted throughout the century' (2000, p. 27).

[70] A study of the account books of Madrid's *corrales* for the period 1706 to 1719, for example, shows that among the public theatres' repertoire *comedias de santos* were the most numerous dramatic sub-genre among the more lavish plays described as 'comedias de teatro' (Varey and Davis 1992, pp. 56-57).

[71] Discussing the *comedia de santos* Arellano insists that '[e]l *docere* no puede discutirse en este tipo de comedias' (1999, p. 262).

the evangelizing efficacy of religious drama, in this case said to result in the conversion of pagans:

> Representar los pasos y misterios
> De tales Sacramentos, es muy justo,
> Porque a mí me mueven y enternecen,
> Y he visto en sólo verlos, convertidos
> Algunos que a los dioses adoraban. (p. 106B)

Lope's character is echoing the views of some contemporary commentators on this point. The devotional impact of the saints' plays could be substantial, according to their advocates in the perpetual controversies that raged concerning the legitimacy of the theatre.[72] The plays' emotional pull and their power to promote increased piety among Golden-Age audiences are the principal grounds upon which the theatre's champions based their defence of the *comedia de santos*, in the face of tenacious opposition. For example, the Trinitarian friar, Manuel de Guerra y Ribera, noted admiringly how 'el ejemplo mueve, los milagros se imprimen, la devoción se extiende. ¡Cuántos me afirman que lloran más que en el más ardiente sermón!'. His point is taken up by Fray Alejandro de Camporedondo, who also insists that the saints' plays 'mueven a devoción y excitan a imitar a los santos; aficionan a la virtud y sacan copiosas lágrimas de ternura y de amor' (Cotarelo y Mori 1997, pp. 334B & 133A, respectively). And Robert Morrison describes how thoroughly some spectators suspended their disbelief 'weeping, kneeling, and even venerating the actors who portrayed saints'. He claims that:

> It was not surprising for persons of merely superficial religious convictions to leave a 'comedia devota' and join a monastic organization. On other occasions, actors portraying divine personages continued the same virtuous customs after the performance, and some left their profession for the garb of the Church. (2000, p. 21)

[72] More than a century after its first publication Cotarelo y Mori's *Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España* remains the fundamental source on the subject.

So, in the eyes of some spectators and critics, if the circumstances were right, the saint's play could trigger a powerful emotional response leading to religious conversion.

A history of the saint's play might describe it, then, as a *comedia* presenting the life and miracles of a saint on stage with the purpose of encouraging devotion through the saint's example, and in a style that avoids the licentiousness of bawdy *entremeses*, for example, though preserving the hallowed role of the *comedia gracioso.* The consensus among the few critics to have written about the *comedia de santos* is, quite rightly, that the principal aims of the sub-genre were religious edification and entertainment.[73] They agree, moreover, that the entertainment was provided largely by the plays' profane elements, chief among them the *gracioso*, with the protagonist, the saint, supplying the spiritual inspiration.[74] However, the young Nicolás presented to the audience in the first scene of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* is an awkward, serious student who is shown to infuriate his

[73] Garasa notes how 'las comedias de santos tenían la virtud de presentar en vivo el admirable ejemplo de sus vidas, de evocar con mayor fuerza sus vicisitudes, de robustecer la confianza en la misericordia divina' (1960, p. 31). Saints' plays tend not to illustrate the outworkings of a doctrine (as many *autos sacramentales* do). Rather, *San Nicolás* seems intended to inspire affection and admiration for the protagonist; that is, it seeks to invoke an emotional response rather than a cognitive one. Javier Aparicio Maydeu makes this point in his study of Calderón's *El José de las mujeres*: '[p]retende no tanto aleccionar con el dogma como forzar a una fe visceral' (1999, p. 21). Of the profane elements in the *comedia de santos* sub-genre Dassbach notes 'son una muestra más de la intención artística de sus autores por crear obras que, además de dramatizar la santidad y exponer determinados contenidos teológicos, *tengan interés dramático y proporcionen el mayor entretenimiento posible*' (1997, p. 125, with emphasis added). She insists that, although not the sole source of humour, the saint's play *gracioso* is 'el personaje cómico más importante' (p. 145) and that humour in the saints' plays makes the sanctity dramatized 'más digerible' (p. 153). Morrison writes that the purpose of the *comedias de santos* 'was twofold: to edify and entertain' (2000, p. 27), and that Lope's sought to edify by encouraging his audiences 'to strive for higher personal standards' (p. 23).

[74] According to Dassbach's definition of the *comedia de santos*, saints' plays must 'dramatizar la santidad de[l] protagonista' (1997, p. 1). She suggests that, in the case of a saint belonging to the category of the mendicant, sanctity tends to be achieved by the saint 'sobresaliendo en el cumplimiento de las normas y requisitos de la orden a la que pertenece' (p. 24). Another attraction was the spectacle associated with the supernatural elements of the staging of religious plays. Dassbach states that this is particularly true of plays that dramatize the lives of saints she classifies as 'miracle workers': '[b]uena parte del interés en este tipo de santo radica en que permite la puesta en escena de una serie de prodigios visualmente muy efectivos' (p. 78). Nicolás is both a mendicant and a miracle worker. The other two of Dassbach's four categories of saints' play types are the martyr and the convert, both of which provide, generally, more opportunities for the creation of dramatic tension than the mendicant in particular.

friends with his precocious intelligence and predictable piety.[75] He is not a character to whom the spectator is likely immediately to warm; his friends are more obviously attractive. The aversion one might, unexpectedly, feel towards him in the play's early scenes could impede the sympathy that is probably a pre-requisite for the desire to emulate an edificatory example to arise. There is evidence from the start, then, that Lope's presentation of sainthood in this play is more complex than the straightforward encomium contained in the prose hagiographies that narrate the life and miracles of Nicholas of Tolentino. Lope seems to have realized that the hagiographic record would need to be modified for his protagonist to stand the best chance of fulfilling his edificatory function.

Act 1: the adolescent Nicolás

San Nicolás de Tolentino begins with action that has no precedent in any of the hagiographies that I have examined; it must be Lope's invention and the purpose for which it seems to have been invented is an interesting one. Nicolás is engaged in a disputation with his student friends, Peregrino and Ruperto, and with Ursino, his nephew. Ruperto advances a proposition – 'que son las mujeres | más bien nacidas' (ll. 1-2) – obviously intended to initiate a round of light-hearted verbal sparring (see the footnote to ll. 1-18), but immediately Nicolás shows his sober bent by upbraiding the *gracioso*, inviting him to present his arguments more coherently (ll. 2-4). Nicolás's censorious intervention provokes Ursino to describe his uncle as a wolf poised to pounce upon the vulnerable sheep, Ruperto (l. 5). This initial depiction of the saint, this attack on his character, is alien to the presentation of sanctity offered by the hagiographies, which

[75] The play's action is summarized and divided into *macrosecuencias*, *microsecuencias* and *cuadros* in the table at Appendix 3. This chapter of the introductory study will focus principally on the scenes of *San Nicolás* that centre on the eponymous hero.

generally cast no shadows over Nicholas's goodness. These opening lines of the play, then, provide an early clue that Lope's approach to sainthood will diverge from that of the prose accounts. The hero of *San Nicolás* must have made a rather unexpected initial impression on the contemporary spectator. The fact that the characterization of the saint, at this early stage, is the result of Lope's adaptation of, his divergence from, the source material points to a deliberate dramatic purpose that I shall discuss below. And this unsympathetic characterization continues for some while at the start of Act 1.

As the pseudo-scholastic disputation unfolds, Nicolás again either misreads his friends' mood or deliberately reacts against it. They desire *holganza* (ll. 102 and 121) and banter, reflected in their quick-fire dialogue sustained up to line 58. However, from line 59 Nicolás begins instead to sermonize at length; he is interrupted only after thirty lines by Ruperto's frustrated outburst, '¡Oh, pesia tal!' (l. 88). Even the more diplomatic Peregrino, who recognizes Nicolás's pre-eminence among the student body (l. 109-110) urges the abandonment of 'esta cuestión | cansada aunque docta' (ll. 91-92). Now the spectator could be minded to give Nicolás the benefit of the doubt at this point, perhaps recognizing in him a superior intellect uncomfortable with the mocking tone with which scholastic niceties are being discussed. But Lope seems committed to preventing this magnanimous concession. High-mindedness is one thing, petulance is another and it is with petulance that Nicolás reacts to Peregrino's tactful suggestion. Nicolás objects that 'Ruperto ha sido | la causa; yo he respondido; | disculpa debo tener' (ll. 94-96). And prudery is added to this petulance when Nicolás pulls a horrified expression at Ursino's talk of the women he hopes to encounter at the *fiestas* in which all but Nicolás are keen to participate (l. 128). Ruperto thinks his master's prudence excessive: '¡Ea, que tu encogimiento | pasa del límite justo!' (ll. 149-150). Peregrino resolves that on this special day he, for one, will avoid sanctimony (l. 175). And Ursino accuses 'pretendientes' (including, by implication, his

uncle, who is destined for a clerical career) of hypocrisy (ll. 153-154). All three want to celebrate the election of the new pope in the conventional manner and they are dismayed at Nicolás's suggestion that instead they should spend the evening engaged in penitential prayer. Recognizing Nicolás's informal status as leader of their group, though, Peregrino and Ruperto eventually, begrudgingly, accept his advice. Ursino alone rebels by stealing away into the night. Even a spectator who had chosen to attend the staging of a saint's play, a sub-genre that inevitably presents a rich display of orthodox piety, must have looked askance at the hero Lope creates here, a hero who heaps scorn precisely upon those profane elements that controversially sugar-coated the bitter pill of Christian edification: the comic repartee, the *cuchilladas* announced in line 178, and the *lances amorosos* that Ursino seeks out, all helping to create anticipation among *oyentes* familiar with the dramatic vicissitudes associated with the secular *comedia*. Lope's adaptation of the hagiographic sources, his unhistorical characterization of this rebarbative boy-saint, seems deliberately engineered to trick the spectator into siding against the priggish hero.

Before the climax to the action of the first half of Act 1, Lope begins to soften the initially hard edges of his literary creation, perhaps causing the more discerning spectator to hold off from dismissing Nicolás as a dreary pedant. First, Peregrino and Ruperto, both sympathetic characters given their general good humour, express affection for their forbidding friend. Before he enters the Augustinian priory to pray, Peregrino notes how Nicolás has tricked him into compliance, but he accepts that this deception consisted in '*amorosos* engaños' (l. 274, with emphasis added). Similarly, Ruperto enters the monastery with his master in spite of himself and he does it for his master's sake: 'Yo lo haré por ti', he says (l. 295), an affection echoed later at lines 853-854. Peregrino and Ruperto see something in Nicolás, then, something that perhaps the spectator has so far missed.

And the hero appears in a more favourable light in his own right in the subsequent episode (ll. 301-530), where Christ himself, disguised as a pilgrim, provides him with an opportunity to demonstrate his selfless charity – he gives the pilgrim the entirety of the income he has earned from his *calonjía* – and his humility, embarrassed as he is by the gratitude shown by the pilgrim, whom Nicolás does not recognize as Christ. Whereas Nicolás is befriended by Christ, lusty, sardonic Ursino, on whom the spectator is counting for a spot of racy *galanteo*, is ensnared by the devil in disguise as the Máscara. Assuredly familiar with the proverb 'no con quien naces, sino con quien paces', a Golden-Age spectator might, at this stage, have questioned his initial sympathies in light of these developments.

Either way, it seems that the drama of the action that follows must have been intended to reveal to the spectator the acuity of his judgment of Nicolás: his good sense, if he saw Christian prudence and love beneath the challengingly stern piety embodied by Nicolás, or his dangerous folly, if he prized worldly matters of the kind dear to Ursino, the *glorias del mundo* that Quevedo, for instance, exposes in a poem such as 'Son las torres de Joray' and Góngora in 'Mientras por competir con tu cabello'.

For the devil himself is struck by the depths of Ursino's vice. Enticed by the devil to pay a clandestine visit to a particular lady, 'cierta dama que os adora' (l. 216), Ursino quickly admits that 'todas las quiero bien, mas poco dura' (l. 359) and that he loves nothing more than boasting publicly about his conquests (l. 379-380), at the expense of the women's honour. The devil is impressed by this Don Juan figure, 'no pienso que [...] el mundo [...] haya criado | un hombre más vicioso y olvidado | de sus obligaciones' (ll. 382-385) and he engineers a swift death in the expectation that Ursino's soul will immediately be consigned to hell. If the spectator is initially drawn to Ursino, his sudden death in the clutches of sin and at the hands of the devil, and the prospect of his eternal damnation

demonstrate, at the very least, that his actions are, in the context of a religious play, meant to be seen as worthy of extreme censure.[76] The devil immediately presses the tribunal of the Last Judgement to hand down this ultimate censure to Ursino, a fate that must have struck fear into the hearts of many Golden-Age spectators. But the devil is, as he sees it, cheated of his prize when the Virgin Mary persuades the Juez Divino to set Nicolás's virtue and prayers off against the tally of his nephew's sins. So, it is thanks to the merits of the apparently priggish hero that Ursino avoids damnation and the spectator who was initially inclined against Nicolás is invited to recognize how his own moral compass had been miscalibrated, perhaps oriented in accordance with the rules, the conventions of the secular *comedia* rather than the *comedia de santos*. The desire to teach the audience this lesson at an early stage must account for the unsympathetic characterization of Nicolás at the start of the play. The picture Lope paints of the young saint is certainly different from the (admittedly rather two-dimensional) one that emerges from the relevant prose hagiographies.

These hagiographies tend to focus on the saint's actions, words and miracles rather than on his character, but most do give a brief account of his early inclinations. Ribadeneira's *Flos Sanctorum*, for example, offers the following description of the young Nicholas, which is very similar to those found in the other hagiographies. These, as we have seen, draw heavily on the original sources – the *Processus* and Monterubbiano's *Vita*:

[76] The hagiographies offer scant detail concerning the death of the historical figure on whom Lope's Ursino is based. Critana's account is typical in its brevity. A messenger comes to Nicolás at the priory and tells the saint that 'a un primo suyo, llamado Gentil, le había muerto en un castillo un su enemigo, y que temían que se había condenado, por ser la muerte violenta' (1612, fol. B4ᵛ). Interestingly, none of the sources I have examined suggests the direct involvement of the devil. Lope's decision to adapt the record in this way, attributing Ursino's death to entrapment by Demonio, casts light on Lope's understanding and use of the supernatural in *San Nicolás* (see the penultimate section of this introductory study that analyses the play's supernatural characters).

> desde niño fue muy inclinado al servicio de Dios, frecuentaba las iglesias, oía misa y rezaba con mucha devoción, huía las compañías de los muchachos traviesos, gustaba de tratar con religiosos, hacía bien a los pobres, y ayunaba y ocupábase en el estudio [...] y como iba creciendo en edad, iba también creciendo en virtud y ciencia. Hiciéronle canónigo de una iglesia de San Salvador y aunque vivía loablemente, no estaba contento, porque siempre anhelaba a otro estado de mayor perfección. Y así, habiendo oído un sermón de un famoso predicador de la orden de San Agustín, del menosprecio del mundo [...] tomó el hábito de San Agustín. (p. 636B)

The hagiographies, then, tend to focus on Nicholas's precocious piety, charity, virtue and knowledge. This portrayal is not inconsistent with Lope's depiction of the young Nicolás, but Lope's most surprising innovation in the early part of the *comedia*, Nicolás's unattractive priggishness is an exaggeration, a corruption of a characteristic barely hinted at in some hagiographies. It seems to grow out of the earnestness implied by the young saint's habit of avoiding mischievous children (and women, adds the *Processus*), preferring instead the company of clergy (and old men, in the *Processus*).[77] Comments found in Orozco, Navarro and Critana add detail to the image we have of the historical Nicholas and may have inspired the scene invented by Lope. Orozco notes how, at school, Nicholas was 'tan recogido y callado que los otros niños no osaban hablar palabra alguna deshonesta, porque él luego se lo reprendía' (2001, p. 152); as we have seen, Lope's Nicolás disapproves of his friends' frivolity. Navarro explains that Nicholas 'menospreciaba todas las burlas y niñerías' and that 'en la mocedad [...] vivió tan sin afectos de carne, tan vencidas todas las pasiones, como si no fuera de carne' (1612, fols 13^{r} & 16^{v}), a biographical trait reflected in Nicolás's flinching at the mention by Ursino of women at lines 125-132. And Critana recounts how Nicolás '[a]partábase siempre de los

[77] Article VI of the *Processus* describes Nicholas: 'quando erat parvulus mulierum et puerorum non solum consortia vitans, sed senium religiosarumque personarum conversationem semper amplectens', 'when he was young he not only avoided the company of women and of boys but he always sought to maximize time spent in conversation with old men and religious' (1984, p. 18). Monterubbiano adds the reason for Nicholas's choice of company: '[q]uia cum sancto sanctus eris, et cum perverso perverseris', 'because if you are in the company of the saintly you shall become a saint, and if you are in the company of the wicked you shall be perverted' ([1326], col. 645C).

otros niños, y desechaba los regalos de la niñez, y en ella parecía viejo en las costumbres' (1612, fol. A4[r]). So, the earnestness of Lope's young Nicolás is a trait that is arguably present in the hagiographic sources that were probably consulted in the composition of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. However, Lope certainly chooses to make much more of this trait by showing the rather realistic reactions of more ordinary, worldly characters of a kind largely undeveloped in the hagiographies. So, literary genre seems to affect the impression that the saint's character makes.

The tone of the hagiographies is purely panegyric. The reader is not invited to respond critically to the historical Nicholas described, but rather to join the hagiographer in his response of wide-eyed admiration for a man incontrovertibly recognized by the Church as a saint. Where the hagiographies briefly describe some scant character traits of the young Nicholas, these are generally very conventional signs strongly indicative of his future sanctity; they are not details intended to construct a psychologically coherent character to whom the reader might try to relate.[78] Context too inclines the reader away from forming any unfavourable impressions of the hagiographic subject. When Navarro tells the reader that the young saint 'menospreciaba todas las burlas y niñerías' there is no Ursino, no devil's advocate, to present this attitude to us as prudish and hypocritical; on the contrary, Navarro is Nicholas's advocate, presenting this scorn for childish things as a sign that his subject was, from a preternaturally early age, 'religiosísimo' (fol. 13[r]). To form a negative impression of the historical Nicholas, the reader would need to defy the unmistakable intentions of the hagiographers. The initial focus that Lope places on the less attractive features of his hero's character and his setting within a realistic world peopled by

[78] In the first two chapters of their study *Saints and Society*, Weinstein and Bell detail characteristics and experiences typical of saints in childhood and adolescence. Several feature in the hagiographic record concerning these early stages in the life of Nicholas of Tolentino. For example, like Nicholas, who refused his mother's milk several days per week, Saint Cunegund of Poland practised abstinence 'by contenting herself with only one breast at each feeding' (1982, p. 24). And Nicholas's decision to embrace a religious vocation, prompted by his encounter with the Augustinian preacher, is similar to the experiences of many an adolescent saint's search for identity, ending in an 'encounter with the holy evangelist' (p. 57).

men and women capable of misapprehending Nicolás's goodness suggest that Lope, by contrast, intends such a negative impression and that realistic world of the *comedia* is one where saintly piety can appear alien.[79]

Lope's emphasis on the life of a saint lived very much within a vaguely realistic society has the potential to lend his hagiographic dramas greater affective pull than the typical prose hagiography, and there is evidence that shows how some Golden-Age spectators did have intensely emotional reactions to these plays.[80] By placing pious Nicolás firmly within a conventional *comedia* setting, by adapting the saint's character to coax the spectator into a stance of disapproval at the hero's difficult exterior and then, subsequently by showing how the spectator was wrong to respond unsympathetically to Nicolás, Lope has demonstrated how saints, as he understands them, do not belong to the fairytale world found in the pages of the *Flores Sanctorum*, but rather, to the real world, albeit a real world whose true nature lies hidden beneath a surface layer of multifaceted *engaño*, a true world of which that spectator might be inclined at times to lose sight, just as, on a smaller scale, he might have lost sight of Nicolás's goodness in the play's opening. Lope's adaptation of the hagiographies is suggestive of a newer, more realistic aesthetic of sainthood and, possibly, a more effective method of conversion than that of the *santorales*. He demonstrates how many men are distracted from what Golden-Age Spaniards would have acknowledged to be the righteous path by the worldly concerns of everyday life: these are the concerns by which Rosela, Feniso, Heraclio, Fabricio, Aurelio and Lidia are

[79] Garasa identifies the initially disconcerting otherness of the saints: '[u]n santo es siempre un individualista, un ser que se destaca de la colectividad rasante o gregaria. Sus caminos o sus metas, sus victorias o sus derrotas, poseen un sello peculiarísimo [...]. Por consiguiente, es forzoso que en *su personalidad, a primera vista desconcertante*, incida el vivo interés de los artistas. Los hombres experimentaron siempre en presencia del santo la fascinación, *el recelo o la incomodidad* que inspiran los seres distintos' (1960, p. 9, with emphasis added).

[80] There are a number of famous cases of spectators, and sometimes the actors themselves, being converted as a result of some religious play, the actress known as La Baltasara being the most famous. Contemporary evidence of the emotional power of religious theatre can be found in the *Relación* that describes the first performance of Lope's *La limpieza no manchada*, on Monday, 29 October 1618. The anonymous author records how at the end of the play the crowd 'rompió en un grito significando la alegría y júbilo interior que todos experimentaron en sus almas' (*Relación* 1618, p. 81).

preoccupied in the series of short exchanges (ll. 526-579) with which the second half of Act 1 begins: erotic love and money.

The second half of Act 1 shows Nicolás acting decisively on the lesson taught by Ursino's death, choosing to turn his back on the world by joining the Augustinian Order. Nicolás's mind is finally made up after hearing Fray Rogerio's sermon (ll. 606-771), which also momentarily re-focuses the minds of Rosela and the other minor characters mentioned above who provide an internal audience for the sermon. The latter half of Act 1 is arguably concerned less with Nicolás's conversion than with Ruperto's, though. So substantive discussion of Rogerio's sermon and its aftermath is best reserved for the analysis of Lope's *gracioso* that follows in the next section of this study.

With the end of the initial section of the play at line 525, Nicolás's pious instincts have been proved right and his reserve wholly justified, a concession the spectator must make once his moral compass has been recalibrated in acknowledgement of the fact that at stake here are not the relative trivia, the ephemera of the *comedia de capa y espada*, but the human soul's eternal fate.

Act 2: Nicolás – miracle worker

When compared to the coherent drama of Act 1, the action of Act 2 of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* is diffuse. Whereas the two episodes around which Act 1 is structured (the *fiesta* and the sermon) could plausibly have taken place during the course of twenty-four hours (the text does not permit precise chronological demarcation), the action of the second act is so fragmented as to prevent any meaningful estimation of the time elapsed from beginning to end, however vague. This fragmentation is common in Lope's *comedias de*

santos; it is a consequence of the (very typical) subject matter of the *segunda jornada*: the miracles invoked by the saint and the temptations he suffered, material which, in the hagiographies, dominates the narration of Nicholas's adult life, although it is hard to be more exact since the prose accounts, like Act 2 of Lope's play, give only imprecise indications of chronology. This change in subject matter, the closer convergence with the hagiographical accounts and the broad shift in focus from the profane world of Lope's imagination to the liminal world straddling earth and heaven that is inhabited by Nicolás in Act 2, all result in a shift in the dramatic interest that the play presents.[81] The episodes of the *segunda jornada* are too disjointed, too lacking in dramatic focus, to sustain the suspense that might have made Act 1 compelling for the spectator.[82] Instead, Act 2 offers the chance to be moved by the hero's acts of love and by his interactions with supernatural characters including the Virgin Mary and the devil. The art of the *tramoyistas*, exploited fully in the staging of supernatural visions and the saint's multiple miracles, must also have made this act visually entertaining.[83] Notwithstanding the shift of focus, however, Act 2 continues to develop Nicolás's character and the image of sainthood by which Lope hoped to instil increased piety in his audience.

---

[81] There are some supernatural episodes in Act 1 – the Last Judgement scene and the visitation of Christ as a pilgrim – but fewer than in the remaining *jornadas*. The action of Act 1 is much more worldly than that of the remaining acts.

[82] Addressing the absence from many saints' plays of 'suspenseful plots' Morrison writes: '[c]ritics have generally failed to take into sufficient account the inherent distinctions of the "comedia de santos", and have neglected to search deeply enough for its beauties of thought, language, and intent. We do not expect in every poem the same strength of theme and imagery, nor should we expect in every drama the same impact of plot and suspense. To dwell only on those Golden Age plays with suspenseful plots and romantic intrigues is to violate a different age, by distorting it to resemble our own and setting aside much of the context of its artistic heritage' (2000, p. 1). Morrison explains that many saints' plays 'can be described as a series of events and tableaux joined together only by the presence of the principal character or characters', but that '[t]he evidence suggests that many theatre-goers preferred this plan. They liked seeing brief scenes depicting the character or miracles of their saints, rather than a well-constructed conflict building through two acts and resolved in the third, for such a conflict would almost surely have to confine the plot to no more than a brief period in the saint's life' (p. 94). Anne Teulade considers episodic saints' plays to be especially typical of Lope, who 'prefiere construir sus comedias acumulando pruebas de santidad y da preferencia a intrigas fragmentarias, contrariamente, por ejemplo, a Calderón' (2008, p. 94).

[83] Although he concedes that some *cognoscenti* might have enjoyed the loveliness of the verse, the subtlety of the controversies discussed between the saint and the devil or the way in which the dramatists exploited their hagiographic sources, Aparicio Maydeu insists that 'el éxito de las piezas se resolvía siempre en la novedad de las tramoyas y en el mayor o menor asombro del auditorio' (1999, p. 33).

An unspecified period of time has passed between the end of Act 1 and the start of Act 2, sufficient for Nicolás – now a friar at the priory of Firmo – to have acquired a reputation for generosity (the topic of discussion in ll. 1052-1055, 1068-1069 and 1166-1169) and saintliness (ll. 1068-75). The biographical sketch concerning Nicolás's childhood and adolescence, given by the Labrador between lines 1080 and 1199, communicates many biographical details firmly established in the hagiographic tradition: his miraculous birth to an ageing mother thought barren, announced by an angel and achieved through the intercession of St Nicholas of Bari (ll. 1090-1119); the holy abstinence of the child Nicholas, in imitation of his namesake (ll. 1124-1127); and the signs of the boy being favoured by God with the vision of the infant Christ's face in the Eucharistic Host (ll. 1133-1139), for example. Lope's decision to reel these episodes off in a monologue at the start of Act 2, rather than dramatizing them during the course of Act 1, is further evidence to support the contention that *el Fénix* deliberately distributed the hagiographic material so as to avoid overburdening Act 1, to avoid Act 1 consisting in a succession of loosely connected *tableaux vivants*.[84] The Labrador's potted biography catches up with the play's action at line 1143, where the spectator is reminded of the sermon Nicolás heard at the end of Act 1 and of his subsequent decision to join the Augustinian Order. The Labrador ends his account by introducing the saint's thaumaturgic potency (ll. 1174-1191), from which he himself has benefited, thus pointing forward to the miracles that are a major interest of Act 2.[85] Lope's deployment of the miracles he selects from the hagiographic record can, I think, be interpreted as deliberately intended to condition the spectator's reaction to his hero. I shall focus here mainly on the three

[84] Saints' plays that focus on a saint's childhood tend to be especially uninspiring. Lope's rather tedious *La niñez del padre Rojas* is a good example.

[85] The Labrador relates how Nicolás once miraculously cured him after he had almost severed his leg with an axe when felling trees. Little is made of this miracle, but it serves to introduce Nicolás's miracles as the focus of Act 2.

principal miracle episodes of Act 2: ll. 1200-1275; ll. 1335-1355 then ll. 1876-1936; and ll. 2040-2186.

The spectator does not have to wait long for the first miracle to be staged. A mere eight lines separate Nicolás's entrance (l. 1200) and the transformation of bread into herbs or leaves of some sort, a miracle worked by God to prevent the prior interfering in Nicolás's alms-giving (but which ensures also that the saint has uttered no lie in describing his basket's contents as 'hierbas'). This miracle, a comparatively low-key one, has precedents in several of the prose sources. In the style typical of Nicholas's prose hagiographers, Navarro, for instance, relates how the prior:

> vio un día que el santo viejo llevaba la falda de su hábito llena de pan, encaminándose con mucha priesa a la portería. Llamóle el prior, y díjole «¿qué lleva en esa falda padre fray Nicolas?» [....]. Respondió pues el misericordioso y humilde santo «padre mío, llevo rosas y otras flores». Mandóle abrir la falda. Viola el prior llena de rosas bellísimas y de otras flores hermosísimas que causaban un suavísimo olor y fragancia. Admirado el prior, levantando los ojos al cielo, y bajándolos a mirar amorosamente al siervo de Dios, le dijo a voces «O santo milagroso, o siervo de Dios bendito, o padre mío fray Nicolás, dad a los pobres cuanto quisiéredes del convento, pues Dios tanto muestra agradarle vuestras limosnas». (1612, fol. 108v)

The substantive details of this episode are the same in Critana's and in Frigerio's Italian hagiographies (1612, fols 20^{v}-21^{r}; 1603, p. 81), both works explaining how the miracle demonstrated the great love Nicholas had for the poor and the infirm, represented in Lope's play by the men, women and children gathered around the priory's gate. Indeed, this is the impression that Nicolás's benevolent concern for these minor characters is likely to create on stage. As with his re-interpretation of the young Nicolás of Act 1, though, the small adjustments Lope makes to his presentation of this and other miracles in Act 2 could

cast light on his dramatic strategy for presenting his hero in a manner intended to maximize the saint's play's religious effectiveness.[86]

Whereas the hagiographic accounts that mention this miracle agree that the bread was transformed into an ostentatious arrangement of stunningly beautiful roses and other sweet-smelling flowers, Lope has it morph into humble 'hierbas' (l. 1206), clearly a much less striking visual spectacle. Similarly, where in Navarro, Critana and Frigerio the prior reacts to the miracle with hyperbolic praise, Lope's prior responds with this muted (possibly even hostile) observation: 'Hierbas se le ha vuelto el pan, | mas ellas se volverán | en el pan que yo no vi. | Dejarle repartir quiero | su limosna' (ll. 1237-1241). Lope's minor adaptation of the hagiographic accounts of this miracle seems intended, then, to play down the extraordinariness of Nicolás's miracle, to make it a little more mundane. Moreover, Ruperto's extreme reaction at seeing his 'morcilla' (l. 1230) transformed into a snake immediately distracts the spectator's attention away from the saint, providing comic relief before the otherworldliness intrinsic in the miracle-worker can alienate the audience from Nicolás. For the time being, and building on the humanizing effect attempted in Act 1, Lope seems intent upon acting to prevent the impression being created of a man very obviously set apart from the mass of humanity. Clearly, Lope sensed that, in order for his spectator to derive some spiritual benefit from the play, it was important that he build up sympathy for Nicolás, that he have some chance of identifying with the saint, albeit to a limited extent only.[87]

---

[86] Cervantes seems to have taken a stricter line on this than Lope. In conversation with Quixote and the Canon of Toledo, Cervantes's *cura* criticizes the liberties taken with the hagiographic record in contemporary religious theatre: 'Pues, ¿qué, si venimos a las comedias divinas? ¡Qué de milagros falsos fingen en ellas, qué de cosas apócrifas y mal entendidas, atribuyendo a un santo los milagros de otro!' (I, 48; Cervantes 1997a, I, p. 559). In his only *comedia divina*, *El rufián dichoso*, Cervantes is scrupulously careful to reassure his readers that his play remains utterly faithful to its sources. The stage directions that prescribe the performance of miracles punctiliously insist on their veracity. For example, when Fray Cristóbal is assailed by six nymph-demons, the *acotación* before line 1760 insists '[t]odo esto fue así, que no es visión supuesta, apócrifa ni mentirosa' (1997c, p. 206).

[87] In her discussion of the manner in which Lope adapted the hagiographic sources that lie behind *La juventud de san Isido*, Elaine Canning observes that the playwright took liberties in order to present 'both the

The response to Nicolás's second miracle is equally muted. The healing of a soldier's withered hand at line 1250 (too generic to correspond to a particular episode in the hagiographies), is greeted by Fisberto's simple expression of surprise, '¡La mano, padre, he extendido!', and the formulaic 'Deme sus pies' (l. 1252), upon which the saint moves on to tend to Rutilio, the next soldier in line. The overall impression of Nicolás by the end of this opening scene of Act 2 is of a mature man much more comfortable in his skin than the awkward, zealous adolescent of the first act. Having shut out the cares of secular life, Nicolás has found his niche in the Augustinian Order. According to the Labrador, the saint even laughs as he invites the poor to return to the priory the following day, explaining that God provides for all (l. 1272): '¡Oh, qué bien se le divisa | la paz del alma en la risa!' (ll. 1273-1274). It is hard to imagine the Nicolás of the *primera jornada* laughing. It is much easier to warm to this rather different character presented in Act 2. That does not mean that the characterization of Act 1 was a dramatic failure in any sense. On the contrary, the startling inconsistencies in Lope's depiction of the hero seem intended to create the impression of a far better rounded character than the two-dimensional being of the less eloquent prose hagiographies.[88]

Closely related to this new happy disposition is Nicolás's self-effacing humility, a fundamental characteristic of the heroes of Golden-Age saints' plays, according to Dassbach.[89] It comes to the fore when Peregrino brings news of Margarita's request that the saint intercede with God to resurrect her dead child (see the footnote to lines 1876-1885 for details of Lope's adaptation of the hagiographic source here): 'Bien sabéis, | padre, la miseria mía' (ll. 1348-1349), he says, in response to Peregrino's breathless plea

saintly qualities and the more human side of his main protagonist' (2004, p. 4). Further research is required in order to assess whether the emphasis Lope deliberately places on the humanity of his saintly protagonists is a general feature of his *comedias de santos*.

[88] Brecht's advice for actors seeking to identify with their characters was that '[t]he coherence of the character is in fact shown by the way in which its individual qualities contradict one another' (1998, p. 243).

[89] '[U]no de los fines de la obediencia es el de cultivar la humildad, y una de las cualidades esenciales de cualquier santo es la humildad' (1997, p. 17).

for help. Nicolás does ultimately go off to assist Margarita, but simply out of obedience to his friend and fellow friar, Peregrino (l. 1355). When the desired miracle takes place (off stage, at l. 1876, after a long interval during which Lope focuses on Ruperto), the on-stage reaction is now more effusive than it was in response to the earlier healing miracles. This time the prior does express enthusiastic admiration for Nicolás: '¡Al cielo alabo! ¡A Nicolás bendigo!' (l. 1878). And Margarita's reaction, which is reported by Peregrino, is more effusive than those of the witnesses to the miracles with which Act 2 began: her face is said to be covered with tears and, we are told, she kisses the ground upon which Nicolás has trodden. Even Ruperto, generally nonchalant faced with his master's miracles, is unable to resist the urge to examine the evidence for this latest one: 'A verlo voy' (l. 1885), he announces.[90] He leaves the prior to wax lyrical in praise of Nicolás, in an ostentatious manner that Lope has resisted up to this late stage of Act 2:

> ¡A su valor suspendan
> los más altos poetas y oradores
> la lira y lengua en alabanza ajena,
> que en Nicolás hallamos las mayores,
> y en número que vence al mar la arena! (ll. 1899-1903)

This drawn-out episode certainly incorporates a more histrionic, affective reaction to Nicolás's miracle, but it is important to bear in mind that the astonishing miracle itself – the bringing back to life of a child – takes place off-stage, as does the tearful response of the child's mother. It is the amazed reaction of bystanders that the spectator witnesses. Even here, then, Lope seems to want to contain the emotion and the spectacle that saint's

[90] A good example of Ruperto's nonchalance faced with the miraculous comes in Act 3: when Nicolás's prayers cause water to spring from a rock, relieving the drought that has afflicted the monastery, the *gracioso* requests that the saint try again, for something a little stronger this time: 'ruégole, por Dios, que en la bodega | haga una fuente de licor más puro' (ll. 2662-2663). I agree with Dassbach, who, in her discussion of the role of the *gracioso* in the *comedia de santos*, explains that he 'humaniza al santo y lo acerca al espectador, al mostrarle su aceptación de lo sobrenatural como algo natural y tan real como cualquier suceso ordinario' (1997, p. 154). The *gracioso* is the subject of the next section of this introductory study. His intervention is not the only element intended to soften the saint's edges, though. As we have seen already, Lope's adaptation of the hagiographic sources seems intended to achieve the same effect.

play miracles have the potential to create. Unsurprisingly, it is at the end of Act 2 when Lope finally lifts the lid, combining the performance of a spectacular miracle on stage with the kind of effusive responses that greeted the off-stage miracle just discussed.

The climax to the miracles presented in Act 2 comes, conventionally enough, at the end.[91] The miracle of the resuscitation of the roast partridge is one of the most idiosyncratic recorded by the hagiographies and, whilst perhaps less compelling, less obviously desirable than the healing of a withered hand or the resurrection of a dead son, Lope must have considered it ideal to supply the culmination of the visual spectacle that attracted the crowds to performances of the *comedias de santos*. It is a miracle that also admits of the light-hearted, playful tone that characterizes several of the miracle scenes in *San Nicolás de Tolentino* (and equivalent scenes in many of Lope's saints' plays).

The presentation of the miracle follows the hagiographic record closely. Critana's *Vida* explains how Nicholas's doctors, fearing that his strength was declining fast, ordered him to eat meat, in contravention of his vow of abstinence:

> y con esto trajeronle una perdiz asada porque para la substancia que él había menester les pareció a propósito, aunque fuese poco lo que comiese. Traída la perdiz asada, y aparada en un plato, y viendo el santo que era fuerza el obedecer, levantó los ojos a Dios, pidiéndole que mostrase si era servido que él la comiese, y haciendo sobre la perdiz la señal de la cruz, se levantó la perdiz viva y voló y se le puso en la mano. (1612, fol. 27^{r})

None of the hagiographic accounts, though, merge this miracle, as Lope does, together with Nicholas's vision of the Virgin Mary and St Augustine and the institution of the *panecillo*, which cures the hero of his *calentura*. In the prose hagiographies these two episodes are separate, although sometimes they come in quick succession. Navarro, for

[91] Of course, it makes dramatic sense more generally to build up a series of miracles, to leave the best for last. This is a fundamental dramatic technique. Thus, for example, in his discussion of the violent episodes in Lope's *Fuenteovejuna* Hall writes: '[t]hese four widely-spaced examples of on-stage action in Acts I and II show a progressive intensification of violence which reaches a climax in Act III with the angry crowd scenes and the fighting as the mob breaks into the Comendador's house' (1985, p. 24).

example, makes the miracle of the partridge the subject of chapter 18 of his *Vida*, leaving Mary's gift of the *panecillos* to chapter 21, with several other miracles narrated in the intervening chapters. Whereas Orozco and Villegas both hold that Mary and St Augustine appeared to Nicholas the night after the resuscitation of the partridge (2001, p. 154; 1578, p. 415^{v}B), as does Critana, although the two miracles are narrated together in that source. (Monterubbiano's *Vita* does not refer to the miracle of the partridge at all, explaining that the Virgin Mary's gift was intended to cure a fever caused by his extreme abstinence ([1326], ch. 3, § 21-22).) These two separate miracles certainly have similar contexts: both are said to have taken place when Nicholas was ageing and both relate to his declining health. However, the fusion of these miracles ensures that Act 2 ends with a spectacular crescendo, now with Nicolás, centre-stage, surrounded by a large cast of his monastic confreres, expressing their love and admiration, and now with heavenly beings descending from the rafters as Nicolás levitates up towards them (see the stage direction before line 2057). So, at the end of Act 2, Lope seems designedly to intensify the miracles that have been a feature throughout. The spectator witnesses here an impressive visual show of the hero's extraordinary piety and of his power to invoke miracles. Lope must have hoped that by this stage the spectator's sympathy for Nicolás would be established firmly enough to endure beyond this challenging glimpse of his hero's spiritual perfection. Even here, though, Lope acts to mitigate the alienating effect of this perfection. The *gracioso*'s response to this miracle – he vows to gobble up the partridge in spite of its part in this supernatural event (ll. 2179-2186) – swiftly draws a veil over it, ensuring that the spectator cannot dwell on this potentially alienating episode long enough to lose sight completely of the human face of Nicolás that Lope has been at pains to draw.

Clearly there are several scenes in which Nicolás appears in Act 2 that do not involve miracles. The saint's prayer soliloquies (ll. 1276-1289, ll. 1937-1986 and ll. 2040-2056)

are moving and evoke a sense of his love for, and trust in, God. Nicolás's discussion with Floro about the distinction between mortal sin and venal sin (ll. 1721-1835) develops the impression of the saint's theological erudition first given in Act 1 and might have been composed with the better educated spectator in mind. It also points to his ability to win over recalcitrant Christians, an ability evoked by Peregrino, who explains to the prior that it is thanks to Nicolás that he has turned his back on the life that would have led to perdition (ll. 1555-1558). And it is in Act 2 that the devil begins to act upon his vow to pursue Nicolás for robbing him of Ursino's soul (ll. 490-497): this act contains a single scene dramatizing the hero's temptation by the devil (ll. 1290-1334). But Nicolás's struggles against temptation, against the devil, are more concentrated in Act 3, which culminates, conventionally, in the saint's death and ascension into heaven, the moment of his triumph.

Act 3: old age and apotheosis

The relevance of the opening scene to the action of Act 3, such as it is, is not obvious. Peregrino has travelled to Rome on monastic business and he takes the opportunity, whilst there, to see the Turin Shroud, which is exposed to public view for a short time. The hagiographies do not mention the shroud. They do not even hint that Pellegrino di Osimo (the model for Lope's Peregrino character) ever travelled to Rome. Something, then, must have prompted Lope to invent this episode, which runs from line 2187 to 2266.

There might be a prosaic explanation. Perhaps the theatre company for which Lope intended the play had recently added a replica of the Turin Shroud to its prop box and wanted to make the most of it. Maybe Lope wished to re-capture the audience's attention

following the interval, perhaps involving a profane *entremés*, with an impressive crowd scene centred around an object, the shroud, bound to make a visual impact and aimed at re-inclining the spectator's mind to devotion, in imitation of the characters who make up the scene's internal audience, who express how they are moved by the shroud. Peregrino identifies for us the miraculous image of Christ imprinted on the shroud (ll. 2242-2244) and says that it leads his mind to contemplation of Jesus's Passion (ll. 2246-2248). Teodoro confesses how his heart melts at the thought of the dead Christ (ll. 2255-2256). So, this scene brings Christ to the spectator's mind; Christ who was fully God yet fully man, able to perform miracles yet bound to suffer as men suffer (possessing the 'dos naturalezas' Nicolás describes around line 2449). The relevance of this shroud scene, as I understand it, becomes clear when Nicolás enters at line 2297. He comes onto the stage carrying his old, worn 'túnica', which he proceeds to mend. He expresses his indifference to the fine clothing of princes and talks of the 'mortaja' (l. 2316) in which all, great and small, will end their days. This, added to the visual resemblance that a sensitive director of this *comedia* should ensure to establish between Nicolás's garment and the holy shroud of the preceding scene, must be intended to lead the spectator to see the affinities that link Christ and the play's protagonist: capable of supernatural wonders, yet inevitably subject to temptation and human frailty, and especially so as death approaches. This analogy sets the focus for Act 3, which continues to depict the saint's great powers to invoke miracles. However, in Act 3 there is an increased emphasis on the dramatization of Nicolás's suffering, caused by old age, disease and persecution by the devil.[92] Nicolás bears this suffering with Christ-like patience and fortitude, inspiring the same mix of wonder, pity

[92] Nicolás's failing health is referred to first in Act 2, where Ruperto admits to Celia that his master '[n]o anda muy bueno' (l. 1633) and, later, the saint excuses himself with the words '[u]n poco estoy indispuesto' (l. 1863). And, of course, Nicolás is suffering from a *calentura* towards the end of Act 2, though he is restored to health thanks to the miraculous *panecillo* prescribed by the Virgin Mary.

and love that the Gospels can inspire, particularly their Passion narratives, which are alluded to in the shroud scene (l. 2248).

After this opening scene in Rome, Lope dramatizes an episode of diabolical temptation that is contained in several of the hagiographies. The story of the devil's theft of the *remiendo* that the saint intended to sew to his habit is a popular one, but none of the hagiographies record what he said whilst he was engaged in this manual labour. That is the product of Lope's imagination.

The content of Nicolás's monologue between lines 2297 and 2502 is unexceptional; the saint is rehearsing well-known episodes from the Gospels, from the Incarnation to the handing down of Christ's sentence of death. What is striking is that all of this pious teaching is addressed to the inanimate tunic that Nicolás is mending. The saint adopts a friendly tone, using the informal 'vos'. He indulgently chides the tunic for giggling at him (l. 2306), and later, at line 2398, he chides the tunic again for laughing openly at his comment that all women are 'ligeras'. The saint suggests his tunic deliberately opened up holes in itself to allow his flesh to peep through to catch a glimpse of heaven (ll. 2307-2311). When he begins his song about the Trinity, Nicolás invites the tunic to sing along with him, 'cantemos' (l. 2320). And when his story reaches the climactic events of Holy Week he enjoins his tunic to cry with him, 'lloremos' (l. 2501).

What is the spectator to make of this? Well, the devil's running commentary on the scene, in which he expresses his frustration at having to hear once again this tale of his own defeat, adds to the already mildly comic tone of this scene; here the devil depicted is the impotent, resentful one that is common in Lope's saints' plays (although in this play as in others he returns later as a more threatening antagonist).[93] So, the spectator might be

[93] In his biography of Satan, Kelly dubs this kind of devil the 'bungling loser'. Interestingly, he traces the origins of this demonic type to one of the foundational (and most enduringly popular) works of hagiography, Jacobus de Voragine's thirteenth-century *Legena Aurea* which describes many encounters between saints and the devil and demons (2006, pp. 218-229). Lope's devil quickly becomes more threatening when, at the

expected to smile at the saint's eccentricity, warming to his obvious humanity. It is possible, too, that one might see in this Nicolás some stereotypical idiosyncrasies of the elderly; Nicolás is (in effect) talking to himself, he seems to have reverted to an almost childlike sentimentality and disposition. All this is likely to inspire pity for Lope's hero, an affection for this vulnerable old man that will be vivified when the devil and his hordes unleash their venom against him. But that comes later; despite the devil's confidence that the theft of the *paño* will lead to a potentially-damning angry response from Nicolás, the saint reacts with patient serenity, assuming that the theft is nothing but an innocent mistake (ll. 2584-2585), a funny mix-up. Interestingly, the hagiographies that detail this episode make it quite clear that Nicholas knows immediately that the theft of the *paño* is the work of the devil (see, for example, Navarro 1612, fols 84v-85r, or Monterubbiano 1326, ch. 3, § 26).[94] Lope's Nicolás does not indicate whether or not he is aware of the devil's presence in this scene. If he is, then his reaction is a mischievous one: he is very deliberately infuriating his enemy by acting the *faux-naïf*. If he is not aware of the devil's role in the disappearance of his *remiendo*, then the spectator will interpret his reaction as illustrating a kind of naive innocence that fits well with the picture of the saint's eccentric old age painted in the run-up to this, the opening scene's dénouement. Either way, the spectator is likely to respond with sympathy for Nicolás. Once again, Lope's adaptation of the sources – the invention of this potentially moving sight of a tired old man talking to his tunic and the note of innocence added by his failure to recognize this as malice rather than accident –

---

end of this episode, he resolves that, having failed to tempt Nicolás, his only remaining option is to kill him (l. 2592), to prevent his virtue inspiring others to reform their lives (as it did Peregrino and Ruperto) and to stop his prayers winning salvation for the souls of purgatory (as it will Peregrino's, having already saved Ursino's from damnation in Act 1).

[94] In response to the theft of the scrap of cloth, Monterubbiano's Nicholas wonders 'quis potuit mihi sic illudere? Vere qui dignus nominari non est, ille ita mihi illusit', 'who could have tricked me in this way? Clearly none other that he who is not worthy to be named, he has tricked me'. Navarro's hero asks '¿quién así me ha burlado? Nadie, por cierto, sino el Demonio, para hacer prueba de mi paciencia' (a direct translation of Monterubbiano, possibly via Frigerio's Italian *Vita* or another earlier hagiography that borrows heavily from Monterubbiano's account).

tends towards humanizing the image of the saint presented by the prose hagiographies. The Nicolás of Act 3 has something of the *santo bobo* type about him.

And yet again, this is the principal motivation for the manner in which Lope adapts the story of Nicolás's vision of purgatory, dramatized between lines 2697 and 2799. The sources agree that the soul of Pellegrino di Osimo visits Nicholas one night to ask him to pray and to say mass for the dead to hasten his entry into heaven. They generally locate the scene in a barren landscape not far from the city and they have as the emotional climax the saint's encounter with 'muchísimas almas de hombres y mujeres de diferentes estados que estaban ardiendo en vivas llamas' (Navarro 1612, fol. 59v, for example), all of whom beg him to intercede with God on their behalves. The reader of the prose hagiographies, even, might pity Nicholas here, hearing how 'no pudo ya con tal visión dejar de compadecer y enternecerse el corazón blando del santo, de lo que en aquella visión había visto' (Navarro 1612, fol. 60r). The pity felt for Lope's Nicolás is likely to be all the more extreme because of the playwright's decision to include, among the number of the souls of purgatory, those of the saint's own mother and father! There is absolutely no suggestion in the hagiographies that Nicholas saw the souls of his parents burning in the flames, but that is the scene Lope stages, exploiting the Golden-Age theatre's technical effects to the full (see the stage direction before line 2728). Lope is very deliberately pulling on the spectator's heart strings, playing on his most intimate fears. Who, imagining the souls of his own parents suffering, like Nicolás's, 'tantas penas' (l. 2731) surrounded by 'fuego' (l. 2738), could fail to be moved to desperate pity and sorrow for the saint, who looks on with his eyes become rivers to quench the fires that afflict these souls (ll. 2760-2761)? And who could fail to resolve, like Nicolás, to take action to relieve the suffering of the souls of their deceased loved ones in the ways prescribed by the Counter-Reformation Church: prayer

and the sacrifice of the mass?[95] The affective power of this scene can only have been intensified by Lope's decision to replace the faceless souls of the prose hagiographies with the souls of the saint's own parents (and of Ursino and Floro, who must have died in the time elapsed since his appearance in Act 2, like the parents since they were last seen at the end of Act 1). At the end of this episode Nicolás vows to 'ser devoto de las almas', to do all that is humanly possible to help them escape purgatory (ll. 2764-2775). It is as Nicolás is in his *oratorio*, beginning to pray to God for the souls he has just encountered (ll. 2835-2839) that the devil unleashes his final onslaught against the saint (l. 2809), in revenge for Nicolás's unconquered fortitude.

On this occasion Nicolás is clearly aware of the presence of these 'bestias fieras' (l. 2843) who have interrupted his prayers, dashing his lamp against the ground, smashing it to pieces. When the saint chooses to ignore his attackers and continue with his prayers he is granted God's favour when the lamp rises up off the ground and is miraculously reassembled and rekindled.[96] Unable to defeat Nicolás's spirit, and fearing his prayers will provide succour for the souls of purgatory, the devil, Inobediencia, Ira and other malign figures attempt to beat him to death.[97] And we imagine they might have succeeded without the brave intervention of Ruperto, who is the subject of the next section of this introductory study. As it is, Nicolás is left lame (l. 2884), an enduring injury confirmed by the

[95] One cannot help but imagine how poignant this scene must have been for Lope himself when he wrote it around 1614, shortly after the deaths of his beloved infant son Carlos Félix in the summer of 1612 and of Juana de Guardo, in childbirth, in 1613. These years in the middle of the 1610s were years of religious crisis for Lope (Zamora Vicente, for example, talks of '[u]na sombra de desengaño' descending (1961, p. 76)). This crisis, coupled with the playwright's own priestly ordination in 1614, and the sense of inadequacy that this must have provoked, could form the basis of a number of suggestive autobiographical interpretations of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* (see the section on Ruperto below). Regarding the action that a pious Catholic might have taken to mitigate the suffering of the souls of the deceased, Chapter 2 of the decrees of the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent confirmed that the mass 'is rightly offered not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those departed in Christ but not yet fully purified' (*Canons* 1978, p. 148), that is, by definition, the souls of purgatory.

[96] Navarro claims that this miracle was worked on three separate occasions (1612, fols 84r-84v).

[97] In the context of his account of the miracle of the lamp, Ribadeneira confirms that the devil was trying to 'apartar al santo de [la] dulce conversación [del Señor]' (1616, p. 637). This scene problematizes our understanding of the nature of the devil and his minions presented by Lope in *San Nicolás*. These supernatural characters are the subject of the penultimate section of this introductory study.

hagiographies, though inflicted on a separate occasion.[98] His devotion to God is undiminished, though: he insists that, despite his injuries, '[q]uerría | no dejar los maitines' (ll. 2885-2886), a touch Lope adds to illustrate Nicolás's indomitable spirit. The saint's patient resistance to the devil's temptations in this Act 3 is rewarded in the final scenes when an angelic host confirms to him in song that he himself will be justified and his prayers and his *panecillos* will provide assistance to others (ll. 2902-2917), when Christ as a pilgrim returns to pay him back for his kindness in Act 1 (ll. 2918-2937), and, finally, when, following his death, the audience sees him rise up to heaven, pulling after him two souls that his intercessory prayers have rescued from purgatory, the *coup de théâtre* that shows him achieving the wonder most frequently associated with his name.[99]

The comparison between the saint depicted in the hagiographies that are most likely to have numbered among the sources for Lope's play and the protagonist that he created demonstrates how carefully and subtly Lope controlled the development of Nicolás's character. In *San Nicolás* Lope's manipulation of the historical record reveals a playwright consistently battling to humanize his protagonist: in Act 1 introducing uneasy contradictions that create the impression of an authentic adolescent rather than the precocious embodiment of saintly perfection; in Act 2 playing down the saint's miracles, trying to make them seem natural in an attempt to prevent the spectator's immediate alienation; in the final act, drawing parallels between Nicolás and Christ, showing the fragile humanity of both, physical and mental. Lope does not hold back from manipulating

[98] Having dealt with the lamp miracle earlier in his account, Ribadeneira explains that it was whilst praying before a crucifix that Nicolás was made lame: 'el demonio le derribó y le maltrató de manera que le dejó por muerto y quedó cojo por toda la vida' (1616, p. 637).

[99] In these closing scenes of *San Nicolás*, one might detect a meta-theatrical distance creeping into the action: particularly in the section where Ruperto and the prior watch in amazement, to one side, as angels dress Nicolás in his starry habit. As the saint slips slowly from this world to the afterlife a drama unfolds on stage to which Ruperto, the prior and the other friars are themselves spectators. Perhaps the audience is being invited, now, to put sympathy to one side and to begin its intellectual digestion of the events it has witnessed on stage, taking its lead from the internal spectators: the spectator might ask himself 'what is it that has earned Nicolás this reward and how might I learn from him so that I might begin to earn a similar fate?'. That must be the kind of response that Lope would have intended.

the hagiographic record to suit his purpose – the creation of a saintly figure with whom the average spectator might be able to identify, for whom he might instinctively feel some sympathy. To achieve this Lope had to re-cast the otherworldly hero of the hagiographies. This is nothing new, although Cervantes, with his irrepressible regard for historical fact would have carped at Lope for falsifying the officially sanctioned record. Lope's defence is clear enough, though. His adaptation of history is intended to create a kind of poetic truth sanctioned by Aristotle, who understood, like Lope, that the poet had, often, to look for the truth beyond the accidents of history. I think it is possible to speak of a poetic truth in Lope's depiction of his hero in *San Nicolás*: Lope sensed that by relating not 'what has actually happened' but what 'might happen', by creating what one might term hagiographiction (a partially fictionalized sort of hagiography), by speaking 'more of universals', he stood a better chance of winning the spectator's sympathy for Nicolás.[100] Lope's creation of his Nicolás character, then, confirms the saint's importance as a vehicle for edification. In this respect *San Nicolás* conforms to the typical saint's play model.

There must have been many spectators, though, who would have found themselves unable to empathize, to identify with Nicolás, despite all these attempts to reveal a human side to the saint, because many spectators will not have considered themselves to be like Nicolás, who, in Lope's play, whilst human, is still, ultimately, unmistakably holy.[101] If my reading of Ruperto's role is right, this concerned Lope enough to cause him to give the *gracioso* a fuller, more varied function than is typical in the *comedia de santos*.

---

[100] Aristotle discusses the differences between poetry and history in Chapter 9 of his *Poetics* (*Classical Literary Theory* 2000, pp. 68-69).

[101] 'For Aristotle identification with a character only happens as a result of spectators thinking themselves to be like that character. As Jonathan Lear puts it, "we cannot identify with the very bad or with the gods: it is precisely because we are so distant from such beings that our emotions must retain a similar distance from theirs"' (Shepherd and Wallis 2004, p. 195). The reference to Lear is to his chapter 'Katharsis' in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's 'Poetics'* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992), pp. 315-340.

4. 'Con igual rostro recibe los menudos y la plata': Ruperto and Lope's devotional aesthetic

The saints' plays' focus on a saintly hero and their relatively decorous action tell only half the story of Lope's *San Nicolás de Tolentino* and possibly the less interesting half. Arguably the more interesting half of the play concerns not the saint, but the *gracioso*, Ruperto. Clearly his role involves the provision of comic relief. The inclusion of the breed of *figuras del donaire* that Robert Morrison has labelled the *graciosos con breviario* does very obviously increase the entertainment value of plays based on the often infuriatingly undramatic lives of some of the saints Lope chose to write about, perhaps having been commissioned to do so.[102] So, in Lope's *La devoción del rosario*, for example, a pious dialogue concerning the importance of regular prayer is enlivened by the *gracioso*'s claim that, far from being deficient in his prayer life, he is rather too adept. Engaged in some sort of Ignatian composition of place, he imagines himself with Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, where St Peter falls asleep despite the injunction by Jesus to keep watch. The *gracioso* confesses that he became so involved in this contemplation, 'lo contemplé tan rendido | que', like the apostle, 'también me dormí yo' (pp. 98B-99A).

A lengthy description of the ways in which Lope's saints' plays entertain would be superfluous here; Lope's quite astounding ability to delight Golden-Age theatre audiences

[102] Christophe Couderc considers the provision of comic relief to be Ruperto's function: '[e]n la comedia *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, el personaje de Ruperto sigue a Nicolás como el criado gracioso suele acompañar al galán, y tiene mucho de figura del donaire. Precisamente porque la intriga es muy lineal, y la comedia, para ser franco, muy discursiva y bastante aburrida (de leer, por lo menos), se explica la presencia repetida de este divertido personaje, cuyas apariciones introducen en el relato pausas, al modo de paréntesis que interrumpen la acumulación de pruebas de que el santo es una persona excepcional.' Couderc goes on to suggest that, in addition to providing comic relief, Ruperto (i) accentuates Nicolás's saintliness by his own base character traits, and (ii) introduces miracle scenes. Both saint and *gracioso*, Couderc concludes, 'ilustran, cada uno en la tonalidad que le es propia, una vida dedicada al servicio de Dios'. They are unifying rather that disparate elements (2008, p. 73-74). Morrison coins the term 'gracioso con breviario' in his 1990 article in *Crítica Hispánica.* He has estimated that there are characters 'easily recognizable as *graciosos*' in half of Lope's saints' plays (1990, p. 34).

is very well established. Instead, this section of the introductory study will focus upon the manner in which Lope seems to look beyond his saintly protagonist to achieve the religious aims of the sub-genre, to inspire, to move his audiences to greater devotion and to provide living models of Christian piety for the spectators' imitation.

As explained in the previous section, Lope evidently sensed that St Nicholas's life might fail to inspire great sympathy among his spectators and so might fall short of the religious edification aimed at. Whilst the remarkably austere asceticism and the prodigious intercessory powers that characterized the official life of St Nicholas of Tolentino might plausibly have succeeded in inciting the awe-struck veneration of a Golden-Age audience used to such extremes, Lope perceived a clear risk that Nicholas of Tolentino might fail to provide a realistic model for imitation by the humbler spectator and, indeed, that, if unmodified, the performance of his life story might actually backfire by setting up a dishearteningly inimitable model of Christian virtue. It is possible that Lope felt this was a risk even after the humanizing adaptations of the hagiographies discussed above. Because Nicholas of Tolentino was one of those saints pretty much born with a halo over his head. Not once during the course of the play's action does Nicolás come close to sin. Even his hagiographer, Navarro, although he clearly views it as a sign of the boy's holiness, admits his inhumanity, describing how 'en la mocedad [Nicolás] vivió tan sin afectos de carne, tan vencidas todas las pasiones, [que fue] como si no fuera de carne'(1612, fol. 16^{v}).

The hagiographies that detail the life and miracles of the eponymous hero of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* do not mention a friend of the saint called Ruperto, nor any man like him. Ruperto is, quite clearly, a fictional character, entirely the fruit of Lope's imagination and of the conventions applicable to the role of *gracioso* he performs. He is a character who, intriguingly, is described in a throwaway line right at the start of the play as an 'oveja' (l. 5), a sheep. It seems plain that it is the role of Ruperto, an attractively flawed

character, to enact a more ordinary spiritual struggle, winning the sympathy of the audience and provoking the kind of examination of conscience and religious resolve that the *comedia de santos* sought to engender.[103] He is a model more realistically imitable by the humbler spectator. In Act 1 Lope depicts the ultimately successful resolution of the first phase of Ruperto's internal struggle, and it is a struggle. The first scene of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* – discussed above, involving the mock scholastic dispute – presents a typically irreverent *gracioso* who earns his master's disapproval early on. Faced with Nicolás's sermonizing, Ruperto reacts impatiently, rolling his eyes at Nicolás's piousness: '¡Oh, pesia tal! | ¡Agora entramos ahí! | Mas ¿qué? ¿Comienza un sermón?' (ll. 88-90). This behaviour is indicative of the profane starting point for the initial phase of Ruperto's struggle.

After this initial confrontation Ruperto continues to express hostility to his master's attempts to herd him and his worldly companions in amongst the flock of the devout, and

[103] I am not the first to see the function of the saint's play *gracioso* generally as something more than merely comic. Charles David Ley believed that the type's 'papel humorístico es quizá menos puro que en las obras seglares' (1954, p. 155). Dassbach, who has produced a summary of the principal functions of the *gracioso con breviario*, lists comic relief first, but adds that he is: (i) a contrast, in his mediocrity, to the saintliness of the protagonist; (ii) a blasé commentator of the saint's miracles, a sympathetic intermediary between the saint and the spectator, whose attitude points to an easier humanity lurking beneath the strange otherness of the saintly hero; and (iii) an on-stage representative of the ordinary man (1997, pp. 145-160). It is this final function that comes closest to my understanding of Ruperto's role in *San Nicolás*. Dassbach argues that there are three essential types of saint's play *gracioso*: (i) the type that imitates and parodies his master, the most common; (ii) the kind that abandons the saint and follows his own vocation; and (iii) comparatively rare by Dassbach's estimation, the *gracioso* who ends up swapping roles with the saint, having taken in the saint's Christian teaching. Again, it is this final type that seems most like Ruperto. Giving the example of Cosme, from Lope's *La devoción del rosario*, Dassbach explains that this type seems intended to show that God's forgiveness is more accessible than it might seem, strengthening the faith of those who, although weak, persevere in virtue and devotion (1997, p. 150). Although it is not right that Ruperto swaps roles with Nicolás, he does, as I see it, take in his master's teaching, to an extent. And Aragone Terni hints, fleetingly, that the moral message of *San Nicolás* is communicated through Ruperto as well as through the saint: '[c]osì senza parere, Lope svolge la sua funzione moralizzatrice anche attraverso le spassose figure di questi "graciosos" [...] Ruperto [...] non resiste alla logica persuasiva delle parole di S. Nicola [...]. Dio ha preso di mira lui e lo ha fatto suo nonostante i pochi meriti che ha, perché «con igual rostro recibe | los menudos y la plata» [...]. La via del Signore, suggerische tra le righe il poeta, a nessuno è preclusa' (1971, pp. 184-185), 'thus, imperceptibly, Lope develops his moralizing function also through these amusing "gracioso" characters: [...] Ruperto [...] cannot resist the persuasive logic of the words of San Nicolás [...]. God has set his sights on him and has made him his notwithstanding the few merits he possesses, because "con igual rostro recibe | los menudos y la plata" [...]. The Lord's way, the poet suggests between the lines, is shut off to no one'. She makes no further comment on the matter, however. I consider Cosme alongside Ruperto in Norton 2012. These two *graciosos* are the clearest examples of the phenomenon I describe in this section of the introductory study. It is by no means the case that all of Lope's *graciosos con breviario* fulfil the function I outline; in fact, only a relatively small minority seem to.

this attitude is sustained for most of Act 1. He is despondent that Nicolás insists that they all head off to pray when their town is alive with the hubbub of a *fiesta* celebrating the election of a new pope; '¿en noche de fiestas | a *Misereres* nos traes?' (ll. 263-264), he asks incredulously. He is suspicious of Nicolás's promise that the priory in which they are to weather the storm of these riotous celebrations will offer them all 'colación' (l. 260). If 'canelón' (l. 261) is handed out, Ruperto suspects, rightly, that it will not be the sticky, sweet variety of 'canelón', but the penitential one, whips for autoflaggelation rather than creamy Sicilian-style *cannoli* (see note to line 261). All this draws out the process of Lope's development of the *gracioso*'s character, leading up to a striking change in Ruperto's tone at the end of Act 1, after the *gracioso* has resolved to join his master in an Augustinian priory, though just for reasons of camaraderie, he insists to Nicolás: '[a]marte a ti | a mucho puede obligar' (ll. 853-854). When Ruperto's tone does change, in the final scenes of Act 1, it could seem rather as if all Ruperto's scornful scepticism has been something of an act, a juvenile façade designed by Ruperto to goad Nicolás and to amuse his inner (and outer) audiences. At the end of Act 1, Ruperto momentarily puts his mask, or if not a mask, this facet of his character, to one side.

As Act 1 draws to a conclusion, Ruperto's distress at his sense of being ill-equipped for a religious life must have elicited the sympathy, perhaps the empathy, of many spectators. If life as a lay friar requires a modicum of wisdom, Ruperto admits, he is ignorance itself; if humility is needed, he is 'la misma arrogancia' (l. 843). Despite these reservations, though, Ruperto agrees to follow Nicolás into the Order and their decision is revealed in a pair of scenes in which each explains his motivations, Nicolás to his parents and Ruperto to Celia, the *criada* he had planned to marry (ll. 874-1009).

This latter scene is comic, but the comedy is bitter and the human suffering of both characters is palpable beneath their petulant banter. Celia, the *criada*, suffers to see herself

abandoned by the man she had hoped to marry. Ruperto is distressed by the upset he is causing Celia and by his continuing sense of unworthiness. Whilst one factor motivating Ruperto's decision, certainly, is his desire to remain with Nicolás, Lope makes it quite plain that Ruperto has been at least partially convinced by the saint that he might plausibly be of some service to God despite his shortcomings. Ruperto, unprompted, adopts the idiom of the devout: 'Dios alumbre tu alma' (l. 1001), he prays as he bids farewell to Celia. His valedictory speech deploys a series of poignant metaphors to expresses his hope of acceptance by God despite his patent inferiority compared to Nicolás:

> Echa en un par de perdices,
> una es gorda, y otra es flaca;
> en un peso hay contrapeso;
> en una principal casa,
> jardín y caballeriza;
> cuando Dios abre sus arcas
> con igual rostro recibe
> los menudos y la plata. (ll. 958-965)

If Nicolás is a promisingly plump bird, Ruperto is a scrawny one; if the future saint is the *jardín ameno*, the *gracioso* is the stinking stable block. But all the same, Ruperto understands that God will receive with equal joy 'los menudos y la plata'—tarnished coppers like Ruperto and shining sovereigns like Nicolás. The *gracioso* has apparently learned the lesson of the 'salvación de los humildes' that is, according to Charles Ley, an essential tenet of Catholic doctrine (1954, p. 12). The development of the play's action shows that Ruperto learns this lesson from the extended sermon that takes up much of the second half of Act 1 and I think that sermon provides persuasive evidence of Lope's deliberate strategy to place the *gracioso*'s conversion at the heart of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*'s evangelizing intent. The model of piety this saint's play offers is not just the saint, but the *gracioso* too.

The sermon preached by Fray Rogerio mid-way through Act 1 is an historical fact referred to in most of the St Nicholas hagiographies examined in the preparation of this critical edition of Lope's play; these hagiographies might well have numbered among Lope's sources. All the hagiographies that mention the sermon's content agree that it dealt with the *desprecio del mundo* topos, many citing the words of the First Letter of John (2. 15) that warn Christians against loving to world too fondly: 'Love not the world, not the things which are in the world.' The following extracts, from four hagiographies, substantiate the point:

> Cum vero in platea praedicaret, ubi maxima convenerat multitudo, inter alia haec ait: Nolite diligere mundum, neque ea, quae in mundo sunt. (When he preached in the square, where a large crowd had gathered, among other things he said the following: "Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world".) (Monterubbiano [1326], col. 645E)

> Y como un día [...] predicase un religioso de la orden de los ermitaños [...] y declarase [...] aquella notable sentencia que dice el santo evangelio, 'el que quisiere ser perfecto, venda todas las cosas que tiene, y délas a los pobres, y sígame, y terná tesoro en el cielo'. (Orozco 2001 [1551], p. 153)

> Con muy fervoroso celo, y con muy grande eficacia reprehendía el devotísimo predicador a los que todo su corazón tienen puesto en el mundo y en sus cosas, valiéndose de aquellas palabras del apóstol y evengelista san Juan: Nolite diligere mundum, neque ea quae in mundo sunt. (Navarro 1612, fol. 17^{r})

> Un famoso y apostólico predicador [...] salió a predicar a la plaza y, oyéndole san Nicolás aquellas palabras del evangelio que dicen: 'el que quiere ser perfecto, venda todo lo que tiene y délo a los pobres y sígame y terná un tesoro en el cielo'; y lo que dice san Juan: 'no queráis amar al mundo, ni lo que en el mundo hay [...] al punto se determinó a ser religioso de la Orden de San Agustín' (Critana 1612, fol. 6^{r-v})

That theme is one that would clearly have spoken to the young Nicholas, at the time a *canónigo* who had already shown many signs of a serious religious vocation and of a distaste for the trappings of secular life. And indeed, the sources agree that it was the

Augustinian preacher's sermon that finally cemented Nicholas's resolve to take holy orders. Moreover, the sermon's theme and its result is confirmed by a potted biography of St Nicholas's childhood that is contained in Act 2 of Lope's play: the Labrador character explains 'como un padre agustino | [...] predicase en una plaza, | quedó [Nicolás] tan enternecido | *para desprecio del mundo*, | [...] [que] tomó el hábito y al siglo | dejó' (ll. 1143-1162, with emphasis added).

However, despite the unanimity of the hagiographic sources and the corroboration of the potted biography that Lope inserted into the text of *San Nicolás* itself, the sermon Fray Rogerio delivers in Act 1 of Lope's play does not, in fact, deal with the *desprecio del mundo* theme at all. Lope's sermon is unambiguously centred on the parable of the Prodigal Son, a subject not mentioned by any of the hagiographic sources examined. That well-known parable is an allegory of God's desire to offer forgiveness to the repentant sinner who falls short of saintly perfection. As such, it clearly speaks far more to Ruperto than it does to Nicolás, who is not a sinner and who at no point in Lope's play requires God's forgiveness. The parable of the Prodigal Son makes a similar point to the parable of the Lost Sheep; Ruperto was referred to as 'una oveja' at the start of the play (l. 5).

This interpretation – that the sermon is really about Ruperto's conversion – would seem to be supported too by Nicolás's words to Ruperto immediately before the start of the sermon. He seems to be pushing Ruperto forward, inviting him to forget fire and brimstone and listen carefully to the message of hope for the unworthy that the sermon will contain. Nicolás tells Ruperto '[e]scucha un poco' (l. 605), '[p]iensa, Ruperto, en el cielo' (l. 604). All this has the desired effect: it is in the immediately following scene that Ruperto's stubborn resistance is definitively broken. Lope has positioned Ruperto centre-stage to offer a realistic model of Christian piety alongside the awesome one embodied in Nicolás.

For the remainder of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, Lope proceeds to develop the tension between Ruperto's gluttonous, slothful instincts and his benevolent, faithful ones. Predictably the *gracioso* continues to fall short of his master's standards. In Act 2, for example, he selfishly tries to keep a basket of food for himself rather than charitably handing it over to a sickly student (ll. 1793-1875). And in Act 3, as we have seen, he reacts nonchalantly to the miracle Nicolás procures when water springs from a stone, asking whether it might be possible for the stone to secrete something a little stronger than water (ll. 2658-2664). However, Ruperto also serves his master faithfully and affectionately. He also consistently peppers his speeches with devout utterances that are not mere lip-service: 'por la mejor senda voy' (l. 1631), '[p]ero ¡paciencia!, que así | he de conquistar el cielo' (ll. 1660-1661), and, as he successfully administers one of his master's miraculous *panecitos*, '[s]iempre yo | tuve con él esta fe' (ll. 3005-3006). Once Nicolás has died and been hoisted up to heaven with a clutch of souls from purgatory in tow, the final note struck by this *gracioso* is understated and dignified. There is no valedictory pun. Instead, Ruperto demonstrates obedience, heading off stage with a companion to tend to the crowds assembled at the priory's gates, determined to break in to venerate their local saint. Ruperto's final words are sober. He simply confirms the urgency of tending to these crowds – '[v]amos, | que bien será menester | según en vida le amaron' (ll. 3069-3071). These words and Ruperto's actions in the latter half of Act 3, suggest that the events of a life lived with a saint have had a profound impact on this *gracioso*. The spectator might ask himself what Ruperto's next (post-dramatic) move might be. The development of his character in the final stages of the *comedia* point to a future of humility, obedience and service, even if, perhaps, one suspects Ruperto might continue occasionally to fall prey to temptations, especially temptations of the flesh. Ruperto claims that a Christian can easily fend off two of the three 'enemigos del alma' (l. 967) – the devil and the world – but

temptations of the flesh are harder to resist. In Ruperto's memorable words: 'la carne | tiene no sé qué de blanda | que, como cuando llovizna, | quien no va a tiento resbala' (ll. 970-973). There might be an obstacle to this interpretation of the *gracioso* as an accessible model of Christian piety, though. And it is to that obstacle that we shall turn now.

Two scenes in which the *gracioso* stars may appear at first glance rather puzzling: ll. 1559-1615 and ll. 1622-1721. Both scenes appear in the middle of Act 2, both apparently concern food - the *gracioso*'s perennial concern. But both might feel a little arbitrary, a little underwhelming. One of these scenes (ll. 1622-1721) sees Ruperto's former girlfriend, Celia, visit the priory with a basket of food for him, bread and wine and cheese and chicken. This is not senseless by any means, as Ruperto grumbles about being hungry throughout the play. But there is a mismatch between the literal meaning of many of the words used and Ruperto's demeanour. Celia sketches an eloquent verbal picture of the way the actor playing Ruperto should be squirming awkwardly in her presence when she twice invites him to stop looking coyly down at the floor and to look up instead at the goodies she has brought him. Celia is trying to seduce the *gracioso*, not so much with the meat in her basket, but with her own flesh.[104] Experience of the erotic idiom of Golden-Age Spain reveals Celia's attempts as strikingly obscene. Ruperto, as much as he wants to resist, finds it impossible to avoid inadvertently developing the vulgar innuendo that imbues so many of the foodstuffs mentioned with erotic metaphorical meanings.

The scene in question begins with an exchange of pleasantries. Ruperto, immediately suspecting the challenge to his chastity that Celia's arrival might involve, insists that he is committed to his righteous path, relieved to have left the storms of the world behind him. In response to Celia's enquiry after his health Ruperto declares he is '[c]omo quien espera el puerto | después de la tempestad' (ll. 1626-1627) and he insists that 'por la mejor senda

[104] In her brief discussion of this scene, Canning notes that 'Ruperto is fully aware of the temptation of *carne* prompted by the female body' (2008, p. 150). She does not, however, refer to the scene's erotic sub-text.

voy' (l. 1631). Celia's attack on Ruperto's abstinence begins when she tries to coax out of him a confession that he misses her (ll. 1640-1641; l. 1644; l. 1646; & l. 1651). He tries to resist, claiming that he has banished all thoughts of women from his mind (ll. 1646-1647), but his resistance is weakened by the recollection of 'lo que de carne tienen' (l. 1648), by the physical allure of women. Ruperto is hungry and in the remainder of the scene Lope toys with Ruperto as he attempts to keep his mind on the more licit temptation of food and Celia tries to fan the flames of his lust.

Ruperto eventually admits that he does remember the old days before his entry into the priory. The first thing that comes to mind is 'la olla' (l. 1654) he associates with Celia. This detail need not strike us as odd at all. Little was more beloved of the Castilian peasant of the Golden Age than the humble *olla*, the stew (and also the pot in which it is cooked) that Sancho Panza, for example, is so delighted to sample at Camacho's wedding (II, 20; Cervantes 1997a, II, p. 176). But given what comes later, one might wonder if, upon remembering Celia's *olla*, and upon pronouncing the word, its erotic meaning (*cunnus*) springs unhelpfully to Ruperto's mind (and to the spectator's), inspired by the provocatively feminine physical presence before him. A pair of extracts from poems included in the *Poesía erótica* collection of erotic verse of the Golden Age will illustrate the erotic usage of the word *olla* (or its synonym *puchero*) in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

> Echaros he en mi puchero,
> entero y sin quebrantaros,
> y para que no os peguéis,
> procuraré menearos.
>
> 'Fue Teresa a su majuelo', ll. 33-36 (p. 279)

> Soñando estaba anoche Artemidora
> que atizaba su fuego don Cotaldo;

> hirvió la olla y derramóse el caldo,
> y almidonóse en balde la señora.
>
> 'Soñando estaba anoche Artemidora', ll. 1-4 (p. 245)

So that explains the anatomical part that might come to Ruperto's mind upon mention of Celia's 'olla'. This erotic sub-text could easily be sustained by the 'cosquillas' (l. 1656) Ruperto feels as he remembers the 'olla'. It seems that Ruperto intends principally to refer to his stomach's enthusiastic reaction to thoughts of the sundry vegetables he names. But 'cosquillas' is a word used in an erotic context too: the tickling, tingling sensation might be one the *gracioso* feels further down his body, a meaning illustrated by an extract from another one of the poems in the *Poesía erótica* collection:

> No me haga, amigo, esas cosquillas,
> que se me echa el caldo por las rodillas.
>
> 'Por la mar abajo va Catalina', ll. 7-8 (p. 269)

Vegetables as well as stew pots are prominent features of the erotic poems of the Golden Age. Usually vegetables are given erotic meanings on the basis of their shapes. Clearly, then, turnips and cucumbers are firm favourites. The vegetables Ruperto mentions – *berzas, cebollas y ajos* – are visually less obviously provocative, but onions and garlic, at least, can be counted among the vegetables that at least one imaginative Golden-Age poet considered risqué. Of some of the vegetables that the 'viuda triste' enjoys introducing into her 'garden' it is said:

> las cabezas de los ajos
> parecen de monasterio;
> cebollas y rabanicos,
> y los nabos del Adviento;
> .....

> Lo que más gusto le daba,
> de la hortaliza del huerto,
> era, según imagino,
> un colorado pimiento.
>
> 'Tenía una viuda triste', ll.23-34 (p. 281)

So, Ruperto seems to be feeling a little hot under the collar, but he manages to keep his appetites under wraps for the moment: 'entre estos rotos andrajos, | me carcomo y hago astillas' (ll. 1658-1659), and he fixes his thoughts on heaven: '[p]ero ¡paciencia!, que así | he de conquistar el cielo' (ll. 1660-1661).

Celia is not beaten yet and invites poor Ruperto to look up; she has something she wants to show him. He catches her drift and explains it would imperil his soul were he to look unguardedly upon a woman, especially one he once loved. Celia protests that he has misunderstood and insists that this basket of food is the only feast she has prepared for his delectation: 'con pan, carne, vino y queso' (l. 1673). But her feigned shock is short lived: it cannot be a coincidence that the bread Celia has brought is 'una rosquilla' (l. 1675), a loaf of bread shaped like a ring doughnut. And the meat is 'una polla' (l. 1676). This last item has a familiar vulgar meaning in modern Spanish too, but this is not the one that makes most sense in this context. Cela's *Diccionario secreto* claims that 'polla' can refer to the female sex too, and this reading seems more persuasive here, since the 'polla' is being presented by a woman, *una criada*, and it is described as being 'una polla [...] *criada* en casa' (ll. 1676-1677, with emphasis added).[105] Ruperto bravely tries to ignore Celia's thinly-veiled advances and moves on from the 'polla' to the wine and the cheese. Neither has an established erotic meaning included in the various dictionaries of erotic language, but that does not necessarily prove that Lope meant them innocently. A little imagination

[105] Cela's second definition of 'polla' reads 'Col. Coño, acep. que se estudia en DS, III' (1969, II.2, p. 423). The suggestion is that this usage is Colombian, but a more general usage seems possible. Unfortunately, the third part of the *Diccionario secreto* to which the definition refers the reader seems never to have been published.

could fit them into the erotic sub-text here, especially the ‘vino’, which Celia suggests Ruperto might like to sample later (l. 1679). The coexistence of words with established erotic meanings with others without such established meanings is a feature of erotic poetry identified by Alzieu, Jammes and Lissorgues, who admit that their glossary contains words:

> que sin duda se empleaban corrientemente en el sentido erótico que indicamos, con otros cuyo empleo metafórico se debe a la imaginación creadora de un autor y que no llegaron nunca a tener este significado fuera del texto en que las hemos encontrado. (*Poesía erótica* 2000, p. xxi)

Once the note of sexual innuendo has been struck in a conversation, it can be sustained with reference to a whole host of otherwise innocent words, particularly if those words are pronounced in an appropriately suggestive manner and with a suitably knowing glance, and the same is likely to be true of this scene. Clearly, the actors playing the parts of the *gracioso* and the *criada* could make or break the double-entendres through their performance choices.

Established euphemisms soon return, though. Ruperto, eyes directed modestly to the ground, desperately wants to look up to drink in the ‘queso’ with his eyes, and Celia invites him to do just that: ‘[m]ientras no es santo’, she tells him, ‘bien puede alzar la cabeza’ (ll. 1683-1684). This phrase which, technically could be meant innocently, literally, by Celia, has an established erotic meaning (*arrigere*), well illustrated by the following sonnet from the *Poesía erótica* collection (p. 59):

> Viendo una dama que un galán moría,
> padeciendo por ella gran tormento,
> concertó de metelle en su aposento
> para poner remate en su porfía.
> Veniendo pues el concertado día,
> o por mucha vergüenza, o por contento,
> no pudo alzar cabeza el istrumento
> para los dos formar dulce harmonía.

Ella, viéndole, dijo: «¿Tal ansina?
¿Antes tantas recuestas y alcahuetas,
y agora no hacer? Ya me admira».
El respondió con voz mansa y mohína:
«Debe de ser de casta de escopetas,
pues cuanto más caliente menos tira».

The physical effect of Ruperto's sexual excitement is visible even from the outside of his Augustinian habit. If the switch from the masculine pronoun of line 1682 to the feminine pronoun of 1685 is deliberate it is significant: Ruperto's '[y]a la miro, gorda está' suggests, again, that, despite himself, Ruperto has been distracted from the food in Celia's basket by her seductive insinuations – he is not looking at the big cheese but at his inflated member, which Celia says she finds most acceptable. Faced with this provocation, again, Ruperto seems to be trying to deflect the conversation back onto pleasantries, asking how Celia occupies her time these days – '¿En qué entiende? (l. 1687) – and yet again Celia seems intent on keeping sex on the menu. Her apparently innocent '[c]oso, lavo y almidono' (l. 1688) might be just that, innocent. But if accompanied in performance by a well-timed thrust of the hips, then the spectator would easily recall that, for an obvious reason, sewing is a well-established euphemism for sex. And so the scene goes on until Celia departs, ultimately defeated in her attempts to coax Ruperto into satisfying his appetites with her rather than the basket of food with which he is left.

There is no doubt in my mind that Lope fully intended this scene to be strikingly lewd. And it is not the only scene like it in *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. If in the prologue to the *Novelas ejemplares* Cervantes famously claims that the absence of salacious descriptions of sex make it impossible for a reader of his *novelas* to make any kind of saucy *pepitoria,* a *pepitoria* is exactly what Ruperto describes himself making in the play's second vulgar scene (ll. 1559-1615). In the absence of conventional ingredients during an extended period of famine, Ruperto proposes to fill any available *olla* with the

genitals of the priory's novices: the *orejones*, *huevos*, *garbanzos*, *carne* and *nabos* that are all referred to in this scene can all signify the *pudendum virile* and its paraphernalia. And there are certainly more erotic euphemisms in these scenes that the ones mentioned above.

Do these scenes make it less likely that Lope intended to present Ruperto as a model of Christian piety more easily imitable than Nicolás? These scenes are obscene, more obscene than one can find in the majority of profane *comedias* even. In the introduction to the *Poesía erótica* volume, Alzieu, Jammes and Lissorgues emphasize that, on the whole, the poems that form their collection were found only in unpublished manuscripts, or if published, publication was anonymous (pp. vii-xxiv). *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, by contrast, was published and the author's name was written clear for all to see at the top of every alternate page (although after Lope's death in 1635). Moreover, the play in which these scenes appear is not a secular one but a deeply religious one which very obviously seeks to present the eponymous hero, at least, as an object of veneration. It is a play in which the human characters are joined on stage not only by various angels, by St Augustine and by the Virgin Mary, but by Christ too. The *parte* in which the play appears contains the usual *censura* confirming its contents as inoffensive to 'las buenas costumbres'.[106] What are we to conclude from that? There are at least three options. That the censorship process was not carried out at all carefully and the censor gave the play only a cursory glace. That the censor, having read them carefully, did not detect the innuendo in the scenes discussed. Or, alternatively, that he did see it, but thought it tolerable, even in the context of a saint's play.

Inevitably these scenes would have outraged the moralists, but as we know from their ultimate failure to close down the theatres, these moralists, though vociferous and

[106] *San Nicolás de Tolentino* appears to have been first published in the *Ventiquatro parte perfeta de las comedias del Fenix de España frey Lope Felix de Vega Carpio, sacadas de sus verdaderos originales, no adulteradas como las que hasta aqui han salido* (Zaragoza: Pedro Verges, 1641), folios 167^{r}–192^{r}. In the *censura* to the *parte*, issued in Zaragoza on 16 October 1640 by Juan Francisco Andrés, the censor confirms '[n]o hallo en ellas cosa que ofenda las regalías de Su Majestad, ni las buenas costumbres'.

relentless, did not represent the views of the general public, into whose mores Lope de Vega is generally thought to have been particularly well tuned. It might be that these salacious scenes were intended principally to amuse the audience, the *gracioso* (and, here, the *criada* in particular) simply fulfilling the typical comic function with an extra helping of smut. However, I prefer to see them, simultaneously, as an important element in Lope's elaboration of Ruperto's character, one he wished to present as realistically torn between the desire to live a good pious life and the kind of temptations that Lope is famous for having known rather well and resisted less well. The lewd scene involving Celia presents the temptations of the flesh as real and almost irresistible, albeit with a humorous tone. In that they can be contrasted with the scenes of the saint's temptations, which are unreal and abstract, involving the onslaught of vice-demons, like Carne and Inobediencia (see the next section of this study, which focuses on the play's supernatural characters).

Lope's depiction of this *gracioso* and his struggle for the self-control needed to persevere in, and build upon, his faith demonstrates a keen understanding by Lope of a particular kind of man, a man 'attracted one day to an extreme of indulgence and the next to an extreme of self-condemnation'. In short, a man like Lope, and the words just quoted are Robert Morrison's description of Lope's character-type (2000, p. 23). If the caricature we have of Lope is at all close to the truth, Ruperto's understandable sense of unworthiness in the run-up to his entry into the Augustinian priory and his simultaneous, tentative hope that there might, despite his defects, still be a chance for him of salvation, probably struck a chord with him. It is worth noting, then, that the estimated year of composition of *San Nicolás de Tolentino* – 1614 – is also the year of Lope's own priestly ordination, when some of Ruperto's sense of unworthiness might well have been shared

by his creator.[107] Unlike Lope's depiction of Nicolás, which was largely circumscribed by the weight of hagiographic authority, Lope's portrayal of Ruperto was a matter for his own sensibilities, subject to the less mandatory constraints of audience expectation. Therefore, the fact that Lope decided to fashion Ruperto, not just as the provider of comic relief, but also as a character meant to exhort and affirm a generous model of unsophisticated, fragile Christian piety tells us something important about Lope's devotional aesthetic as a saint's play dramatist: Lope meant us to sympathize with the *gracioso*'s instincts and efforts, with his partial victory over himself, and thereby to offer hope of reconciliation, and ultimately salvation, to Golden-Age Spain's lost sheep and prodigal sons. *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, and possibly Lope's saints' plays more generally, belong to a vein of Golden-Age religious culture that is particularly humane, realistic and joyful. It can in many ways stand in opposition to the po-faced, censorious diatribes of the *moralistas*, who would undoubtedly have been appalled by this play, but who, in criticizing the saints' plays' practice of 'junta[ndo] la tierra con el cielo' seem to have lost sight of the hypostatic union that is at the heart of the Christian religion.[108]

Lope saw no inconsistency in a man with both a deep religious faith and a naturally rebellious, passionate character. Indeed I suspect that for many Ruperto will seem the most obviously sympathetic character in the play, and for some he might offer the most useful example. The case of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, then, seems to challenge the general

[107] Lope was ordained priest in 1614. Castro and Rennert give the month as March (1968, p. 205). Zamora Vicente gives the date as 24 May (1961, p. 79). Some sense of Lope's awareness of his own unworthiness might be gleaned from the evidently pseudo-autobiographical 'Epístola al Doctor Porras': '[a]unque por tanta indignidad, cobarde, | el ánimo dispuse al sacerdocio, | porque este asilo me defienda y guarde' (quoted in Zamora Vicente 1961, p. 78).

[108] P. Ignacio de Camargo, a Jesuit priest writing in 1689, considered *comedias de santos* to be 'mucho peores y menos tolerables que las de asuntos profanos que llaman de capa y espada' and likely to lead to 'la ruina de las almas'. He condemned as indecent 'la monstruosidad horrorosa de mezclar lo sagrado con lo profano, de confundir la luz con las tinieblas y de juntar la tierra con el cielo'. Camargo clearly saw no possible merits in the typical *gracioso con breviario*. These characters became a specific target of his invective: '¿[q]ué cosa más disonante que ver al gracioso o boba de la comedia vestido con hábito sagrado de religioso, tan venerable en la iglesia, decir bufonadas y hacer acciones ridículas y representar el papel de un hombre truhán y vicioso y muchas veces bebedor y deshonesto?' Camargo's views are echoed by Fomperosa y Quintana and Gaspar Díaz, amongst others (Cotarelo y Mori 1997, pp. 127B, 234A & 262A-269A).

assumption that, in the *comedia de santos*, the saintly protagonist is the source of religious inspiration and that the plays were invariably decorous. The evidence points to a clear intention on Lope's part to put Ruperto forward as a more realistically imitable model for those who struggle to be good. It is not the case that the *gracioso*'s occasional or even frequent lapses in piety and in decorum render him ineligible as an edifying religious model, quite the contrary, in fact.[109] As Havelock Ellis observed in his *Soul of Spain*, outward laxity in the religious observances of Spaniards should not be considered a sign of irreverence. Ellis describes well the Catholic tradition into which I think Lope's religious theatre fits squarely:

> We realise how far we are from the present when we enter a Spanish church. The ecstatic attitude of devotion which the worshippers sometimes fall into without thought of any observer is equally unlike the elegant grace of the French worshipper and the rigid decorum of the English, while perhaps, if it is a great festival, groups of women cluster on the ground with their fans at the base of the piers, and children quietly play about in the corners with unchecked and innocent freedom. Nor are the dogs and cats less free than the children; at Tudela I have even seen a dog curled up in the most comfortable chair by the high altar, probably left in charge of the church, for he raised his head in a watchful manner when the stranger entered; and in Gerona Cathedral there was a cat who would stroll about in front of the 'capilla mayor' during the progress of the mass, receiving the caresses of the passers-by. It would be a serious mistake to see here any indifference to religion; on the contrary, this easy familiarity with sacred things is simply the attitude of those who in Wordsworth's phrase 'lie in Abraham's bosom all the year,' and do not, as often among ourselves, enter a church once a week to prove how severely respectable, for the example of others, they can on occasion show themselves to be. (1926, pp. 13-14)[110]

[109] Note that it is Celia rather than Ruperto who is responsible for the lowering of the tone in the scene analyzed.

[110] Pfandl too identifies a cheerful, optimistic streak in early modern Spanish Christianity, one which he links expressly to the parable of the Prodigal Son, so important to Ruperto's conversion in *San Nicolás*. Pfandl argues that 'la religiosidad española del siglo barroco aparece bien ajena al temor ante el *mysterium tremendum* de la divinidad. No conoce [...] el terror de Dios que Jehová produce o envía, ni la cólera de Jahveh [...] como elementos de la santidad y la omnipotencia, sino sólo al Padre bondadoso, al Hijo que se ofrece como víctima y al Espíritu santo dispensador de bendiciones [...]. Nada corresponde mejor a este concepto español de la divinidad que la maravillosa parábola del hijo pródigo' (1929, p. 269).

5. 'Si no fuera espíritu me rasgara los ojos': the supernatural in *San Nicolás*

The optimistic strain of Catholicism that offered some hope of redemption to flawed men such as Ruperto is detectable in much religious drama of the Golden Age.[111] Also characteristic of this period's religiosity is a fascination with the workings of the supernatural. Probably inspired in part by the compelling experiences and accounts of the mystics, religious authors wrote at length and in systematic detail about the several forms and the varied phenomenology of supernatural experience and about the methods for the discernment of spirits that would enable readers to distinguish genuinely divine communication from demonic delusion, and supernatural from preternatural or natural causation.[112] Far from being credulous throwbacks to a more superstitious time, treatises on the supernatural were considered intellectually rigorous and relevant, important contributions to the Counter-Reformation Church's attempts to define and codify Catholic doctrine. As Keitt notes:

> In seventeenth-century Europe magic, miracles, demons and visionary experience were by no means on their last legs as subjects of learned discourse, inevitably retreating before an onslaught of critical rationalism. In reality it was a time when many fields of knowledge we now deem superstitious were indistinguishable from, and indispensable to, scientific enquiry. (2005, p. 7)

[111] An extreme case is given by Tirso in *El condenado por desconfiado* where the murderous bandit Enrico attains salvation despite his crimes because he re-discovers his faith in God's unlimited grace and he off-sets his wickedness, to some extent, with his touching devotion to his elderly father, Anareto.

[112] Keitt notes that '[b]etween the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, Spanish writers produced a disproportionately large number of these works, which were in essence attempts to isolate causal principles in order to differentiate genuine miraculous causation from natural processes or demonic agency' (2005, p. 9). And it seems there was considerable demand for this material. Manescal explains in his 'Tratado de las apariencias', for example, that he will discuss the matter of souls returning from purgatory '[p]ara responder de una vez a lo que en tantas ocasiones se me pregunta' (1611, p. 2). The extent to which the mystics captured the imagination of important sectors of early modern Spanish society should not be underestimated. Haliczer contends that 'nowhere in Europe did mysticism come to play such a dominant role as in Spain, where it was not limited to a comparatively small number of devout individuals but took on the character of almost a mass movement, at least among the urban middle and upper classes' (2002, p. 8).

Despite the controversial nature of this subject matter – often alluded to by the tellingly reticent phrase *cosas dificultosas* – dramatists including Lope engaged in their *comedias* with theories pertaining to the nature of supernatural phenomena, apparently little concerned about the risk of displeasing the Inquisition.[113] *San Nicolás de Tolentino* is rich in this respect.[114] In fact Lope seems so at ease with these *cosas dificultosas* that he allows his devil character to make light of them. No doubt rubbing shoulders with those holding popular beliefs, the educated spectator would have understood the devil's corporeal presence on stage to be merely symbolic and Demonio himself gives an ironic nod to his theologically misleading (though artistically conventional) physicality in *San Nicolás* in an amusing flash of metatheatrical self-awareness. Frustrated, in Act 1, by the unexpected justification of Ursino's soul, the devil – a pure spirit for Aquinas, yet here on stage a man of flesh and blood, clearly visible to the spectator – vents his anger, exclaiming knowingly that 'si no fuera espíritu | me rasgara los ojos y vertiera | cuanta sangre tuviera por las venas' (ll. 475-477).[115]

[113] Huarte de San Juan uses the phrase in his famous *Examen de ingenios*, when he explains that the nature of the supernatural cannot be grasped by mediocre intellects, inveighing against those who say such things are false because they do not understand them: 'como si las cosas dificultosas y muy delicadas estuviesen sujetas a los rateros entendimientos y de ellos se dejasen entender' (1989, p. 310). In similar vein, Honofre de Manescal, in his *Tratado de las apariencias*, writes that, if his reader has difficulty understanding the material he treats, then it is not the author's fault but rather it is attributable to the nature of this material, to 'las cosas que tengo de decir, que son dificultosas y subidas un poco de punto' (1611, p. 2).

[114] The play includes thirteen episodes involving supernatural characters and, in addition, there are several miracle scenes, discussed in some detail in the section of this introductory study that focuses on Lope's portrayal of Nicolás. Dramatists needed to strive to ensure the orthodoxy of their presentation of the supernatural. In 1670, Calderón, for example, was required to re-cast a scene from his saint's play *El José de las mujeres*, when the censors objected to the devil being shown to inhabit and re-animate Aurelio's corpse (see Aparicio Maydeu 1994).

[115] The Catechism insists that angels (including demons, the fallen angels) are 'spiritual, non-corporeal beings' (§328). Aquinas confirms this in the *Summa* (Part 1, Qs. 50 & 51). Lope exploits misunderstandings relating to the nature of the supernatural for comic ends in secular plays too. In *La dama boba*, for example – a play composed in 1613, at about the same time as *San Nicolás* – Finea (now only feigning stupidity) scoffs at Liseo's inability to describe the appearance of the soul. She insists that one can take as a model the souls habitually depicted sitting in St Michael's scales in Last Judgement paintings and she is unimpressed by Liseo's attempt to explain that '[t]ambién a un ángel ponemos | alas y cuerpo, y, en fin | *es un espíritu* bello' (ll. 2582-2584, with emphasis added). The uneducated seventeenth-century Spaniard might, like Finea, have been more inclined than his educated contemporary to view symbolic depictions of the supernatural as literal and mimetic. Morrison notes how 'some informed persons scoffed at [devils], but most of the populace had a

The range of supernatural phenomena dramatized in Lope's *comedias de santos* and the importance of these in creating the visual spectacle that contributed to the popularity of the saints' plays has not gone unnoticed by those scholars who have written about the sub-genre.[116] Dassbach, for instance, gives a flavour of the variety on offer when she lists some of the supernatural episodes common in hagiographic drama – 'profecías, voces celestiales, visiones, apariencias, levitaciones y milagros en sentido más estricto, como son curas, resurrecciones, transubstanciones, milagros de protección y vuelos al más allá', all of which feature in *San Nicolás* – and she explains that it is 'a través de la dramatización de lo sobrenatural como se logra crear la espectacularidad que caracteriza a estas obras', a spectacle made splendid through a combination of the lavish costume and the *tramoyas* that were associated with the presentation of the supernatural on the Golden-Age stage (1997, pp. 85 & 99). Yet the scholars who mention the saints' play supernatural often gloss over the precise nature of the figures encountered in Lope's religious theatre, when the playtexts themselves contain evidence that the nature of the supernatural was of interest to the dramatist and, presumably, to a sector, at least, of the *comedia* audience. The matter merits consideration because, alongside unmistakable figures such as the Juez Divino, Christ in the guise of a pilgrim, the Virgin Mary and a wide selection of deceased saints on the one hand, and the devil on the other, many of Lope's *comedias de santos* feature peculiar beings of a perplexing nature, such as, in *San Nicolás*, Justicia, Misericordia, Inobediencia and Ira, characters that Bouterwek and Menéndez Pelayo are among the earliest scholars to classify as 'allegorische Personen' (allegorical characters)

---

genuine fear of them' (2000, p. 9). The Council of Trent was evidently aware of the misleading effect pictorial representations of the supernatural could have. The decrees of the twenty-fifth session required that 'if at times it happens, when this is beneficial to the illiterate, that the stories and narratives of the Holy Scriptures are portrayed and exhibited, the people should be instructed that not for that reason is the divinity represented in picture as if it can be seen with bodily eyes or expressed in colors or figures' (*Canons* 1978, pp. 219-220).

[116] Dassbach notes too that the supernatural is necessary to prove the protagonist's *santidad*, the proof of sainthood in the seventeenth century, as now, resting upon proof of miracles (1997, p. 89).

or ‘los obligados personajes alegóricos’ (1801-1850, III, p. 385 & 1890-1913, IV, p. xcvii, respectively).[117] Whilst the names mentioned – all abstract nouns – are of the kind conventionally given to allegorical figures, to the personifications familiar from the *auto sacramental*, their use in some of the scenes in which they appear in *San Nicolás* is dissimilar to their use in the allegorical drama par excellence that is the *auto* of Golden-Age Spain.

It is unsurprising that the depiction of these figures should appear confused. Their presentation was inevitably influenced by a broad range of traditions and theories that coalesce in the seventeenth-century *comedia*, to name a few, the dramatic tradition, the source hagiographies in which the supernatural inevitably features heavily, religious painting and sculpture, the literature of emblems and iconography, spiritual treatises and works on demonology, as well as formal scholastic theology. An examination of a number of scenes featuring supernatural characters will illustrate the importance of these influences and, I hope, cast light on the way in which Lope intended these so-called allegorical figures to be understood. In the first scene we shall consider, though, Justicia and Misericordia probably can legitimately be taken to be allegorical personifications.

Having secured the untimely death of Nicolás’s nephew Ursino, the devil, confident that his victim will be damned since he died in mortal sin without time to repent, brings his claim for Ursino’s soul before God’s tribunal (from l. 404). There the devil prosecutes his case before the Juez Divino, attempting to enlist the help of Justicia against Misericordia and, later, the Virgin Mary, who beg for clemency. Justicia and Misericordia

[117] More recently Garasa has described these characters as ‘visiones alegóricas’ (1960, p. 4). Dassbach notes the presence in the saints’ plays of ‘personajes sagrados y alegóricos’ such as Justicia and Virtud or Soberbia and Envidia, who tend to ‘reemplazar o reforzar el papel de los personajes angélicos y diabólicos’ and, in the case of the characters given the names of vices ‘tentar al santo y entorpecer su misión, tal y como hacen los demonios’ (1997, p. 112). Morrison refers to these figures as ‘allegorical personifications’ and explains sensibly that some of these ‘allegorical characters [...] such as Mentira, Envidia, and El Pecado Original are almost indistinguishable from devils’ (2000, pp. 94-95).

are not described by the stage directions or in the scene's dialogue.[118] Their interventions are limited to the making of brief speeches that are in keeping with the abstract concepts whose names they bear. And the judgement scene takes place on a plain of reality, a diegetic level, separate from that of the main narrative, a supernatural sphere in which the verisimilitude the spectator would expect from what is (unlike many an *auto sacramental*) essentially a realistic, historical play might safely be suspended temporarily. In the absence of any factors preventing the interpretation of Justicia and Misericordia as allegorical figures, then (and, I think, crucially, in the absence of any living human characters belonging to Nicolás's earthly reality), a description of them as 'personajes alegóricos' would seem legitimate: they are figures who embody abstract concepts and who act, in this scene, like impersonal advocates. Whilst orthodox Catholics of seventeenth-century Spain would have believed in the Last Judgement (or in personal judgement as seen here in *San Nicolás*), such an event is by definition outside the experience of any living human being and so allegory is a natural means of describing it,

[118] Justicia's words to Misericordia – 'álzate aquí con el poder divino' (l. 423) – imply that Justicia and Juez Divino are positioned above Misericordia, the devil and Ursino, the presence on stage of the latter suggested by ll. 447-448. This elevated performance space was probably the upper balcony positioned at the back of the typical *corral* stage and a raised position befits a judge and his counsellor, with counsel for the prosecution and the defence addressing the bench from below, from the main stage. It is not absolutely clear whether the Juez Divino would be depicted as God the Father or as Christ. Seventeenth-century pictorial representations of the Last Judgement would suggest the latter was more common (see, for instance, the paintings by Luis de Vargas and Francisco de Pacheco). No directions are provided by Lope as to the appearance of Justicia and Misericordia. The absence of any instructions on this point suggests he believed the correct representation would be obvious to his *autor*, which makes it very likely that he intended these characters to be dressed in accordance with the precepts concerning the appearance of virtues and vices established by works such as Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* (see the footnote to l. 411). Arellano confirms that the 'atributos vestimentarios' of characters such as these were 'orientados por la emblemática' (2000, p. 86). Ripa almost always depicts the vices and virtues as women and so it is likely that the parts of Justicia and Misericordia would have been played by actresses. Indeed, when the time comes for their evil counterparts to appear on stage, Lope does specify that they are 'damas' (see stage direction before l. 2540). The devil in this scene would presumably still be dressed as the *galán*, the Máscara, of the immediately preceding scene. He is not a menacing character at this point. Lope's depiction of man's immortal enemy here is in the style of the bungling loser (as described by see Kelly 2006, pp. 218-229). The devil is petulant and frustrated when he fails to win Ursino's soul. Addressing the Virgin Mary, the *mulier amicta sole* of Revelation 12. 1, he decries his fate — to be eternally trodden beneath Mary's heel, a lament that is an extremely common one among Lope's saints' play devils (ll. 460-463). His tone becomes more menacing towards the end of his soliloquy (ll. 478-504), where he vows to pursue Nicolás, before fleeing to the 'reino del espanto', perhaps via a smoking *escotillón*, though this is not prescribed. Sometimes supernatural figures were represented using paintings or statues that were revealed on stage at the opportune moment, but the *acotación* 'vanse', with which this scene ends, suggests the presence of actors on stage.

suggesting the *meollo* of the unseen heavenly reality by the analogous *corteza* of the faintly drawn procedures and personnel of earthly tribunals.[119]

There is an alternative possibility, however. It is one suggested by the slightly more detailed presentation of the only other character in *San Nicolás*, apart from the vice characters, given the name of an abstraction — Música. She appears in two scenes in Act 3 (the act in which the supernatural is especially concentrated) but it is the second one, beginning at line 2902, that I shall analyze here. Nicolás is in decline and his imminent *tránsito* is announced to him by Música, presented as an off-stage voice. The first clue that this figure, which might easily be lumped under the general category of 'personajes alegóricos', might be something other than an allegorical personification comes when the protagonist, happy that he will soon meet his maker, describes his interlocutor, 'Música' according to Lope's playtext, as 'espíritus' (l. 2905). Now the mere fact of the interaction between Nicolás and Música in a scene that must be considered realistic (understood according to the standards and beliefs of Lope's day) militates against Música being the personification of an abstraction.[120] Whilst Paxson insists that the interaction of abstraction personifications with 'real' human characters is common in medieval literature (though not in classical literature), this is not true of the *comedia nueva*, where conventional allegorical figures are generally kept 'quarantined', 'ontologically differentiated' (to use Paxson's terms), apart from the level of the real world of the main narrative, in order to preserve verisimilitude.[121] Unless Nicolás is dreaming or enraptured

[119] *Corteza* and *meollo* are the terms used by Berceo in his *Milagros de Nuestra Señora* to describe, respectively, the outer shell and the inner truth of allegory.

[120] As Riley notes, El Pinciano 'admits "personas inanimadas" on the stage only when they figure outside the action proper, i.e., in prologues and the like (II, 74-75; III, 294-295)' (1971, p. 630). The references are to López Pinciano's *Philosophia antigua poetica*, ed. by Carballo Picazo (Madrid, 1953).

[121] Paxson writes that 'a primary characteristic of medieval personification fabulation is that human characters and personification figures interact freely: they converse, argue, fight with, or instruct one another'. On the other hand, Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, a fourth-century poem important in the developement of the topos of the *bellum intestinum* between the Vices and the Virtues, 'provides an empirical instance of the principle of strict diegetic quarantining', a quaranting observed in most classical literarure (1994, pp. 74-75). For the purposes of our discussion, a distinction needs to be drawn between

(and that is possible, given that these states are intimately associated with visionary experiences), in which case, dialogue with an allegorical figure might not completely destroy the spectator's sense of verisimilitude, Nicolás's description of the characters as 'espíritus' suggests that Música is almost certainly intended, not as an abstract, unreal personification, but as an angel, a creature that is pure spirit, according to Catholic doctrine and the kind of being typically entrusted with the conveying of messages from God.[122] The point is put beyond doubt at the end of the exchange when, at line 2916, Nicolás addresses his interlocutor as 'ángeles'.[123] In light of this, and in light of their

---

conventional allegorical figures, the kind that Riley describes as 'animated ideas like "La Fama" in *Numancia* or "Curiosidad" in *El rufián*' and what Cervantes describes as 'figuras morales' that give 'external dramatic form to what is going on in the mind of a character', in the style of *Psychomachia* (1971, p. 624). The latter kind, not especially common in the *comedia nueva*, can interact with human characters because they represent, not literary personifications of abstract concepts, but externalizations of inner voices, of unspoken thoughts. The characters Comedia and Curiosidad, from Cervantes's *El rufián dichoso*, are examples of conventional animated ideas. They appear in a single scene at the start of Act 2; they do not interact with any 'real' characters; and their discussion has no impact on the main narrative. Similarly, the conventional allegories in Lope's *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco* – España, Francia and Italia – do not interact with the human characters of the main narrative. Historical characters and allegorical figures do sometimes appear on stage simultaneously in this play, but, in such cases, the latter stand to one side and merely comment on the main action. Lope's *La limpieza no manchada* is awash with allegorical figures both of a conventional kind and a kind akin to Cervantes's *figuras morales*. It is an unusually unrealistic saint's play, however: there is no staging of the life of the protagonist – St Bridgit – but, instead, the play follows her mental processes as she comes to find an intellectually coherent justification for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

[122] It is unclear why Nicolás refers to a plurality of 'espíritus' when Lope has their words spoken by the singular Música, 'una voz' (stage direction after l. 2901). The point does not seem significant; indeed, if deliberate, it might suggest some uncertainty on Nicolás's part as regards the precise source and nature of the 'voice' he hears. The angel's role as messenger is well-established. Gabriel's part in the Annunciation illustrates it well.

[123] Our conclusion is the same for the other scene in Act 3 in which Música appears (ll. 2324-2523). Again Música is positioned 'dentro' (stage direction before l. 2324) and again Música is identified as a plurality of angels, this time by the devil (at l. 2372). The angel's role as musician too is amply illustrated by religious paintings produced in Golden-Age Spain. One or more angels playing a variety of contemporary musical instruments can be seen encircling heavenly apparitions in El Greco's *The Vision of St John of Patmos* (*c.* 1580-1585), Carducho's *The Vision of St Anthony of Padua* (1613) and Ribalta's *The Vision of St Francis* (*c.* 1620). (The paintings are reproduced at, respectively, pp. 111, 130 & 158 of Stoichita 1995). Indeed, it is common in Lope's saints' plays for stage directions describing vision scenes to prescribe that they be staged to the accompaniment of music, often *chirimías*. The influence of religious painting on the staging of Golden-Age *comedias de santos* has been treated elsewhere and is proved by the frequency with which the period's dramatists instruct that the saints and sacred apparitions to be deployed be dressed and equipped *como se pinta* (see, for example, Ruano 2000, p. 85 & Arellano 2000b). Stoichita (1995) and Thompson (2009) both describe the highly developed conventions applied in religious paintings of the period. Those depicting visions employ a codified language intended to communicate to the onlooker their special nature, seen by the onlooker though understood as invisible. It would be interesting to study in detail the explicit and implicit stage directions in the period's *comedias de santos* to gauge the extent to which this codified language was used by dramatists too. (*San Nicolás* does not offer much helpful evidence, but other, plays, such as Calderón's *El José de las mujeres*, perhaps, are likely to be more illuminative.) The (rather elementary) dividing line between the earth and *el más allá* that is constituted by clouds in vision paintings,

proximity to God, it is possible that Justicia and Misericordia too would have been depicted, and so understood, as angels. The Archangel Michael, after all, is traditionally portrayed holding the scales of justice in which good works are weighed against sins in paintings of the Last Judgement.

The angel's incorporeal nature is suggested effectively in this scene by the absence from the stage of an actor (or an actress - see the footnote to the stage direction before line 2596) embodying the character. Instead, the angel is no more than an off-stage voice. Elsewhere in *San Nicolás*, however, angel characters do appear physically on stage, for example, two angels enter at line 2932 to dress Nicolás with his black habit covered in golden stars. Of course, angels (and so, by definition, demons also) could choose to make themselves corporeally visible to man if they wished to do so; the experiences of the mystics and the explanations of the *tratadistas* make it clear that this was certainly not typical, however.[124] And it is widely accepted that the physical presence on stage of supernatural figures was to be understood as artificial, a product of dramatic licence rather

---

for example, is often imported into the *comedia*, the *pescante* by which supernatural characters are raised from, and lowered onto, the stage was often disguised with a painted cloud (see Ruano 2008, p. 45). And the popular location of the heavenly realms above the earth, a location generally confirmed by the period's paintings, in which heavenly visions appear in the upper part of the canvas, is emulated in *San Nicolás*. The Virgin Mary and St Augustine, for instance, float down from *lo alto* to meet Nicolás, who is elevated to meet them (stage direction before l. 2057).

[124] Aquinas confirms that angels 'sometimes assume bodies' (*Summa*, Part 1, Q. 51). When he is asked about exactly this matter, the eponymous hero of Lope's *San Diego de Alcalá* confirms robustly:

> Y ¡cómo, pues es de fe,
> Y en la Escritura probable!
> Tres ángeles vio Abraham
> Que concebido anunciasen
> Á Isac, como tres varones;
> Dos a Loth, en otra parte,
> El incendio de Sodoma;
> Tobías, de lindo talle
> vio un mancebo, que ángel fue;
> Y San Lucas dijo, Padres,
> Que entró el ángel á la Virgen:
> Luego si entró, queda fácil
> Que tuvo cuerpo' (ll. 2337-2349, quoted by Garasa 1960, p. 85).

than heterodox belief.[125] In the next scene to be considered, another ostensibly allegorical figure corporeally present on stage interacts directly with a living human one, Nicolás, in a manner that might risk undermining the realism of *San Nicolás* were we to interpret the figure as an abstract personification, a conventional allegory. There is, however, evidence that Lope did not intend this figure – Carne – as an abstract personification, but as a demon, and that, notwithstanding the character's physical presence, Lope was well aware of the orthodoxy concerning the phenomenology of demonic temptation.

Carne enters at line 1290 to tempt Nicolás into mitigating the harshness of his flagellation, at the request of Demonio (suggesting that Carne is some kind of subordinate of the devil). Nicolás is said by Carne to be 'elevado' (l. 1295), in a state of trance or rapture in which his sensitivity to sensory data would be diminished.[126] Thus when Carne speaks to Nicolás and the *oyente* hears Carne's words, it must be that the audience was meant to assume that the communication was not audible in the conventional sense. Carne cajoles the future saint, inviting him to agree that he has no sins to punish with his *cadena*, being so chaste and pure. Nicolás is not that easily tempted, though, and retorts that his penance is intended to ensure that he remain chaste and pure. Nothing in the scene indicates that Nicolás sees the devil or Carne as corporeally present (as the spectator does).

[125] Garasa explains that 'Lope y los dramaturgos, al representar a los ángeles con humana apariencia, se limitaba a seguir una antigua y prestigiosa tradición', insisting that '[e]n el teatro el Demonio por fuerza tiene que aparecer como personaje concreto' (1960, pp. 85 & 88). Garasa's point might be overstated. In some Golden-Age *comedias* the presence of the devil and other supernatural characters is left rather more ambiguous. For example, in Tirso's Jezebel play, *La mujer que manda en casa*, it is possible to interpret the song the queen, sitting in front of her mirror, hears towards the end of Act 3 as simply the product of her crazed mind (the scene begins at l. 2791 in Smith's 1984 edition). Tirso seems to have enjoyed presenting a rather psychological kind of supernatural (as to which see McClelland 1948, ch. 2 in particular). Commenting on the shepherd boy who appears in Tirso *El condenado por desconfiado*, Rogers admits that '[i]t is not clear how far this figure should be regarded as existing outside Paulo's imagination' (1974, p. 29).

[126] Santa Teresa describes this experience in her *Vida*: '[e]stando ansí el alma buscando a Dios, siente con un deleite grandísimo y suave casi desfallecer toda con una manera de desmayo que le va faltando el huelgo y todas las fuerzas corporales, de manera que, si no es con mucha pena, no puede aun menear las manos; los ojos se le cierran sin quererlos cerrar, u si los tiene abiertos, no ve casi nada [...]; oye, mas no entiende lo que oye. Ansí que de los sentidos no se aprovecha nada' (ch. 18. 10; 1997, p. 101). It is interesting to speculate as to whether the codified language used by the painters of visions – whereby the saint experiencing the vision would, for example, have his eyes directed away from the locus, in the painting, of the vision – would have been imitated on stage. This scene could be made dramatically effective in this sense with the devil and Carne positioned behind Nicolás.

Indeed, the possibility that Carne is meant to be understood neither as an unreal conceptual personification nor as a physical being, the kind of demon existing only in the popular imagination and symbolic art, is greatly enhanced when Nicolás addresses Carne not as Carne, devil, demon, or *enemigo*, but as 'cuerpo' (l. 1324): Nicolás apparently perceives this as the 'voice' of his own abused body, as an internal voice playing a part in the *bellum intestinum*, in the psychomachy of long-established tradition. So, the corporeal Carne visible to the spectator should be considered as a artificial dramatic device designed to make visible to the audience in a dramatically exciting, attractive way, what was in reality understood to be invisible, the externalization of the internal promptings of evil spirits, or an impulse of the human will, which is not to suggest any doubt in Lope's mind concerning the real existence of demons – in Lope's era as it is now a matter of Catholic faith, albeit a relatively obscure one.[127] Rather it suggests that Lope was familiar with sophisticated theories pertaining to the subtle operation of the devil's temptation of man.

Characters from other *comedias de santos* by Lope confirm the dramatist's awareness that demons can work directly on the human imagination, for instance, bypassing the senses. In *El capellán de la Virgen, san Ildefonso*, Ramiro confirms this to Favila:

> Pues piensa
> que un demonio conjurado
> la imaginación altera
> con mil imaginaciones,
> y que en mil cosas hay fuerza
> de atraer la voluntad. (p. 290B)

In Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso*, Cipriano explains the pagan precedents for the battle waged between angels and demons for the Christian soul:

[127] In his erudite study of the *autos sacramentales*, Poppenberg explains that the internal battle between the impulses of good and evil can be considered as a battle between the understanding's knowledge of good and the will's passions and desires, the latter being associated with evil impulses (2009, pp. 67-74).

> Cuando importara
> el moverlos, genios hay,
> que buenos y malos llaman
> todos los doctos, que son
> unos espíritus que andan
> entre nosotros, dictando
> las obras buenas y malas,
> argumento que asegura
> la inmortalidad del alma;
> y bien pudiera ese dios,
> con ellos, sin que llegara
> a mostrar que mentir sabe,
> mover afectos. (ll. 244-256)

The evidence adduced suggests that, in the scene of *San Nicolás* just discussed, Carne is not an intellectual abstraction, a *personaje alegórico* in the conventional sense, but rather a demon acting, not corporeally in the manner the superstitious spectator might have expected, but incorporeally, subtly, in a manner in keeping with erudite accounts of orthodox demonology.[128]

Interestingly, Lope's adaptation of the hagiographic accounts of this episode indicates that he was keen to emphasize the role played by the devil in human temptation. Critana's account is typical in explaining that it was a relative of Nicholas who suggested he lessen

[128] There are other scenes in *San Nicolás* that suggest that Lope was familiar with contemporary accounts of supernatural experiences. For example, when Peregrino first mentions his vision of hell (ll. 516-521), he expresses uncertainty as to whether it was a dream vision or a waking one: 'Despacio te diré lo que he soñado | —si no ha sido visión, que es lo más cierto' (ll. 518-519). The meaning of 'cierto' is ambiguous here, but, if Peregrino is debating, as I think he is, whether a waking vision is a more reliable form of divine communication than a dream, then this is a matter expounded by the experts. For example, Manescal discusses *apariciones imaginarias* and debates the relative merits of waking revelations and dream ones (1611, ch. 16). Later, Peregrino's description of his state during his vision of hell is consistent with elements of Santa Teresa's accounts. Peregrino explains that 'turbéme y diome un desmayo | que el alma me arrebató | y estando yo sin sentido, | me pareció que en visión vía al ángel de mi guarda' (ll. 1402-1406). In chapter 32 of her *Vida*, Teresa too recalls an unforgettable vision of the place that demons had apparently prepared for her in hell. Remembering this vision in chapter 40 she is afflicted by 'un arrebatamiento de espíritu' (ch. 40. 1; 1997, p. 223). And on occasions when she had felt the presence of heavenly beings, Teresa recalls how, initially, these visions 'me turbava[n] y alborotava[n]' (e.g. ch. 28. 2; 1997, p. 149). Similarly, Nicolás's reticence when faced with an apparition claiming to be the soul of his erstwhile confrere Peregrino (ll. 2704-2706) fits in with contemporary warnings against belief in such visions. Discussing visions perceptible by the senses, San Juan de la Cruz warns in the *Subida* that 'nunca jamás se han de asegurar en ellas ni las han de admitir, antes totalmente han de huir de ellas' (1991, p. 318).

that harshness of his monastic existence, though this relative was inspired to do this by the devil:

> Fue san Nicolás a visitar a un religioso pariente suyo que era prior del monasterio de Santa María de Santiago de la misma Orden de San Agustín. Y viendo que san Nicolás hacía vida tan áspera y andaba tan maltratado y vivía en un monasterio muy pobre quisole traer al suyo, que era rico, atendiendo más a las cosas del cuerpo que a las del alma [...]. Reparó san Nicolás en que aquel era un lazo secreto que le quería poner el demonio para apartarle del camino tan perfecto como había comenzado. (1612, fol. 13^{r-v})

Whereas the hagiographic record demonstrates the subtlety with which the devil operates by showing him working through a relative of the saint, Lope chooses to portray this instead as an internal temptation, perhaps believing the adaptation would make the scene more compelling on stage (and perhaps more effective in achieving the play's religious aims) by making the supernatural visible.[129] Carne might well have been a titillating sight if depicted as 'a handsome woman, of a lascivious and lively aspect', as prescribed by Ripa for the figure Voluptuousness (see the footnote to ll. 1299-1300). Later in Act 3 the devil seems expressly to intend that his minions take on lascivious physical appearances that might tempt even Nicolás, ordering them to appear in 'formas que serán contrarias | a su oración y *castidad*' (ll. 2811-2812 with emphasis added).

In the scene just mentioned (ll. 2800-2895), in which the devil and his 'ejército' (l. 2800) gather for a final assault on Nicolás, a number of comments reinforce our understanding that these figures with conventionally allegorical names are meant to be understood as incorporeal demons. The stage directions that describe the entry on stage of the devil's army for this climactic scene suggest that these demons were to appear ferocious, the devil, Inobediencia and Ira to enter 'con otros de diversas figuras, como leones, sierpes y otras así' (*acotación* before l. 2800). Lope makes it clear, though, that

[129] Lope adapts the hagiographic record to foreground the devil's role in inciting man to sin in his dramatization of the death of Gentil Ursino: the sources do not name the devil as the culprit.

these outer appearances are incidental ones that the spirits have chosen to present. Demonio declares that they will defeat Nicolás '*tomando* formas que serán contrarias | a su oración y castidad' (ll. 2811-2812 with emphasis added). And Demonio orders the demons to hide in wait for Nicolás with the words 'retirad los *cuerpos vanos*' (l. 2826 with emphasis added), *Autoridades* defining *vano* as 'falto de realidad, sustancia o entidad'. The subtle suggestiveness of Carne in the Act 2 scene discussed above is, however, not replicated here. It seems that Lope intends us to take the demons in this climactic scene to be not merely visible but physical too: they physically attack the future saint, injuring his leg so that he remains lame for the rest of his life. It would be a nonsense, in my view, to contemplate this physical injury, confirmed by the hagiographies, having been caused to a historical figure by an abstract personification, a conventional allegory. And compared to Carne in the scene discussed above, it is harder, here, to interpret the on-stage physicality of the devil, Inobediencia and Ira as purely symbolic, meant to suggest the presence of unseen incorporeal spirits. Here, towards the end of Act 3, perhaps we can detect the influence of a more popular, superstitious conception of the supernatural. For not only are these demons shown to act physically upon Nicolás, but they are visible to other human characters in a way that Carne was not. The prior, for example, expresses his horror at the sight of these 'visiones extrañas' (2869). Some subtlety is preserved, though, since it seems the demons' appearance is not as clear to the prior and to Ruperto as it is to the spectator: Ruperto hints at some difficulty in making them out when he addresses them as '*[s]ombras* vanas' (l. 2869 with emphasis added). Interestingly, though, the shift here from hidden to open attacks on Nicolás by the devil is grounded in the hagiographic record. Critana explains that after several failures subtly to trick the future saint, the devil gave up and decided to wage an open war against him: '[v]iendo, pues, el demonio que no

lo podía vencer con tentaciones encubiertas, comenzóle a perseguir al descubierto' (1612, fol. 15^{v}).

Whilst it might be harder for a modern spectator to interpret this scene as realistic in the same way as the Carne scene because of the seemingly superstitious portrayal of the demons, their visibility and their power to cause Nicolás physical harm is nevertheless consistent with the Catholic orthodoxy of the period, as I understand it. Aquinas taught that demons 'can from the air form a body of any form and shape, and assume it so as to appear visibly' (*Summa* I, Q. 114, Art. 4).[130] Similarly, even the current Catechism instructs (albeit rather obliquely) that Satan may cause grave injuries 'of a spiritual nature and, indirectly, even of a physical nature' (§395). For an orthodox understanding of the physical attack on Nicolás, then, all that is required is acceptance that the direct physical injury is a symbol for an injury caused indirectly. The direct physical attack is an artificial dramatic device permitted in order to underline, to make visible, the hidden role that the devil may have in the causing of even physical injury.[131]

Even without this difficult nugget of Catholic doctrine, the authorized accounts of the hagiographers and the well-established traditions of religious painters provided Lope with a plausible defence against potential accusations of theological naivety or of superstition in his dramatic rendering of this episode. The nature of the scene he presents in *San Nicolás* has several precedents. For example, Critana relates the physical attack on Nicholas as a literal occurrence, narrating how the demons 'entraron de tropel y, tomándole de los pies y de la cabeza, le dieron tantos golpes en el suelo que le dejaron

[130] Aquinas teaches that 'whatever is beheld in imaginary vision is only in the beholder's imagination, and consequently is not seen by everybody' and that 'by such a vision only a body can be beheld. Consequently, since the angels are not bodies, nor have they bodies naturally united with them [...] it follows that they sometimes assume bodies' (*Summa*, Part 1, Q. 51). However, this does not prove the demons in this scene have adopted bodies. Aquinas explains elsewhere that 'the demon, who forms an image in a man's imagination, can offer the same picture to another man's senses' (I, Q. 114).

[131] One could imagine the devil being understood to cause indirectly physical harm of the kind Nicholas suffers perhaps by causing him to slip or by causing a heavy object to fall on his fragile bones. Aquinas confirms that spiritual beings can cause physical objects to move, reasoning that 'corporeal nature has a natural aptitude to be moved immediately by the spiritual nature as regards place' (*Summa*, Part 1, Q.110).

medio muerto [...]. [D]esta lucha y vencimiento quedó el santo cojo' (1612, fol. 16[r]). And Ambrogio Brambilla's engraving of the episode depicts two ugly, club-toting demons very much corresponding to the appearance of the devil dear to the popular imagination to this day, with horns, bat-like wings, cloven hooves and a pointy tail.[132]

So, in *San Nicolás* Lope presents his audience with scenes demonstrating a variety of ways in which supernatural characters can interact with human ones. In so doing he remains, as far as I am aware, within orthodox Catholic belief and he ensures that the play's verisimilitude is not undermined in the way that I think it would be by the unrealistic interaction of human characters with conventional allegories. To quote Riley, there is 'an essential discrepancy between allegory and verisimilitude' (1971, p. 630) and it must be right that verisimilitude would have been desirable in the dramatization of the recorded lives and authenticated miracles of historical saints, from whose real existence the audience was meant to derive spiritual comfort and inspiration. Lope's demons – perhaps we can call them vice-demons and their heavenly counterparts virtue-angels – are closer to the 'figuras morales', the 'pensamientos escondidos del alma', that in the prologue to *Ocho comedias* (1615) Cervantes claimed to have invented, figures that, in Riley's words, give 'external dramatic form to what is going on in the mind of a character' (1971, p. 624). However, if there is a difference between Cervantes's *pensamientos escondidos* in *Los tratos de Árgel* (the play Riley analyzes) and Lope's virtue-angels and vice-demons in *San Nicolás*, it is that Lope's figures are unmistakably Christian, whereas the Cervantes figures – Necesidad and Ocasión – are a little more ambiguous, although Riley confirms their diabolical origins when he comments that '[t]he devil may have an objective existence, but his sphere of operations is the world of the spirit'. In *San Nicolás,*

[132] Brambilla's engraving, which depicts eleven episodes from St Nicholas's life (of which the episode discussed is the second) is entitled *Vita beati Nicolai de Tollentino* and was printed in Rome in 1582. It can be viewed via the website of the Biblioteca Nacional: http://bibliotecadigitalhispanica.bne.es:80/webclient/DeliveryManager?pid=3173476&custom_att_2=simple_viewer

Lope never intends his spectator to lose sight of the devil's objective existence and indeed, as we have seen, on at least two occasions he adapts his hagiographic sources to foreground the devil and his minions. Not for the Lope of *San Nicolás* are techniques that might enable the devil to achieve what Baudelaire would claim to be the archfiend's most spectacular ruse – 'de vous persuader qu'il n'existe pas'.[133] For Lope and the overwhelming majority of his contemporaries devils were not mythical allegories of human wickedness but the most feared of the three very real *enemigos del alma*.

[133] 'To persuade you that he doesn't exist', from 'Le Joueur généreux', found in Baudelaire's 1862 *Le Spleen de Paris*.

6. The versification of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*

Lines 305-312 of Lope's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (1609) do not constitute a carefully considered versificatory system, but they do confirm that Lope was well aware that the various verse forms habitually used in the *comedia* could be deployed deliberately to create particular aural effects and that certain forms tended to suit certain dramatic situations better than others. It is supposed that the aural effects of those verse forms (and especially the aural impact of changes from one form to another) would have been perceived by the Golden-Age *oyente* (perhaps only at a subliminal level in some cases) and, if handled deftly, the effects would have tended to reinforce the tone of the dramatic action. In Antonucci's words, the plurality of verse forms used in the *comedia* provided the opportunity to 'subrayar cambios tonales y de orientación del discurso' (2007, p. 1). Claude Anibal concedes that the precise role that verse forms play in the *comedia nueva* 'may well lie beyond our perfect comprehension', but in light of the study of Lope's use of versification in *San Nicolás* which follows, it seems he is right to conclude that 'the pace and mood set by [Lope's] metrics certainly contributes a potent and to some extent an appreciable influence' (1943, p. 343, quoted by Dixon 1985, p. 113).

San Nicolás contains nine familiar verse forms in addition to songs and an unidentified octosyllabic form described by Morley and Bruerton as 'irregular 8's' (1940, p. 240). A basic synopsis of the play's versification can be found at Appendix 4. A more thorough understanding of the effect of Lope's versification requires a commentary analyzing elements of Lope's prosody in conjunction with the vicissitudes of the play's dramatic action and it is to such a commentary that I now turn.

Act 1

Act 1 of *San Nicolás* can usefully be divided into two relatively long halves, each with a clear thrust to the dramatic action. The first *macrosecuencia* (ll. 1-525) depicts the encounter of Nicolás and his friends with the temptations and vices of the secular world. The second, by deliberate contrast, presents the Christian alternative as explained and exemplified by the character of Fray Rogerio (ll. 526-1009).[134] In Act 1, then, Lope dramatizes two complementary stages in the protagonists' spiritual development that lead, by the end of the first act, to their joint decision to become Augustinian friars. That Lope devotes the entirety of Act 1 to dramatizing the circumstances underlying Nicolás's and Ruperto's motivations in embracing a religious vocation suggests a concerted attempt on the part of the playwright to present them to the *corral* audience as psychologically coherent and convincingly human characters prior to the unveiling of the saint as a prodigious thaumaturge, whose miracles will begin early on in Act 2. The protagonists' decision to abandon secular life is shown to result not only from innate virtue, in the case of Nicolás, but also from the pair's experiences in Act 1: in the first half, the sudden violent death of Ursino – killed, they must assume, by some drunken louts during the *fiesta* of which Nicolás so vehemently and vocally disapproves; and in the second, the preaching of Fray Rogerio, whose sermon on the Prodigal Son parable inspires Nicolás, and especially Ruperto, to request the black *hábito de Agustín* (l. 803).

[134] The *macrosecuencia* is a unit of action 'inmediatamente inferior al acto' (Antonucci 2007, p. 12). Logically, *macrosecuencias* are divisible into *microsecuencias*, smaller units of dramatic action. The tables at Appendix 3 divide the play's action into *macrosecuencias* and *microsecuencias*, and *cuadros* are shown too. (Tables of this kind feature heavily in Antonucci 2007, pp. 71-82, 103-107, 128-132, 163-167 & 230-231. They are useful in assessing the extent to which verse form and dramatic structure interrelate.)

As was typical of Lope's plays from around 1608 according to Güell, *San Nicolás* begins with a passage of *redondillas* (lines 1 to 350, interrupted by the song between lines 193 and 206) (2007, p. 119). These *redondillas* contain the good-humoured and spirited debate between Nicolás and his fellow students on the distinct origins of man and of woman and on their relative status, a topic with little obvious relevance to the rest of the play that was presumably selected by Lope because it could be relied upon to stir-up some impassioned controversy among the *oyentes*, thereby capturing their attention from the outset (see the footnote to lines 1-18 of the play). *Redondillas* (and the other Castilian octosyllabic forms) are '[s]hort and therefore lively' (Dixon 1981, p. 55) and so are well-suited to the jocular conversation with which the play begins. Once Nicolás has soured the students' fun by taking the debate seriously, the characters' chatter soon turns to the matter of the *fiesta* due to take place that night; all but pious Nicolás are desperate to attend. He successfully persuades Peregrino and Ruperto to shun the celebrations in favour of an evening's prayer and contemplation, but rash Ursino, Nicolás's nephew, is seen heading off into the night with the mysterious Máscara figure.

Redondillas are the principal metre used by Lope for dialogue in *San Nicolás* and can be considered the default option for this mode of dramatic action. In fact, all of the twelve passages of *redondillas* in the play comprise dialogue, with just one also containing a short soliloquy: Ruperto's comic musings on the wonder of food (ll. 1592-1615). The predominance of dialogue within the *redondillas* in this play confirms Diego Marín's findings. In his 'qualitative' analysis of the verse forms used by Lope in twenty-seven *comedias*, he notes that *redondillas* were most commonly used for 'diálogo factual, en estilo conversacional ordinario' throughout the many years of Lope's dramatic production (1962, p. 12). Lope's own contention, that *redondillas* are best 'para las [cosas] de amor' (l. 312 of the *Arte nuevo*) is not borne out by their use in *San Nicolás*, where *cosas de*

amor are not the focus of much attention, but as has been mentioned, the *Arte nuevo* does not contain an infallible guide to Lope's versification, far from it.[135]

The first significant change of verse form in Act 1 comes at line 351, after the *redondillas* end and a passage of *versos sueltos* begins. As is frequently (though not invariably) the case, this change in verse form is simultaneous with a shift in the play's internal dynamics.[136] The change in metre here coincides with a change in characters, setting and tone. (Such changes are usually signified in my proposed segmentation of the play by the start of a new *microsecuencia* (see Appendix 3).) The play's action shifts from the open streets of our city in the Marca de Ancona to a dark alleyway, where the sinister Máscara – the devil – has led Ursino with the ominous promise that today will be the day when he will either get his lascivious hands on Laurencia or be damned. The introduction, with these *versos sueltos*, with no fixed rhyme scheme, following 350 lines of tightly rhymed *redondillas*, must have been sensed by the ears of the more expert *oyentes* at least, even if some were not consciously aware of it. One might speculate that the effect of the sudden appearance of these *sueltos* could well have been to introduce a note of discord. Combined with the visual impact of the Máscara character, whose aspect and behaviour would, presumably, have provided an external reflection of his sinister motive, this might well have hinted to the spectator that he ought to be feeling an increased sense of discomfort and unease at this point. If so, so much the better, because the passage of *sueltos* reaches its disconcerting climax with the death of Ursino, who falls off the ladder propped up by the Máscara against Laurencia's window. We shall return to the discussion of *versos sueltos* in our analysis of Act 3, where three of the four passages of this verse form are to be found.

---

[135] Where the *cosas de amor* typical of *capa y espada* plays are discussed – very briefly at lines 526-565 and again at lines 572-579 – Lope uses *décimas*.

[136] There is coincidence between a change in verse form and the start of a new *microsecuencia* twenty-one times out of thirty-three in *San Nicolás*. Verse form sometimes changes within *microsecuencias* too.

Ursino dead, the *sueltos* continue as his immortal soul is judged before the court of the Juez Divino. (The continuation of the verse form joins what might otherwise be considered very separate units of action, reinforcing the causality and immediacy linking one scene and the next.) Thanks to the impassioned advocacy of the Virgin Mary – she argues that Ursino's sins should be set off against his uncle's prayers and virtues – Ursino's soul is spared damnation, confounding the Máscara who, unlikely upholder of justice, questions the fairness of the verdict and verbalizes his frustration, screaming 'si no fuera espíritu | me rasgara los ojos' (ll. 475-476). As the tribunal rises, the metre changes and the Demonio pronounces a soliloquy that is important to our understanding of the motives underlying his relentless persecution of Nicolás. Addressing Mary the devil says:

> Por ser Gentil de Nicolás sobrino,
> hoy me le sacas de mis hondos senos.
> ¿Que así enternezcas al Juez divino,
> y tanto con tu amor puedan los buenos?
> ¿Que así me quites a Gentil Ursino,
> por ruegos que en efeto son ajenos?
> Pues ¡vive el Hijo tuyo! deste modo
> que me lo ha de pagar Nicolás todo. (ll. 486-493)

Given the grave importance of this soliloquy, it is surprising neither that Lope should choose, as it starts, to change the metre, drawing attention to the next shift in tone and content, nor that he should choose *octavas reales*, one of the more elaborate and striking verse forms used in the *comedia* in which *relaciones*, as Lope would have it, 'lucen por extremo' (line 310 of the *Arte nuevo*), even on the lips of the devil himself. Navarro Tomás confirms that in Golden-Age drama *octavas reales* were used for 'parlamentos graves y en escenas de ceremonia y dignidad' (1972, p. 255).

Indeed, both passages of *octavas reales* deployed by Lope in *San Nicolás* begin with soliloquies by the devil in which he reveals his vindictive plans concerning his enemy, Nicolás. It seems likely that Lope's choice of metre was intended to bestow a certain

gravitas and awesomeness on these passages, with the *octavas*' elaborate ABABABCC rhyme pattern and their Italianate hendecasyllables. The *admiratio* inspired by the devil's *octava* soliloquy in Act 1 would no doubt have been compounded by his abandonment of the stage at line 504. He ends his rant by announcing that '[h]uirme quiero al reino del espanto' and, whilst the *princeps* edition provides no stage direction to elaborate on how the *autor* should arrange this exit, precedents from seventeenth-century theatre would suggest that an *escotillón*, smoke, flames and the pervasive stench of sulphur might have parts to play.[137]

Marín's study shows that *octavas* were, on average, the most widely used Italianate metre in terms of the number of 'subescenas' in which Lope included them. This is not the case in *San Nicolás*, where there are just two passages of *octavas* compared with four of *versos sueltos* and three sonnets. Here, then, Lope might have intended to increase the impact of his *octavas* by reserving their use for these scenes of diabolic invective, both scenes of substantial importance to the development of the plot. In his study, Marín admits to being surprised that his findings in his analysis of twenty-seven Lope *comedias* were not similar to these, as far as the use of *octavas* was concerned. Regarding the category of dramatic action he labels 'soliloquios líricos o con "razones" más o menos retóricas' he comments that 'el uso de octavas es escaso, [...] contra lo que el metro haría esperar' (1962, p. 42). He found that *octavas* were used for this kind of content only during the periods 1593-94 and 1630-34, on a small scale, generally for monologues with little dramatic content. This conclusion is surprising, and not just in light of the evidence from *San Nicolás*, probably composed in 1614. As regards *octavas*, then, I am tempted to sympathize with the view that Marín's sample of twenty-seven plays (between four and

[137] At the very end of Calderón's *auto El gran mercado del mundo*, for example, the devilish allegories Mal Genio and Culpa sink down into hell, the stage direction after l. 1614 prescribing 'se abre un escotillón y salen llamas de fuego y se hunden el Mal Genio y la Culpa' (2005, p. 156).

ten plays for each of the four periods on which he comments) was too small to produce consistently reliable data.

The use of *octavas* in *San Nicolás* is not limited to soliloquies, although it is with soliloquies that both of the two passages in this metre begin. Once the devil's Act 1 soliloquy ends, the metre continues with dialogue into the start of the short scene in which we return to the streets of the city we left for the Last Judgement *microsecuencia*, where Nicolás, Peregrino and Ruperto discover Ursino's lifeless body. If Lope was careful to 'acomod[ar] los versos con prudencia' (l. 305 of the *Arte nuevo*) when it came to selecting a metre appropriate to the devil's soliloquy, his decision to allow these awesome *octavas* to tail off into this dialogue which, whilst dramatically significant, is not *altisonante* in the same way as the soliloquy, seems almost negligent. Perhaps we should conclude that Lope wished the continuation of the *octavas* to leave the devil's threat echoing in the air. Or perhaps Lope considered twenty-one lines too few to merit a change in metre, which would come soon enough with the end of this unit of dramatic action at line 525. If this is the case, it was not a matter of course: there is a passage of *redondillas* just eight lines long in *San Nicolás* (ll. 2896-2903).

The discovery of Ursino's corpse ends the first half of Act 1. The second half, the second *macrosecuencia*, beginning at line 526, starts with eighty lines of *décimas*. These incorporate a series of five short dialogues (probably staged as an *escena multitudinaria*) intended by Lope to act as a prelude to the sermon that follows (from line 606).[138] The purpose of the first three dialogues (each between a different pair of minor characters and entirely unconnected to the main plot) must be to set up fresh evidence of the ordinary man's worldly focus, his *engaño* (here specifically amorous and financial) that Fray Rogerio will condemn when he speaks to the crowd. On this occasion, then, Lope seems to

[138] Antonucci identifies *escenas multitudinarias*, crowd scenes, as one of the techniques used by Golden-Age dramatists to create spectacle in their dramas (2007, p. 1).

follow his own advice that the *décima* is 'buena para quejas' (*Arte nuevo* line 307). (It is not clear why *décimas* ought to be considered suitable for *quejas*. Perhaps it has something to do with the way their rhyme scheme, drawn out over ten lines at a time, makes *quejas* in *décima* form feel rather protracted and their speakers, self-indulgent. If so, this just goes to emphasize how ripe for conversion by Fray Rogerio the speakers are.)

There are two passages of *décimas* in *San Nicolás*. The second passage, a long soliloquy spoken by Nicolás, is not a passage of *quejas* in the conventional sense, but maybe this metre is also fit for purpose when the *quejas* are addressed, not to the speaker's beloved *dama* or *galán*, but to a rather different kind of beloved, described variously as 'mi bien' (l. 1957), 'mi gloria' (l. 1963) and 'Señor' (l. 1938) – God. Nicolás's soliloquy in *décimas* is a prayer in which he declares God the focus of his earthly life.

The use to which this second passage of *décimas* is put corresponds exactly to that which Marín identifies as the *décima*'s main one, the 'soliloquio lírico' (1962, p. 36). The principal use of the first passage mentioned above ties in closely with one use to which the form is typically put when presented as dialogue: 'el diálogo [...] que encierra un conflicto o tensión derivados usualmente de celos'; Feniso's 'celos' are raised explicitly at line 532 in the first in this series of worldly dialogues. So, whereas Marín's general conclusions pertaining to the *octava real* fail to coincide with that metre's use in *San Nicolás*, his results in relation to *décimas* coincide closely.

Once the scene has been set for Fray Rogerio's sermon, this venerable friar begins to speak and the verse form changes, predictably (as we shall see below), to *romance*. This metre continues to the end of the sermon and the final ten lines of *romance* contain the brief reactions of the citizens on stage. When dialogue properly resumes as line 782 (that is, dialogue that advances the dramatic action), the verse form changes to the default *redondillas*, as Nicolás informs Fray Rogerio of his wish to become an Augustinian friar

and Rogerio advises the postulant to seek his parents' blessing before coming to the priory later that day. Once Rogerio exits, a second dialogue begins, this time between Nicolás and Ruperto, in which the latter expresses his dismay that his comfortable life as Nicolás's *capigorrón* is to come to an abrupt end, also voicing his concern that he will make an atrocious friar himself, before finally giving in to his master's words of encouragement. When the pair arrive at the home of Nicolás's parents, the dialogue continues as Nicolás reveals his intentions to them and Ruperto tells his girlfriend, Celia, that he plans to follow Nicolás into the priory, news that, in performance, she might greet with hoots of incredulous, bitter laughter. These dialogues might be expected to continue the *redondillas* form but for a rule higher up Lope's hierarchy of versificatory preferences: the acts of Lope's *comedias* of this mature period tend to end in *romances* and the three acts of *San Nicolás* are no exception (Marín 1962, p. 81).

Act 2

In Act 1 Lope's intention is to depict aspects of Nicolás's life as a youth struggling to discern God's plan for him in the face of the secular world's *engaños*. By the start of Act 2, some time has passed (it is not clear exactly how much) and we find Nicolás firmly established in his new life and developing a reputation as a saintly man and miracle-worker. This is the general theme of Act 2, which can be segmented into four *macrosecuencias*, each with a more particular focus: (1) presents Nicolás as a man willing to sacrifice his own needs and his own comfort for the lowly and vulnerable; (2) has Peregrino as the protagonist, but the action paints Nicolás as a shining example to others in his Christian counsel and penance; (3) has Ruperto as its focus and represents a moment

of profane comic relief, but also depicts Nicolás as an exacting, but ultimately very loving, master; and (4) shows Nicolás as a faithful servant of God, even in great adversity. The action of Act 2 is more fragmented, then, than that of Act 1.

The first *macrosecuencia* of Act 2 is similar in structure to the second half of Act 1: it begins with a period of dialogue that acts as a prelude to a long monologue. The structure will be repeated again in the second *macrosecuencia* of this second act. Here at the start of Act 2, predictably, the dialogue is in the *redondillas* form. Ailing soldiers join the poor locals at the gates of Nicolás's priory at Firmo and lament the ravages of war and famine sweeping through the region. The Labrador character assures them that they can expect kind treatment from the 'santo' (l. 1072) who dwells within. When the other characters bid the Labrador to tell them what he knows of this man, the verse form changes (at line 1082) to *romance*, according to Lope, the verse form that *relaciones* demand (line 309 of the *Arte nuevo*). The choice of *romance* for long monologues is a typical one and the metre, with its gentle assonance on alternate lines, creates a pleasanter, more natural effect than would a long monologue in a metre with a heavier, consonantal rhyme. A long monologue in *redondillas*, for example, could sound monotonous and forced without the division between several speakers that gives the form dynamism when used for dialogue.

Romance is the most extensively used metre in *San Nicolás*. The fact that the play contains more lines of *romance* than *redondillas* was an important one in estimating the date of its composition; it is one on which Morley and Bruerton expressly rely in postulating the 1613-1615 composition window. There are eight passages of *romance* in *San Nicolás*, the shortest of which is eighty-four lines long (all the others are over 100 lines in length). Six of the eight passages of *romance* in *San Nicolás* contain some monologue. Two (ll. 1082-1199 and ll. 1378-1551) are entirely monologue, whilst four contain monologue that is preceded or followed by dialogue in *romance*. There are two

passages of *romance* that are entirely dialogue (ll. 874-1009 and ll. 2057-2186) and Marín suggests that it was in the 1613-1616 period that Lope began to use *romance* for dialogue (1962, p. 27).

Again, Marín's analyses seem to confirm what we find in *San Nicolás*. The principal use of *romance* is for 'relaciones de carácter afectivo, en que el narrador propone generalmente provocar una reacción favorable por parte del oyente' (1962, p. 27). However, according to Marín, it is also used for purely informative or lyrical monologues, which have no effect on the dramatic situation. These two categories can be said fairly to encompass all the *romance* monologues in this play, although they are admittedly very broad.

Whilst seven of the eight passages of *romance* in *San Nicolás* deploy feminine assonance, Peregrino's long monologue account of his vision of hell (again introduced by a passage of dialogue in *redondillas*) is the only passage of *romance* in *San Nicolás* with masculine assonance (in *ó*), which, if we believe in the Golden-Age audience's reputed sensitivity to changes in verse form, must have produced some subtle effect. In his note on the *romance* metre in the *comedia* Thacker indicates that '[t]he effect of the *agudo* endings, especially over a long speech [...], is to provide a rhythmic, almost insistent beat to the lines' (2007, p. 182). Such an effect would certainly have complemented the harrowing scenes Peregrino describes and increased the heart rate of the *oyentes* most adept at suspending their disbelief.

Once the Labrador ends his *relación* in *romance* (which contains a pre-history of St Nicholas that borrows very heavily from the hagiographic sources discussed above) the verse form returns to the *redondillas* with which Act 2 began, for the scene where Nicolás risks defying his monastic superior by distributing the alms that the prior insists are needed for the community's own consumption and by performing his first cure miracle of

the play: the healing of Fisberto's withered arm. When Nicolás is left alone on stage at the end of this *macrosecuencia,* Lope deploys the first of the three sonnets he incorporates into the play.

As is often the case and as suits the careful intricacy associated with the form, this first sonnet (ll. 1276-1289) occurs in the stillness between snatches of busy dramatic action. Two of the three sonnets in *San Nicolás* are spoken by the saint when he is alone on stage, which lends an especial intimacy to the sonnet form in this play. The third sonnet does not really infringe this rule as, in that case (ll. 2904-2917), Nicolás is accompanied by an angel in whose presence the poignant tone of intimacy is preserved. All three sonnets are spoken by Nicolás and can be considered to be prayers (or requests for intercession), the first to Christ, the second to the Virgin Mary and to St Augustine and the third to the angel.[139] All three sonnets rhyme ABBA ABBA CDC DCD. Unusually for a *comedia* sonnet (although not without precedent) this third is in the form of a dialogue, the majority of lines shared between Nicolás and the angelic voice.[140] Marín observes that the sonnet is Lope's favourite metre for lyrical soliloquies and a prayer is similar. As regards the thematic uses to which Lope generally put the sonnet, Marín comments that 'los temas predominantes con el soneto son los de amores y celos' (1962, p. 50). There is no hint of *celos* in any of the sonnets contained in *San Nicolás* and, whilst the first of the three sonnets does express Nicolás's love for God, I do not think this is love of the kind Marín intends to designate by the term *amores.* This mismatch between the thematic use of sonnets in *San Nicolás* and their typical use in Lope's drama (as described by Marín) is probably a result of the small number of saints' plays Marín included in his sample of

[139] Lope's use of the sonnet as a verse form in which to compose prayers is not limited to *San Nicolás*. A sonnet-prayer appears too in his final saint's play *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco* (p. 10A).

[140] In his discussion of Lope's use of sonnets in his plays, Peter Dunn comments that sonnets are 'unfit to carry dialogue' (Dunn 1957, p. 214). There is a 'soneto dialogado' in Lope's *El marqués de Mantua* (according to Antonucci 2007, p. 64) and, outside the *comedia*, the famous sonnet in the *versos preliminares* to part I of *Don Quijote*, the 'Diálogo entre Babieca y Rocinante'.

twenty-seven *comedias*, only one – *San Segundo de Ávila*.[141] A comparative study of Lope's versificatory habits in secular plays, on the one hand, and in religious plays, on the other, may result in some interesting findings. (Of course, religious sonnets are found frequently in Lope's collections of verse.)

In this first sonnet-prayer (ll. 1276-1289) Nicolás imagines his '[d]ulce Señor, enamorado mío' weighed down by the cross and he calls on Christ to turn to face him, the 'alma lastimada' that made Christ's sacrifice necessary. Nicolás begs Christ to let him share his burden and hopes he will be worthy to receive his Lord's embrace. By the estimation of Sainz de Robles, this is 'uno de los más hermosos, inspirados y sentidos [sonetos] de tema religioso escritos por el Fénix' (1946-1955, III, p. 236).

This first sonnet does indeed produce a moment of calm before the storm as the stillness of Nicolás's prayer contrasts sharply with the action and dialogue that follows on from the sonnet's end, when we return to *redondillas* and the second *macrosecuencia* of Act 2 begins. Here, Nicolás's intimate solitude is wrecked as the stage is invaded by the devil and Carne and the stillness is broken when Nicolás sets about mortifying his own flesh. The pace of the action accelerates as the Italianate hendecasyllables of the sonnet are replaced by Castilian octosyllables with their faster beat. The devil and Carne try to tempt Nicolás to mitigate the harshness of his penance, but they fail utterly and depart despondent.

The *redondillas* continue as news of the death of Margarita's son reaches Nicolás, whose intercession is requested. Peregrino considers his good fortune at having found a role model in Nicolás and he discusses his *profesión* with the prior – the prelude to the *romance* narration by Peregrino of his Damascene conversion experience, the vision of hell referred to above. When Peregrino ends his *relación*, Lope changes the verse form to

[141] At least, only one of the twenty-seven plays that Marín examined appears in Morrison's list of authentic Lope saints' plays (2000, p. 321).

redondillas again, as the prior and Peregrino briefly exchange their impressions of the vision and of the part played by Nicolás in Peregrino's spiritual growth, before the third *macrosecuencia* of Act 2 starts at line 1559.

The arrival of the order's provincial is announced and the friars lament their inability to welcome this dignitary with a feast. This leads to Ruperto's comic (and lewd) soliloquy in which he fantasizes about the 'tocino', 'garbanzos' and the 'nabos' that he puts in his imagined 'ollas' (ll. 1603-1605). This is cut short by Celia's arrival at the priory. A dialogue ensues (still in the default *redondillas*) in which Celia tries to tempt Ruperto into conceding that he still harbours a special love for her that would go against his vow of chastity and the pair use their discussion of the contents of Celia's basket (a gift for Ruperto) and Ruperto's hunger for alimentary *carne* as a thinly-veiled metaphor for his sexual appetite for *carne* of an illicit kind (as to which, see the section above that focuses on Ruperto). Eventually, Celia safely despatched, another dialogue begins, this time in *romance* (ll. 1732-1864). The change of verse form accentuates the keen contrast between Ruperto and Celia, on the one hand, and the speakers in this subsequent scene, on the other – the altogether more wholesome pairing of Nicolás and Floro, who discuss the distinction between mortal and venal sin. The contrast is maintained by the periodic, petulant asides that Ruperto spits out as he waits for Nicolás and Floro to clear off, leaving him alone to tuck in to his hamper of goodies. Unfortunately for Ruperto, Nicolás discovers the hamper inexplicably hidden in a bush and offers it to Floro after Ruperto insists he has nothing more than hunger to offer to this starving student. Ruperto's ensuing sulk earns him a lecture on the virtue of abstinence and the spectator might be tempted to judge Nicolás harshly for his lack of sympathy, faced with Ruperto's ever-shrinking, rumbling tummy, were it not for the scene that follows, where, thanks to Nicolás's miraculous resuscitation

of Margarita's son, this grateful mother proves herself an example to all (spectators in particular, perhaps) by generously donating a substantial quantity of food to the friars.

For this *microsecuencia* (ll. 1876-1936) Lope uses Italianate *tercetos*, the only passage of these in *San Nicolás*. This scant deployment of *tercetos* confirms Marín's observation that Lope used them 'siempre en proporción pequeña' (1962, p. 60). Lope himself recommends *tercetos* for 'cosas graves' (*Arte nuevo,* l. 311). Whilst the miracle discussed in this section (and the donation of food marking the happy resolution of the priory's crisis) is indeed serious, the tone of the dialogue is not solemn, but celebratory, the brothers jubilant that '¡[y]a Nicolás los muertos resucita!' (l. 1884) and that '[p]or él vivimos. | [y] por él comemos' (l. 1936). All the characters present on stage exit, resulting in the first *espacio vacío* of this second act. This coincides with the break signalling the start of the final *macrosecuencia* of Act 2, which begins with a short passage of *décimas* (ll. 1937-1986).

These *décimas* are spoken by Nicolás, and his sombre, although stoical, tone contrasts with the joyous one of the celebrations that have just been taken off stage, a contrast hinted at by the change of verse form. Nicolás is sick and, addressing God, he asks that, if it makes him more virtuous, his sickness might continue, comparing the obedience and humility to which he aspires to that of the lamb that surrenders itself to the sacrificial knife (ll. 1944-1945). The *décimas* end with Nicolás's prayer and the start of *redondillas* at line 1987 hints again at a change in the action and suggests that *redondilla*-type dialogue, that moves the action forward, is about to begin, which it does, as the prior, Peregrino, Ruperto and the Jewish doctor enter to discuss how best to cure Nicolás's illness. The consensus is that Nicolás must eat a roasted partridge, notwithstanding his vow never to eat meat, other than the body of Christ in the Eucharist, 'mi dulce amor en blanco velo' (l. 2050). In the last two and a half lines of *redondillas,* Nicolás, alone on stage, asks God for guidance and

then starts his second prayer-sonnet, this time to the Virgin – 'Cristífera María' – and to St Augustine, his 'padre amado (ll. 2043-2056), in which he asks for a way to avoid breaking his vow of abstinance. Once more, the sonnet coincides with a moment of tranquillity, spoken whilst Nicolás *aguarda*, whilst he waits for Ruperto to return with the unpalatable partridge.[142]

If the first prayer-sonnet was answered by the unwelcome appearance of the devil and Carne, this time a rather more agreeable pair float down from the rafters of the *corral* as Nicolás levitates up to greet Mary and Augustine and the verse form changes to *romance* (from line 2057). The *é-o* assonance produces a much smoother, gentler effect than the masculine *ó* assonance of Peregrino's traumatizing vision narrative, rhyming words such as *consuelo, requiebros* and *cielo* as the Virgin bestows, upon a Nicolás rendered childlike by the presence of his celestial mother, the gift of the miraculous *panecitos* which will later bear his name.

When this tranquil scene finishes and the friars return to the stage to recommence the dialogue concerning Nicolás's health, one might expect a return to *redondillas* but, in fact, Lope chooses to continue the *romance* form on from the scene of Nicolás's visitation. A change of verse form here might be expected, since the contrast between the intimacy of the visitation and the return to the bustle and dynamism of the friars' medical ministrations is a clear one. However, as was the case with Act 1, in Lope's loose hierarchy of versificatory rules, the one that requires that acts end with *romances* trumps the one that in a majority of cases (at least in *San Nicolás*) demands a new verse form for a new stage of the dramatic action. The act ends with *romance*, then, as Nicolás escapes breaking his vegetarian vow when the partridge served up to him, roasted and quartered, comes back to life and flies off his plate.

[142] Lope wrote that sonnets were suitable for 'los que aguardan' (*Arte nuevo*, l. 308).

Act 3

According to my proposed segmentation (see Appendix 3), Act 3 contains more dramatic 'movements' (eight *macrosecuencias*) and more changes of tempo within those movements (fifteen *microsecuencias*) than either of Acts 1 or 2. This reflects an increased pace to the action, which hurtles inexorably towards the dramatic dénouement of the play with a quick succession of episodes involving a large cast of characters and frequent changes in location.[143] All this is admirably reinforced by Lope's versification technique. Although Act 3 is the shortest act in *San Nicolás,* it contains more verse forms (nine as opposed to six and five respectively in Acts 1 and 2) and more changes in verse form (sixteen changes compared with eight in Act 1 and twelve in Act 2) than the other two acts, giving further credence to the suggestion that Lope consciously exploited the advantages of polymetry to complement mutations in the action of his *comedias*. The difference in the metric texture between the three acts is clear from a graphic illustration of the play's verse forms (see Appendix 5).[144]

Act 3 does not, as we might expect, begin with *redondillas* but with *quintillas,* the first appearance of this verse form in *San Nicolás*. These two metres were for a long time closely associated with one another, though, Marín commenting that *quintillas* were considered a variety of *redondillas*.[145] Marín identifies the principal use of *quintillas,* increasingly rare by the time our play was probably composed, as 'diálogo factual y

[143] The increased fragmentation of Lope's third acts has been noted elsewhere. Teresa Ferrer Valls, for example, comments that Act 3 of Lope's *El premio de la hermosura* contains 'un mayor número de escenas sueltas' (1991, p. 183, quoted by Gavela 2007, p. 88).
[144] These useful versification charts were introduced to me by Kathleen Jeffs.
[145] Marín notes 'la tendencia inicial a hacer escasa distinción funcional entre quintillas y redondillas, pudiéndose ver en aquéllas una variedad métrica de éstas' (1962, p. 22).

ordinario' and that is a fair (albeit, again, broad) description of the dialogue that takes place in Rome between Peregrino, visiting that holy city on monastic business, and the Secretario character between lines 2187 and 2230. The climax of this scene, certainly from a visual perspective, is the display of the *sábana santa*, an episode whose relevance to the rest of the play appears puzzling initially.

The action of the second *macrosecuencia* of Act 3, beginning at line 2297, seems to have little to do with that of the first. It takes place back in Tolentino, many miles from Rome; the focus is back on Nicolás, rather than on Peregrino; and the dialogue is replaced by what is essentially an intimate monologue. It is surprising, then, that again Lope chooses not to change the verse form here, but instead continues with *quintillas*. This may well have been an arbitrary decision by Lope, but, should one wish to speculate as to the reason that might have lain behind the decision to link the two scenes in this way, I think a clue lies in the seemingly arbitrary appearance of the Turin Shroud in Rome. By continuing *quintillas* it is possible that Lope might have wished formally to draw the parallel between the shroud and the humble *túnica* Nicolás mends in this second *macrosecuencia* of Act 3, thereby drawing a parallel between Christ and the future saint. Of course, the mere continuance of the verse form may not in itself lead the *oyente* to make that link, but it might have helped to cement any visual parallels presented on stage by an astute *autor*.

As Nicolás sews, he talks and sings to his habit about, *inter alia*, the mystery of the Trinity and the Fall of Man. The tone changes at line 2369, though, as the Demonio's threatening presence is felt on stage, coinciding with a shift in verse form to *romance*, and Nicolás's *relación* continues, interrupted at irregular intervals by the devil's acerbic commentary. When the scene is cut off by Ruperto, who comes to enlist his master's prayers to end the drought the priory is suffering, Lope switches to *redondillas* for the

twenty lines of dialogue that pass between the *gracioso* and his master, one case where Lope does decide to change metre for a very short passage. This pair exit and the *redondillas* give way to *octavas reales*, the second passage of this august metre in *San Nicolás*, which, like the first, begins with a menacing declaration by the devil of his intention to destroy his enemy (from l. 2524). After this monologue, the remaining *octavas* are divided mostly between the Demonio and his three cronies – Inobediencia, Carne and Ira – who fail to provoke anger in Nicolás by stealing the *paño* with which he was mending his *túnica.* So, as with the first set of *octavas*, Lope clearly did not consider that the impact of this verse form in his demonic soliloquies would be diminished by the continuation of the metre for the dialogues that follow.

Quintillas mark the beginning of the next stage of the play's action – a supernatural scene in which Nicolás discusses the priory's drought with an angel, who gives the protagonist a golden rod with which to imitate Moses by drawing water from a stone. Upon discovery of this miracle, the friars rejoice in *versos sueltos* (ll. 2636-2667) with forty-four per cent. of the lines *pareados* (so, for Morley and Bruerton, these lines count as *sueltos* rather than *silva*).[146] The relatively high proportion of unrhymed lines would probably be picked up by the *oyente*, who might by now associate passages of *versos sueltos*, lacking a regular rhyme pattern (whether consonantal or assonantal), with moments of uncertainty or bewilderment. The use of *versos sueltos* in *San Nicolás* is, as has been mentioned, concentrated in this third act and in each case (ll. 2636-2667, ll. 2800-2826 and ll. 2855-2895) they are used in scenes than can be characterized by some sense of confusion or foreboding. Whereas lines 2636-2667, as I have said, present

[146] Morley and Bruerton divide the verses that I have categorized as *versos sueltos* between *sueltos* and *silvas* (of the third order), the difference being that the former kind contain rhymes in a minority of verses, the latter in a majority (1940, pp. 12-13 & 240). I am following Thacker, who defines *silva* as a form that 'usually combines seven- and eleven-syllable lines which rhyme freely' and *versos sueltos* as 'hendecasyllables that do not have a pattern of rhyme', both forms with occasional rhyming couplets (2007, p. 185).

the scene of the friars' amazement at Nicolás's latest prodigy, lines 2800-2826 contain the devil's final battle cry in which he and his army of demons converge on Nicolás's cell to 'matarle a palos' (l. 2809) (fifty-two per cent. *pareados*) and, finally, lines 2855 to 2895 (only twenty per cent. *pareados*, the lowest figure in the play) contain the dialogue spoken during the great battle scene in which confusion does reign and Nicolás is only saved from death by the brave intervention of Ruperto, armed with 'una escoba en un palo largo y un tapador de tinaja' (stage direction before line 2868). Again, Marín's general comments on Lope's use of *endecasílabos sueltos* coincide with their use in *San Nicolás*: 'suele[n] emplearse para situaciones de cierta intensidad dramática y tono grave' (1962, p. 55).

The final verse form deployed in *San Nicolás* is the *lira*, which Lope keeps in reserve for the spectacular episode (lines 2668 to 2799) in which, after Nicolás offers thanks to God for the miracle of water, Peregrino's spirit visits him to take him on a journey to purgatory, where he encounters the suffering souls of his parents and of Floro and Ursino.[147] This climactic scene must have been intended by Lope as one of the most magnificent in the play. Describing what Peregrino's spirit should do to Nicolás, the stage direction before line 2728 reads:

> *O le levante en alto, o le dé vuelta por tramoya, en fin le lleve, y echando fuego por cuatro partes del teatro, salgan por los escotillones cuatro almas: PADRE y MADRE de san Nicolás, FLORO y URSINO.*

Marín confirms the *lira* was most commonly used by Lope in the 1613-1616 period and that it was often used for scenes of emotional intensity, which accurately describes the *lira* scene in *San Nicolás*, where Nicolás comes face to face with the agonizing torments to which the souls of his beloved parents are being subjected (1962, p. 67).

[147] The *lira* existed in two distinct forms in Golden-Age Spain. Here Lope uses what Navarro Tomás calls the *sexteto-lira* or the *estrofa alirada*, with alternating heptasyllable and hendecasyllable lines rhyming aBaBcC. This is the form Luis de León often used in his translations of Horace. Fray Luis preferred to use the five-line *lira* verse form (rhyming aBabB) in his original poems, according to Navarro Tomás (1966, pp. 207 & 256).

Back from his journey to purgatory, Nicolás heads straight for his *oratorio* to comply with his promise to pray for the souls of the departed. It is here, in his cell, that the devil tries to kill Nicolás, eventually fought off by Ruperto, as mentioned above. After the final sonnet-prayer (ll. 2904-2917) the action of the *comedia* is brought to an end with a mixture of *redondillas* and *romances* (the last lines in *romance*, of course) as a fire is extinguished by a salutary *panecito de san Nicolás* (a nod to the many posthumous miracles credited to the saint's intercession), Nicolás is dressed by angels in a star-spangled habit, he dies and he rises up into the sky, dragging two souls of purgatory with him as the prior and the audience see all three disappearing into heaven.

Lope's use in *San Nicolás* of the *comedia*'s distinctive polymetry is broadly in line with his general versificatory practices, as set out by Diego Marín. To begin with, two of the three acts respect the convention, during the relevant period of Lope's dramatic production, that the *comedia*'s *jornadas* should begin with *redondillas*.[148] All three acts respect the one that prescribes *romance* as the metre with which to close. In addition, the *redondillas* form is extensively employed for dialogue of the kind that advances the dramatic action, and *romance* is used, with pleasing effect, for long monologues, often preceded by dialogue in *redondillas* (or *décimas*) by way of preface. Of particular interest in our play are the *octavas reales*, *versos sueltos* and *lira* forms, each of which seems to have been reserved by Lope for scenes, if not particularly suited to the metres *per se*, at least deserving of special metrical attention. So, as we have seen, the *octavas* are closely associated with the devil's menacing soliloquies, the *sueltos* are deployed at moments of confusion and the *lira*, one of the most easily identified forms, with its alternating eleven-

[148] The third starts with *quintillas*, which, as has been mentioned, are often considered a variety of *redondillas*. Navarro Tomás notes that '[q]uintillas y redondillas alternaban en las comedias y en la poesía lírica sin que la elección de unas u otras obedeciera a determinado propósito en relación con el asunto' (1972, p. 266).

and seven-syllable lines, is used for just one passage, for what could be visually the most spectacular episode in the play – Nicolás's journey to purgatory.

Whilst Marín's observations concerning the dramatic modes to which these verse forms are suited do generally apply to their use in *San Nicolás*, there is some divergence as far as their thematic uses are concerned. In particular, verse forms typically used, according to Marín's analyses, for *cosas de amor* or for *celos* are, perhaps unsurprisingly given the sub-genre to which our play belongs, used differently in *San Nicolás*. For example, the sonnet is reserved for prayer rather than the amorous soliloquies of the secular drama. This mismatch is almost certainly a result of the little attention paid to religious plays in Marín's study.[149]

The high proportion of coincidence between changes in verse form and changes in the dramatic action (the latter signified by the start of a new *microsecuencia* in my proposed segmentation of the play at Appendix 3) does suggest that Lope, more often than not, intends changes in metre to have a role in signalling such breaks. Dixon is correct to assert, then, that verse forms should be considered a 'unit of construction' in the *comedia*.[150] Those *oyentes* with a good ear, those able to detect a shift in verse form, would probably have associated such shifts with changes in the subject or tone of the dramatic action. The detection of these shifts in action would have been helpful to the spectator in his appreciation of the play's structure and would have been particularly important in circumstances where the change in the action was not accompanied by the more obvious breaks signalled by changes in the dramatic location or in the characters on stage.

---

[149] As explained above, only one saint's play is included in his sample. I do not mean to suggest that *cosas de amor* never have a place in plays usually considered to be *comedias religiosas*. Take Lope's *Púsoseme el sol, salióme la luna* or Tirso's *Doña Beatriz de Silva* as two examples of the saint's play genre where typical *capa y espada* antics take up a large proportion of the action.

[150] Dixon says, discussing the function of the *cuadro*, that the *cuadro* is 'the *only* unit of construction (apart from verse-forms) in the *comedia*' (1981, p. 59). I am less convinced that the *cuadro* is useful as a tool of construction in *San Nicolás*.

Lope's skill as a poet does not just provide ornamentation for *San Nicolás*. It seems likely that his versification techniques, the *prudencia* with which he selected which forms to use when, were intended to reinforce the spectator's sense of the drama's structural and tonal development in a manner similar to the incidental music used today in films. The effectiveness of these techniques – the extent to which the *corral* audience was receptive to them – remains a controversial matter requiring futher investigation of a kind hampered by the scarcity of contemporary 'eye-witness' accounts of the *comedia* in performance.

Lope de Vega

San Nicolás de Tolentino

A Note on Textual History and Editorial Criteria

There are no known manuscript versions of *San Nicolás* and only a single Golden-Age printed edition, found at folios 167[v] to 192[v] of the posthumous *Veinticuatro parte perfecta de las comedias del Fénix de España frey Lope Félix de Vega Carpio [...] sacadas de sus verdaderas originales* (Zaragoza: Pedro Verges, 1641), the *princeps* (P), upon which the text of this edition is based.[151]

The copy of the *Veinticuatro parte* used is the one held by the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid with shelfmark R. 13875. All the other copies of this edition that I have examined are textually identical.[152]

Since 1641 the text of *San Nicolás* has been re-published on four occasions (though never as part of a critical edition):

M *Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1890-1913), IV (1894), pp. xcii-c & 313-357;

S *Obras escogidas de Lope Félix de Vega Carpio*, ed. by Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles, 3 vols (Madrid: Aguilar, 1946-1955), III (1955), pp. 235-269;

R *Obras de Lope de Vega, X: Comedias de vidas de santos II*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 178 (Madrid: Atlas, 1965), pp. 71-129;

A *San Nicolás de Tolentino*, prologue and notes by Jorge Puente Peña (Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Agustinianas, 1984).[153]

[151] Rennert claimed that a *suelta* edition of the play was apparently held in the library of Pascual de Gayangos. He noted that, unlike the majority of that library, the *suelta* was not incorporated into the collection of the Biblioteca Nacional (1915, p. 238) and, indeed I can find no sign of a *suelta* there. Rennert's claim is repeated in Castro and Rennert 1968 (p. 492).

[152] Profeti provides details of thirty-three extant copies of the *Veinticuatro parte* (1988, p. 205). In addition to the one detailed above, I have examined six copies held by the Biblioteca Nacional: R. 14117; R. 23481; R. 24979; R. 25006; R. 25613; U. 10578; and the following three from the British Library: 1072.k.6; 1072.l.3-20; and 11726.l.7.

These modern re-prints/editions of *San Nicolás* have been consulted to help remedy defects in the *princeps.* The variants presented by M, S, R and A are collated at pages 239 to 244. Where any variant merits discussion, this is included in the footnote to the relevant line(s) of the playtext.

The text presented here has been modified as follows. The spelling has been modernized, except where alterations would affect the pronunciation. Punctuation, capitalization and accents have been standardized in accordance with the rules of modern Spanish. Abbreviations have been resolved. Songs and Latin have been italicized. The two common early modern spellings of *ahora* (*agora* and *aora*) are preserved because of their different metrical values, as are common Golden-Age contractions (e.g. *deste, della*). No attempt has been made to force upon Lope's verse the rules of modern Spanish grammar where these differ from Lope's usual practice. Quotations within the text are indicated using chevrons. Words spoken aside are introduced with '[*Aparte*]' and words addressed only to a particular character are introduced with '[*A Nicolás*]' (or equivalent, as appropriate). The first line of each stanza of verse is indented, as is the first line of each segment of verse forms not conventionally broken into stanzas (e.g. *romance* or *versos sueltos*), to draw the change in metre to the eye of the reader. Likely lacunae are indicated with a line of dots.

Footnotes to the text explain the important complexities and obscurities of *San Nicolás* and some idiosyncrasies of the *comedia* generally. In particular, I have provided ample explanation of the play's religious allusions, since, in my experience, familiarity with such material – crucial for a full understanding of Golden-Age literature – is slowly waning.

---

[153] Puente Peña claims that his text 'corresponde al tomo III de las obras completas de Lope de Vega publicadas por Aguilar' (p.6). In fact A departs from S on many occasions, so it is treated here as a separate edition.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

Aut	*Diccionario de autoridades de la Real Academia Española,* on-line version at <http://buscon.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle>; definitions are from the original 1726-1739 edition unless stated otherwise.
Correas	*Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales*, ed. by Louis Combet, revised by Robert Jammes and Maïte Mir-Andreu (Madrid: Castalia, 2000).
Covarrubias	Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*, ed. by Ignacio Arellano and Rafael Zafra, Biblioteca Áurea Hispánica, 21 (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2006).
Douay-Rheims	*Holy Bible: Douay Version Translated from the Latin Vulgate (Douay, A.D. 1609; Rheims, A.D. 1582)* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1956).
Vulgate	*Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam Clementinam*, ed. by Alberto Colunga and Lorenzo Turrado, 12th edn (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2005).

PERSONAS QUE HABLAN EN ELLA*

IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

Ruperto, *gorrón*
Nicolás
Ursino[155]
Peregrino
[Cuatro Estudiantes][156]
[Músicos]
El Demonio[157]
Un Peregrino
El Juez divino
[La Justicia]
La Misericordia
La Virgen
Rosela, *dama*
Feniso
Heraclio
Fabricio
Aurelio
Lidia[158]
Fray Rogerio, *agustino descalzo*
Fray Antonio, *su compañero*
Padre de Nicolás
Madre de Nicolás
Celia, *criada*
Fisberto, *soldado roto*
Rutilio, *soldado*
Una Mujer, *llamada* Fabia, *con un niño*[159]
Un Labrador, *cojo*
El Prior
La Carne
Fray Gil
Floro, *estudiante*
Un Médico judío
San Agustín
Un Secretario
Laurencia
Teodoro
Ludovico
[La Música]
La Inobediencia
La Ira
Un Ángel
[Unos Ángeles]
Fray Ángel

* P contains three separate cast lists, one at the start of each Act. They are consolidated here into a single list. Square brackets indicate a character with a speaking part not named in P's lists. Included in P's lists but excluded here are 'Máscaras', 'escudero', 'niño' and 'La Historia'. The first three appear but have no lines. 'La Historia' does not appear in the play.

[155] P's Act 1 list gives 'Urbino'. 'Ursino' is the name given by the playtext and the Act 3 cast list.

[156] P simply allocates the numbers 1 to 4 to these characters. M lists them as 'estudiantes', a decision followed here.

[157] P, M, S, R list 'Un Demonio de máscara'(P Act 1) and 'El Demonio' (P Act 2 and 3) as separate characters. It is clear from the playtext that they are a single character. In Act 1 we give 'Demonio' rather than 'Máscara'.

[158] Cast lists in P, M, S, R give 'Ledia'. 'Lidia' is the name given in the playtexts of all editions.

[159] P, M, S, R list 'Una mujer'(P Act 2) and 'Fabia' (P Act 3) as separate characters. In Act 2 the 'Mujer' is addressed by the Labrador as Fabia, suggesting the two listed characters are one and the same, although the contexts in which she appears in the two acts are different.

ACTO PRIMERO

Sale[n] URSINO, PEREGRINO, NICOLÁS, *de estudiantes, [y]* RUPERTO, *capigorrón.*

RUPERTO Digo que son las mujeres
más bien nacidas.
NICOLÁS Ruperto,
arguye con más concierto
cuando su defensa fueres.
URSINO ¿Por la oveja vuelve el lobo? 5
RUPERTO Digo que más nobles son
que el hombre.
PEREGRINO Da la razón.
RUPERTO Yo la daré.
URSINO *Nego.*
RUPERTO *Probo.*
¿El hombre no fue formado
de la tierra?

(stage direction before line 1): *capigorrón*: 'el que anda de capa y gorra, para poder más fácilmente vivir libre y ocioso. Dícese más comúnmente de los estudiantes que andan en este traje pegando petardos y viviendo licenciosamente' (*Aut*).

[1-18] Ruperto is advancing the 'e materia' proof of female excellence: whereas Adam was made from base earth, Eve was made from living flesh, a distinction indicative of woman's superiority, according to some writers occasionally labelled feminist, for example Cornelius Agrippa in his *De nobilitate et praecellentia foeminei sexus...declamatio* (1529) and Nicodemus Frischlin in his *Methodus declamandi in laudatione, thesi de laudibus mulierum demonstrata* (1606). Maclean notes, however, that '[t]hese "proofs" are clearly inconsistent with the wider context of theology; Agrippa himself admits that, in declamations of the sort he wrote in favour of woman, there are many invalid arguments and jests' (1980, p. 91). This last point is particularly illuminating: it supports a reading of the scholastic *disputatio* with which the play begins as light-hearted and jocular in tone.

[3] *concierto*: 'buena orden, disposición y método en el modo de hacer y ejecutar alguna cosa' (*Aut*). *Aut* gives a pertinent example of this usage from the *proemio* to book 3 of Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo*: '[d]icen que no hablo en romance, porque no hablo desatadamente y sin orden, y porque pongo en las palabras concierto y las escojo y les doy su lugar'. Nicolás's criticism seems unwarranted since Ruperto's initial assertion is coherent. This criticism of the *gracioso* contributes to Nicolás's characterization in the early stages of the play as an earnest, pedantic young man, one which is reinforced by his waspish outburst (ll. 94-96) and his visible disapproval at the mention of *máscaras* and *mujeres* at line 128.

[4] *fueres*: the second-person singular of the future subjunctive of *ser*. The future subjunctive is used here in an 'open' conditional clause. It also appears commonly in Golden-Age Spanish in temporal clauses which refer to the future and in relative clauses with an indefinite antecedent oriented towards the future. (See Penny 2002, pp. 216 & 249.)

[5] *por la oveja vuelve el lobo*: Ursino anticipates the defeat of Ruperto's argument by Nicolás, their intellectual superior (see lines 108-110). Note how, right at the start of the play, Ursino identifies Nicolás with the wolf and Ruperto with the sheep, with the latter animal's well-known Christian symbolism. The former identification may be thought to say more about the impetuous Ursino, struggling, as we shall see, to be free of his uncle's pious influence, than it does about Nicolás. The latter can be seen as an early hint of Ruperto's role as a character ripe for conversion.

[8] *nego, probo*: medieval university students such as Nicolás and his friends would have been trained in the art of debate. Lope deploys these Latin words here to give a flavour of the language of formal scholastic disputation. With his *nego*, Ursino is setting himself in opposition to the proposition that – with his *probo* –

URSINO Y es de fe.
RUPERTO ¿Y la mujer no lo fue
del hombre?
URSINO Y de su costado.
RUPERTO Luego fue más bien nacida
y es más noble la mujer
que el hombre, pues viene a ser
de su carne producida,
y el hombre de tierra y nada;
ésta es llana conclusión.
NICOLÁS Ofrécese una cuestión,
pero esa cuestión dejada,
pregunto: ¿formóse Eva
más que del hueso de Adán?
PEREGRINO De carne también le dan
principio y claro se prueba
del mismo texto sagrado:
«ésta es de mis huesos hueso,
carne de mi carne».
NICOLÁS En eso
esta duda me ha quedado:
si de carne se formó,
causa el decir maravilla
no más que de la costilla.
PEREGRINO Nombre a la parte se dio
más principal, o por ser
—que es evidente razón—
de la fuerza del varón
la que tiene la mujer;
que por eso dice allí:
«*replevit carnem pro ea*».

Ruperto undertakes to defend. When Lope includes lines of Latin in *San Nicolás* these do not always fit in with the metrical scheme. Lines 8 and 38 do, if read in accordance with the rules of Castilian prosody, whereas lines 606 and 625 do not, for example. Dixon notes that Lope 'had much more than Shakespeare's "small Latin". He made between 1581 and 1585 a translation (now lost) of Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae*, and claimed in 1632 (as Fernando) that at Alcalá he had often written "en versos latinos o castellanos. Comencé a juntar libros de todas lenguas, que después de los principios de la griega y ejercicio grande de la latina, supe bien la toscana, y de la francesa tuve noticia"' (2008, pp. 19-20). Lope confirms this linguistic knowledge in a letter to the Duque de Sessa (that Amezúa dates to mid-1613); he claims to be a 'buen lector de latín, italiano y francés' (Amezúa, 1935-1943, III, p. 122).

[18] *llano*: 'metafóricamente significa fácil, corriente y que no tiene embarazo, dificultad ni impedimento' (*Aut*).

[26-27] Genesis 2. 23: 'Dixitque Adam: Hoc nunc, os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: haec vocabitur Virago, quoniam de viro sumpta est', 'And Adam said: This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man'. Biblical quotations are taken from the Latin Vulgate and are followed by the Douay-Rheims English translation. The Latin is reproduced where Lope is quoting from, or paraphrasing, the Vulgate. Otherwise only the Douay-Rheims text is given. Jameson suggests that the extraordinary retentiveness of Lope's memory is 'proved beyond doubt by his acquaintance with the Bible' (1937, p. 137). *San Nicolás de Tolentino* contains a wealth of quotations from and allusions to Scripture.

[38] Genesis 2. 21: 'Immisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in Adam: cumque obdormisset, tulit unam de costis eius, et replevit carnem pro ea', 'Then the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon Adam: and when he was fast asleep, he took one of his ribs, and filled up flesh for it'.

RUPERTO Eso o esotro se sea;
oíd una duda.
NICOLÁS Di,
pues es segura verdad
que el hombre, como cabeza,
dio a la mujer fortaleza
y recibió enfermedad.
RUPERTO Si de carne fueron llenos
los huesos, es la cuestión
si es del hombre imperfección
aquella costilla menos.
NICOLÁS Ruperto, si fue criada
la costilla para hacer
solamente a la mujer,
no quedó imperfeto en nada;
que Dios allí la formó
para este efeto no más.
URSINO ¿Y qué causa me darás
por qué durmiendo sacó
a Eva de su costilla?
¿Fue causa por el dolor?
NICOLÁS No, que despierto el Señor
hiciera esa maravilla.
Por la significación,
Ursino, el sueño le dan
y de la mente de Adán
la quieta elevación.
Bien pudiera Dios hacer
que, sin dolor y tormento,
de Adán, y sin sentimiento,
se formara la mujer,
aunque despierto estuviera.
Lo segundo probó, en fin,
sobre san Juan, Agustín,
diciendo desta manera:
«duerme Adán, Eva se forma,

[39] *esotro*: that is *eso otro*; the fusion of the demonstrative pronoun with *otro* had precedents in Latin (see Menéndez Pidal 1952, p. 260). Here, Ruperto is dismissively brushing aside Peregrino's intervention.

[42] *como cabeza*: I Corinthians 11. 3: 'Volo autem vos scire quod omnis viri caput, Christus es: caput autem mulieris, vir: caput vero Christi, Deus', 'But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God'.

[73 & 76] *forma*: these lines end in an autorhyme. Whilst these were generally frowned upon by *preceptistas*, this instance would have been acceptable since the identical words are not used with an identical meaning. The first 'forma' is a verb and the second a noun. (See Arjona 1953, p. 277.)

[73-82] The parallel between Adam and Christ is drawn by St Paul in Romans 5. 12-21. Nicolás's reference is to the ninth homily of St Augustine's *In Joannis evangelium tractatus*, where Adam is presented as a type for Christ: 'Dormit Adam ut fiat Eva: moritur Christus ut fiat Ecclesia. Dormienti Adae fit Eva de latere: mortuo Christo lancea percutitur latus, ut profluant sacramenta, quibus formetur Ecclesia' (1844-1855, III (XXXIV), p. 161); 'Adam sleeps, that Eve may be formed: Christ dies, that the Church may be formed. While Adam sleeps, Eve is formed from his side. When Christ is dead, His side is smitten with a spear, that there may flow forth sacraments to form the Church' (1849, I, p. 146). The same homily includes a brief discussion of the question asked by Ursino at lines 55-58: was God 'unable while Adam was awake to take the rib from him [...]

muere Cristo y dél procede
la Iglesia, para que quede
en tan soberana forma.
Del lado del que durmió
Eva sale, y del dormido
en la cruz, del lado herido,
la Iglesia también salió,
hecha de los sacramentos
que salen de su costado»,
y por estar elevado,
se prueban los sentimientos
y el éxtasis celestial
con que vio misterios tantos,
común opinión de santos
que dicen…

RUPERTO ¡Oh, pesia tal!
¡Agora entramos ahí!
Mas ¿qué? ¿Comienza un sermón?

PEREGRINO Dejemos esta cuestión
cansada, aunque docta, ansí,
pues que venimos a ver
las fiestas.

NICOLÁS Ruperto ha sido
la causa; yo he respondido;
disculpa debo tener.

PEREGRINO Esta noche, Nicolás,
que se hace fiesta en razón
de aquesta nueva elección
del pontífice, no hay más
de prestar santa paciencia;
que nos habemos de holgar.

URSINO Licencia nos has de dar.

NICOLÁS ¿Cómo puede dar licencia
quien no ha sido superior?

PEREGRINO En alto lugar estás;
que en efeto, Nicolás,
eres agora el mayor
de los ingenios que tiene
aquesta universidad,
y que por su habilidad
a tan justa opinión viene.
Sin eso, la calonjía
en que ya estás proveído,
que de tu virtud ha sido
tan corto premio este día,

---

[o]r was it necessary, peradventure, that he should be asleep for this reason, that he might not feel pain in his side, when the rib was taken away?' (1849, I, p. 146).

[113] *calonjía*: 'prebenda del canónigo en iglesia catedral o colegiata' (*Aut*).

ya nos mueve a más respeto;
pero en estas ocasiones
perdonen tus devociones
—pues eres mozo y discreto—
que nos queremos holgar.

URSINO La ciudad, con luminarias,
del cielo las luces varias
quiere esta noche imitar;
las máscaras, las mujeres,
que en muchas debe de ser
máscara lo que es mujer
—oye, por Dios, no te alteres—
nos provocan a salir
del círculo del compás
que tu virtud, Nicolás,
suele otras noches medir.
La fiesta es justa.

NICOLÁS Bien medro
con eso.

URSINO ¡Que es la elección
del soberano patrón
de la barca de san Pedro!

NICOLÁS ……..
celebrallas santamente,
no como el vulgo y la gente
que desto se satisface.
Si el pontífice supremo
salió ya elegido al gusto
de Roma, no será justo
ofender, como lo temo,
al pontífice mayor.

RUPERTO Pues, ¿qué? ¿Quieres que recemos
una noche que tenemos
esta libertad, señor?

[117-120] This *redondilla*, as it is given in P, rhymes *abab* rather than the anticipated *abba*: 'Ya nos mueve a más respeto, | pero en estas ocasiones, | pues eres mozo y discreto, | perdonen tus devociones'. P's reading is retained by M, S, R, A. The lines' incorrect order was probably the result of an error by the typesetter, confused by three consecutive lines starting with the letter 'p'. I have instated the correct *redondilla* order; the sense is unaffected.

[130] *salir de compás*: 'no proceder uno como debe conforme a su calidad y estado; exceder de lo que puede y debe y no medirse, ni arreglarse en sus acciones y modo de obrar' (*Aut*).

[136] *la barca de san Pedro*: Peter's boat symbolizes the Church.

[137] The first line of the *redondilla* is missing.

[138] *celebrallas*: the final *r* of the infinitive was still often assimilated to the *l* of the postposed object pronoun and palatalized in the period between 1500 and 1700 (Spaulding 1943, p. 166; Penny 2002, p. 233). The practice is common in *San Nicolás* and in Lope's drama generally.

[145] *pontífice mayor*: the context makes it clear that Nicolás means God. The same phrase is used to refer to God in Lope's St Jerome play, *El cardenal de Belén*, in similar circumstances. Damasus has just been elected pope and Rome is urged to give thanks: '[d]a gracias por tal hazaña | al pontífice mayor' (p. 166A). It would be senseless to offer thanks to the pope for his own election, so God must be the intended referent.

¡Ea, que tu encogimiento
pasa del límite justo!
URSINO Perdona, que ha de haber gusto,
y algo más de atrevimiento.
Dejemos la hipocresía
cubierta de pretendientes,
que por engañar las gentes
fruncen las caras de día.
¡Oh, qué bien dijo Nerón:
que todos eran lascivos,
hasta cónsules altivos,
si fuese el mismo Catón,
pero que la diferencia
sólo debía de estar
en saber disimular!
PEREGRINO Él hablaba de experiencia,
pues tan mal disimuló
sus vicios.
URSINO Hombres verás
que publican mucho más
de aquello que les pasó,
y otros que, abrasando el mundo,
con tanto recato están
que ejemplo a los otros dan.
NICOLÁS De aquel ingenio profundo,
del gran obispo de Hipona,
es la cautela consejo.
PEREGRINO Hoy la santimonia dejo.
RUPERTO Toda la Marca de Ancona

---

[149] *ea*: 'género de aspiración con que se suele avivar la oración y el discurso, para alentar y mover al auditorio, conciliando la atención en los oyentes' (*Aut*) and a common exclamation in Lope's plays.

[149b] *encogimiento*: 'metafóricamente vale cortedad de ánimo, poco espíritu, falta de valor y resolución para obrar' (*Aut*).

[154] *pretendiente*: Nicolás intends to pursue an ecclesiastical career; he is a *pretendiente* in that sense. Ursino evidently holds typical examples of such men in low esteem.

[155] Use of the personal *a* became obligatory only at the end of the Golden Age (Penny 2002, p. 116).

[157-163] I have been unable to locate reference to this statement by Nero. Rather than the hypocrisy apparently suggested by Nero, Cato the Younger has long stood, by antonomasia, for virtue and prudence. In his *Epitome epithetorum* Textor, for instance, offers the following epithets for Cato: 'inuictus, durus, intonsus, grauis, seuerus, consummatus, pugnax, rigidus, tetricus, doctus, tristis, honorus, sanctus, moratus' (1613, p. 83), that is 'undefeated, tough, unshaven, serious, austere, consummate, pugnacious, stern, severe, learned, sad, gracious, pious, civilized'. Lope names Cato as such a model in many plays. In another *comedia de santos*, *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco,* Pedro praises Jaime of Aragon, commenting, '[p]arece que en él residen | la prudencia de Catón' (p. 20B). Far from being concerned more with appearing virtuous than actually being virtuous, Cato was known for the contrary concern. In his *Bellum Catilinae* Sallust remarks of Cato: 'esse quam videri bonus malebat', 'he preferred to be good rather than to appear good' (2007, p. 50). It may be that wayward Ursino, exasperated by his uncle's purity, is allying himself with cynical Nero in perversely suggesting that Cato's (and hence Nicolás's) goodness was only superficial, despite this being manifestly untrue.

[173] St Augustine of Hippo, father of the Augustinian order that Nicolás will join. If an Augustinian community did commission Lope to compose this *comedia de santos*, they would have been well pleased by the depiction of the Order: suitably austere (ll. 815-816); numbering stirring preachers greatly admired by the laity (stage direction before l. 778b); and founded by 'el más soberano ingenio | que la Iglesia ha conocido' (ll. 2086-2087).

se arde en fiestas.
URSINO ¡Gran ruido!
RUPERTO ¡Cuchilladas!
PEREGRINO ¡Lindo miedo!
NICOLÁS ¡Todo el mundo se esté quedo!

Dentro:

[ESTUDIANTE 1] ¡Fuera! ¡Paz! ¡Estoy herido!
[ESTUDIANTE 2] ¡Aquí, amigos y parientes!
[ESTUDIANTE 3] ¡Si yo una alabarda saco…!
[ESTUDIANTE 4] ¡Óyete, puerco!
[ESTUDIANTE 2] ¡Ah, bellaco!
[ESTUDIANTE 4] ¡Espera, gallina!
[ESTUDIANTE 2] ¡Mientes!
[ESTUDIANTE 4] Pues, ¡toma esa bofetada!
NICOLÁS Ved lo que las fiestas son.
PEREGRINO Esta bulla y confusión
es lo que en ellas agrada.
NICOLÁS Mejor en casa estaremos;
sobrino, venid tras mí.
URSINO Máscaras vienen aquí.
Aguarda, que luego iremos.

[Salen el DEMONIO,*]* MÁSCARAS *con hachas y los* MÚSICOS *[cantan]*.

MÚSICOS *¡Vivas muchos años*
romana Iglesia,
que palabras del cielo
nunca se quiebran!
¡Vivas muchos años
sagrada Roma,
que en Gregorio santo
tal padre cobras!
La Marca de Ancona
mil parabienes
desde aquí te ofrece.
¡Vivas eterna,
que palabras del cielo

[176] *la Marca de Ancona*: aside from the scene in Rome at the start of Act 3, this eastern region of Italy is the setting for all the earthbound action of *San Nicolás*.

[185] *toma*: P, M, S, R, A: *tome*. The formal imperative seems incongruous in this brawl scene and might simply be a misprint in the *princeps* or an accidental inconsistency on Lope's part. The line's prosody is unaffected by the emendation. In this edition verb forms have occasionally been corrected to achieve consistency within scenes, where appropriate and where the corrections do not affect the lines' metrical values.

[199] Probably Gregory X, elected to the papacy in 1271 when Nicholas would have been about twenty-five years old. Gregory was known for struggling to settle the internecine strife between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines (J. Kelly 2006, p. 197). See the note to line 1030 on the Guelph-Ghibelline conflict.

nunca se quiebran!
Vivas.

[DEMONIO] [*A Ursino*] Por acá, por acá vamos;
por acá será mejor.

Una de las Máscaras [—el DEMONIO*—] llegue a* URSINO.

NICOLÁS Mal entre aqueste rumor,
máscaras y hachas estamos.
[DEMONIO] [*A Ursino*] ¡Ah, hidalgo!
URSINO ¿Decís a mí?
[DEMONIO] ¿No sois vos Gentil Ursino?
URSINO Aunque sea desatino,
máscara, decir que sí,
el mismo soy; ¿qué queréis?
[DEMONIO] Cierta dama que os adora
y que tengo por señora,
aunque no me conocéis,
me dijo que si os hallaba
conmigo os llevase.
URSINO ¿Adónde?
[DEMONIO] A su casa.
URSINO ¿Corresponde
con mi amor, puesto que estaba
desdeñosa aquestos días?
[DEMONIO] Esta noche con la fiesta
podéis verla.
URSINO Si está puesta
en dar a las ansias mías
remedio, entraré aunque sea
escalando sus ventanas.
[DEMONIO] Todas las cosas son llanas
a quien amando desea.
Vamos, que no ha de faltar
escala; yo os la daré,
[*Aparte*] aunque una que yo tomé
fue sólo para bajar.

193-206 This song is categorized by Alín and Barrio Alonso as a 'canción no identificada': unlike many of the songs Lope used in his plays, it has not been found printed in any other text and it does not belong to the oral tradition (1997, pp. 384-385).

222 *puesto que*: 'vale lo mismo que aunque' (*Aut*).

233-234 With these words the 'Máscara' identifies himself to the audience as the devil. According to traditional interpretations of Scripture, the devil and a third of the angels were cast out of heaven as punishment for their rebellion against God (Isaiah 14. 12-15; Revelation 12. 3-12). This allusion is often drawn by the devil in Lope's saints' plays; it is one the Golden-Age spectator would not fail to grasp. For example, in Lope's *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco*, Montfort's first speech contains a reference to 'el Lucero que tan loco estuvo, | que la tercera parte le destierra [del cielo]' (p. 3A). The devil and his fallen angels are often depicted in art climbing down a ladder (sometimes Jacob's ladder: Genesis 28. 12). Christian tradition has long taken the Lucifer referred to in Isaiah, and the Red Dragon of Revelation, as the same being as the devil of the Gospels. See H. Kelly 2006 for an interesting analysis of the way in which the Bible's various satans, demons, serpents and dragons came to be regarded as a single being.

URSINO Voy tras vos, pero querría
despedirme de mi tío.
[DEMONIO] ¡No lo hagáis!... que es desvarío.
URSINO Quejarse después podría.
[DEMONIO] ¿No sabéis que Nicolás
no ha de dejaros?
URSINO Yo creo
que ha de impedir mi deseo.
[DEMONIO] Pues vamos.
URSINO No aguardo más.

Váyanse los dos.

NICOLÁS ¿Qué se ha hecho mi sobrino,
Ursino Gentil?
PEREGRINO No sé.
RUPERTO Con una máscara fue,
si no me he engañado, Ursino;
que después de hablar los dos,
vi que le siguió.
NICOLÁS Y ¿por dónde?
PEREGRINO Ya sé que de ti se esconde;
déjale agora, por Dios;
que tiene ciertos amores
y los esconde de ti.
NICOLÁS Hallara en seguirme a mí
otros más altos favores;
que yo sé dónde se dan.
PEREGRINO ¿Tú favores? ¡Cosa nueva!
NICOLÁS Si no es verdad, a la prueba;
que no lejos de aquí están.
PEREGRINO Si es esta casa de enfrente,
ya sé que dan colación.
RUPERTO De tan fino canelón,
que por seis horas se siente.

---

[246] P: *si no me ha engañado Ursino*. The correction made by M, S, R, A is to be preferred. A concession by Ruperto that he cannot be certain where and with whom he saw Ursino depart seems more likely, in the context of the hubbub of a *fiesta*, than a suspicion that Ursino might deliberately have sought to cover his tracks by trickery.

[253] P: *hallarà*. Rather than this future tense, the Golden-Age conditional use of the form *hallara* (as to which see Penny 2002, p. 167) has been adopted, following M, S, R, A.

[260] *colación*: 'la confitura o bocado que se da para beber' or 'el bocado que se toma por la tarde el día que es de ayuno, cuando no se ha de comer que una vez al día' (Covarrubias).

[261] Ruperto must intend a pun based on the polyvalency of *canelones*: both 'confite largo que tiene dentro una raja de acitrón o de canela, el cual es labrado y cuadrado' and '[e]l azote compuesto de seis u ocho ramales que rematan juntos y son más gordos, duros y desigualmente labrados [...] con que se disciplina el virtuoso y penitente' (*Aut*). So whereas Peregrino might optimistically be anticipating a snack (*colación*), Ruperto imagines that the only kind of *canelones* on offer inside this monastery will be the whips for penitential flagellation. This meaning is reinforced by Ruperto's description of himself in line 289 as a *peonza*, a spinning top set in motion by a small whip. The account of the dream-vision that Peregrino gives to the prior (ll. 1380-1551) seems to refer back to this same evening at the *convento* and confirms the auto-flagellation: '[c]omo vi tantos azotes, | lágrimas, pena y dolor' (ll. 1400-1401). Looking back on that evening as the moment of his

Señor, ¿en noche de fiestas
a *Misereres* nos traes?
NICOLÁS Anda, necio, que no caes
en las fiestas que son éstas.
Entra, por Dios, Peregrino,
no más que a ver lo que pasa
en aquesta santa casa,
que es un convento agustino
de descalzos ermitaños.
PEREGRINO ¿Aquí quieres que entre?
NICOLÁS Sí,
entra por Dios y por mí.
PEREGRINO ¡Con qué amorosos engaños
me has traído a que lo vea!
Entro.

[Entra PEREGRINO*]*

NICOLÁS Dios entre contigo.
Entra tú, Ruperto, amigo;
entra, que es justo que sea
la colación para todos.
RUPERTO ¿Dices de veras que yo
entre también?
NICOLÁS ¿Por qué no?
Y alábese de mil modos
aquel divino Señor.
…….
…….
…….
RUPERTO Pienso que te estás burlando.
Si el cielo quieres seguir,
¿soy peonza que he de ir
con azotes caminando?
¡Buenas noches de elección
de papa!
NICOLÁS Destos colores
son para Dios los mejores:
y el ayuno y la oración.
Entra.
RUPERTO Yo lo haré por ti;
pues ello topa en sonar,
por Dios, que tengo de dar

---

conversion, Peregrino explains that 'truje mis canelones | para tomar colación; | no me supieron tan mal | como lo pensaba yo' (ll. 1526-1529), the verb 'saber' sustaining the *equívoco*.

[264] *Misereres*: Psalm 51(50), the *Miserere* is one of the penitential psalms used for penance or confession. The contrast between the celebratory atmosphere outside the *convento* and the sober one inside is stark.

[283-286] Line 283 is an odd line in the midst of a long passage of *redondillas*. It is likely that the three lines of *redondilla* that should have followed were omitted by mistake during the printing process, or perhaps when a manuscript copy (now lost) was being drawn up.

en la pared, que no en mí.

[Entra RUPERTO*]*

NICOLÁS Pobres están a la puerta;
¡oh, quién tuviera qué dar!

Sale un PEREGRINO.

[EL] PEREGRINO Pues aquí queréis entrar,
la caridad será cierta;
dadme limosna.
NICOLÁS ¿Quién es?
[EL] PEREGRINO Un peregrino que pasa
a Roma.
NICOLÁS Esta santa casa
os la puede hacer después;
que saldrá gente piadosa
deste ejercicio; entretanto,
peregrino, os daré cuanto
traigo con mano amorosa.
Cien monedas me habían dado
de una rentilla que tengo;
aquí van.
[EL] PEREGRINO No en balde vengo
de aquesta casa informado;
esos pies os besaré.
NICOLÁS ¡Jesús! ¿Eso hacéis?
[EL] PEREGRINO ¿Pues no,
si de uno que me vendió
alguna vez los besé?
Vos me dáis ciento y aquél
por treinta me puso en venta.
NICOLÁS Hermano, por otros treinta
vendieron al justo Abel.

(stage direction before line 301): 'El peregrino lleva ropa parda, con la indispensable esclavina y báculo' (Arellano 2000b, p. 91).

301 A moral contrast between Nicolás and Ursino is suggested by the respective visitor each receives: the former, Christ, and the latter, the devil.

311 This line is hypersyllabic unless the *ía* of 'habían' is pronounced as a diphthong.

313 P: *aquí vã*; M, S, R, A *aquí va*. The subject is 'cien monedas', so the verb should be plural.

316 Intended as an interjection expressing surprise, Nicolás unwittingly identifies his interlocutor with his '¡Jesús!'. This identification is confirmed by the lines that follow.

317-320 Judas Iscariot betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26. 15).

321-322 Old Testament Abel was not sold or betrayed for money; rather, this is a further reference to Christ. Abel is one of the principal Old Testament types for Christ – both were shepherds (Christ metaphorically), both offered sacrifice, both were betrayed and put to death. Abel is named in Matthew 23. 35 as 'Abel iusti', 'Abel, the just'. The typology is made explicit in Hebrews 12. 24, where the author refers to 'Jesus the mediator of the new testament, and to the sprinkling of blood which speaketh better than that of Abel', better because Christ's blood 'cleanseth us from all sin' (I John 1. 7). Lope would often have heard (or, from 1614, said) the words 'iusti Abel' at mass; they were spoken as part of the Eucharistic Prayer (see the 1570

Muy pobre de ropa estáis;
mi capa os ha de cubrir.
[EL] PEREGRINO ¿También me queréis vestir?
NICOLÁS Mas, antes, vos me la dais:
que por ésta que en el suelo
os doy, peregrino, a vos,
dará el pontífice Dios
capa de coro en el cielo.

*Éntrase [*NICOLÁS*]*.

[EL] PEREGRINO Entróse al fin Nicolás;
voy a escuchar su oración.
Yo estaré en tu corazón
como tú en el mío estás;
y la palabra te doy
—que ningún poder contrasta,
como quien yo soy, que basta
decir yo como quien soy—
de hacer que aquestas monedas
se vuelvan estrellas tantas,
que venzan las luces santas
de las celestiales ruedas;
esta capa, un negro manto
con la cinta de Agustín,
que al más alto serafín
ponga su riqueza espanto
y encoja las alas bellas;
mira si tu celo es santo,
pues Agustín te da el manto,
y yo le bordo de estrellas.

[Éntrase] [el PEREGRINO*], y salen [el* DEMONIO*] y* URSINO GENTIL.

URSINO Bien conozco la calle.
[DEMONIO] Desa suerte
sabrás que no te engaño.
URSINO En esta casa
el ángel vive que mi pecho abrasa.
[DEMONIO] Está quejosa de que no la quieres.
URSINO ¿Por qué razón?
[DEMONIO] Porque vicioso eres,
y a cuantas miras quieres bien, Ursino.

Missale Romanum). Nicolás does not detect the clue to the pilgrim's identity contained in lines 317-320, hence his superfluous restatement of the allusion already drawn by Christ.

335-342 Christ's promise is fulfilled towards the end of Act 3, when angels dress Nicolás in a black habit decorated with stars.

342 *celestiales ruedas*: the concentric circles of the Ptolomaic universe, with the Earth at the orbital centre and the planets, stars and other celestial bodies arranged in order around it.

349 The black habit of the Augustinian Order that Nicolás will join before the start of Act 2.

URSINO Máscara, no lo niego, que bien creo
que de todas me mata igual deseo;
todas las quiero bien, mas poco dura.
[DEMONIO] No es eso, Ursino, amor, sino locura.
URSINO La ausencia sola asiste en mis sentidos;
sólo su nombre escuchan mis oídos;
soy de la fama en su alabanza lengua,
y quien, de cuantas viven, se deslengua;
mis ojos no ven cosa a que se rinda
mi alma en sujeción, por ser tan linda
que me los lleva a su divina esfera
y me deshace como el sol la cera;
no tengo gusto más que de su gusto
y aunque me pierdo, me parece justo;
sólo falta a mis manos el tocalla.
[DEMONIO] Hoy ha de ser, mas lo que fuere calla;
que no es Laurencia de tan viles prendas
que te alabes en público de aquello
que con tanto secreto lo mereces.
URSINO Por ti, que tantas prendas encareces,
yo callaré, pero, por Dios, amigo,
que si verdad en las de amor te digo,
que yo no sé qué queda, el bien gozado,
sino el contarle en público.
[DEMONIO] Ese es vicio
indigno de los hombres de tu sangre;
no pienso que esta tierra, esta provincia,
Italia toda, el mundo, haya criado
un hombre más vicioso y olvidado
de sus obligaciones.
URSINO Si te pones
a mirar en mi edad obligaciones,
no solicites gusto que me importe.
[DEMONIO] Aora bien, esta plática se acorte;
Laurencia es bella y noble; tú la quieres;
no la pondrás con las demás mujeres.
URSINO Como me sucediere...
[DEMONIO] Estas escalas
serán para volar ligeras alas
a la esfera del sol de su hermosura;
ya las arrojo.
URSINO Ya de arriba tiran.
[DEMONIO] Es que te aguardan y con ojos miran
de aquel pastor que del pavón las plumas

[364] *deslenguarse*: 'desbocarse y propasarse a decir lo que no es justo ni honesto' (*Aut*).
[378] *las de amor*: that is, *las cosas de amor*.
[391-393] This echo of the Icarus legend is a clue that Ursino's dalliance will not end well.
[395-397] *con ojos miran de aquel pastor*, etc.: an allusion to the myth of the nymph Io, recounted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (book 1, ll. 568-747), the poem from which Lope acquired most of his 'unsurpassed knowledge' of classical mythology (Dixon 2008, p. 21). Juno, Jupiter's jealous wife, kept Io, her rival for her

volvió en los ojos que engendraron celos;
sube seguro.

URSINO ¡Válganme los cielos!

Subiendo, ve en lo alto una muerte y cae.

[DEMONIO] Cayó y sintieron que subir quería.
La máscara me quito; aquesto es hecho.
¿De qué sirve que agora se arrepienta?,

---

husband's affections (transformed into a heifer by Jupiter) under the guard of hundred-eyed Argus, a sentinel-herdsman. Unable to bear Io's suffering, Jupiter ordered his son Mercury to kill Argus, which he did leaping down to earth in disguise as a fellow herdsman ('ut pastor'). His music lulled Argus's one hundred eyes to sleep and then he cut off the giant's head. Juno retrieved these eyes and, to commemorate her faithful servant, she placed them on the feathers of the peacock, a bird closely associated with her cult. The devil, then, seeks to reassure Ursino with the apparently comforting comment that those atop the ladder are, like Argus, keeping a watchful eye on him. However, Argus is not the 'pastor' whose actions resulted in eyes becoming the circles on the peacock's feathers. It is Mercury (also a herdsman in this story) who caused this metamorphosis by beheading Argus. If the devil's mention of 'aquel pastor*'* is an allusion to Mercury, rather than Argus, then his words are much more menacing. This would be entirely appropriate given this scene's dénouement. The hyperbaton of lines 395-397 makes it difficult to ascertain their precise sense. They seem to make most sense recast as follows: *Es que te aguardan y [te] miran con los ojos de aquel pastor que volvió en las plumas del pavón los ojos que engendraron celos*. It is not clear why Argus's eyes were the cause of *celos*.

398 A fall from a ladder would have been interpreted by the seventeenth-century spectator as symbolic of a moral fall. Russell's footnote to *Celestina*'s Auto XIX, in which Calisto falls to his death from a ladder, could sensibly be applied to Ursino's fall: 'la caída indudablemente tiene cierto significado simbólico' (Rojas 1991, p. 574). Gentil, one of Nicholas's relatives (whether a brother, nephew or cousin is unclear, although Lope describes him as a 'sobrino', perhaps chiefly as it is a useful rhyme for Ursino) was indeed killed in a state of mortal sin, but the hagiographic sources do not provide further details concerning the manner or the agents of his violent death. The 1554 *Historia*, for instance, is typical in its brevity: 'fue muerto [...] por un su enemigo' (fol. 146^{r}). The physical stage presence of the devil, not mentioned by the hagiographies in the context of Ursino's death, can be seen as an attempt to render visible the hidden actions of the devil. (See the section on the supernatural in the introductory study to this edition.)

399 (stage direction before line 399): *ve en lo alto una muerte*: Ruano de la Haza explains (2000, p.85) that *una muerte* is a figural representation of death that appears as a skeleton, for example the one with which Cipriano struggles in Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso*. In fact, Antonio Prieto states that the word *muerte* 'podía utilizarse como sinónimo de esqueleto' (Tirso 1974, p. 127). This is confirmed by the note to line 2349 of Ruano de la Haza's edition of Calderón's *El purgatorio de san Patricio*, where the editor explains that the role of *una muerte* would probably have been performed by an actor wearing a skeleton mask. The phrase 'en lo alto' indicated that the action should take place on the top gallery of the typical *corral* stage, which was used to represent the heavens, amongst other things (Ruano 2008, p. 44).

401-403 The devil's half-uttered comment raises the controversial question of last-minute repentance. Reliance on this was considered extremely dangerous by the theologians and moralists of Golden-Age Spain. In his widely-read *Guía de pecadores*, Fray Luis de Granada wrote that many souls have been damned because men persist in repenting only on their deathbeds, assuming that God will be merciful, when in fact such confessions usually stem more from fear rather than from true repentance. However, wishing to avoid leading readers into despair, Fray Luis begins his discussion by insisting, in agreement with Augustine (in his *De vera et falsa poenitentia*) and the other Fathers of the Church, that, although rarely so, last-minute repentance, as long as it is genuine, can secure salvation: 'en cualquier tiempo que la penitencia fuere verdadera (aunque sea en el punto de la muerte) es poderosa para dar salud'. The general rule, though, is that 'a la buena vida se sigue buena muerte, y a la mala vida mala muerte' (1986, pp. 256 & 267). An example of a genuine, effective last-minute repentance is that of Enrico in Tirso's *El condenado por desconfiado* (1992, ll. 2523-2557). Tirso's Don Juan also attempts to repent moments before his death, but he is told that it is too late: '[y]a acuerdas tarde' (1997, l. 2856). The audience is left in some doubt as to whether he is saved or damned. The crimes listed by the devil in his indictment of Ursino (ll. 434-445) bear a striking resemblance to Don Juan's. Here (at ll. 432-433), whilst Misericordia does draw Ursino's repentance to the attention of the Last Judgement Tribunal, he escapes damnation, not on account of this, but on account of Nicolás's merits (ll. 468-473), in conformity with the hagiographic tradition (see, for example, Navarro 1612, fol. 62^{v}).

puesto que dice Dios que en cualquier hora
que el que le ofende se convierte y llora…
¡Ah, divino Juez!

Ábrese un Tribunal con el JUEZ DIVINO, *la* JUSTICIA *y la* MISERICORDIA.

JUEZ ¿Qué es lo que quieres?
[DEMONIO] Si tan piadoso como justo eres,
y tan justo, Señor, como piadoso…
Ursino yace aquí muerto en pecado.
JUEZ ¿De qué lo sabes tú?
[DEMONIO] Yo lo he trazado,
siendo tantos sus vicios y delitos
como en este papel se ven escritos.
MISERICORDIA Señor, este cruel, con sus agravios
ha quitado el sentido a muchos sabios,
ha derribado en tierra a muchos justos.
[DEMONIO] ¿Pídote agora más que los injustos?
¿Quiero los buenos yo? ¿Dígole al cielo
que me entregue las almas que caminan
por la senda real de sus preceptos?
¿Cómo callas, Justicia?

[402] *puesto que*: for the devil's statement to make sense, 'puesto que' must be understood as equivalent to the concessive *aunque* (see the note to line 222).

[408] *yo lo he trazado*: one of the devil's traditional functions is as the tester of men's virtue and perseverence. With God's permission the devil tests Old Testament Job and, in the New Testament, he tempts Christ and the apostles. Allied to this function is the devil's role as prosecutor before the heavenly tribunal; in Revelation, the devil is referred to as 'the accuser of our brethren [...] who accused them before our God day and night' (12. 10). The devil has this role in Quevedo's 'Sueño del Juicio Final'.

[411] The visual appearance of the actress playing the role of Misericordia could well have been influenced by the established iconography. Arellano asserts that the 'atributos vestimentarios' of such characters were often 'orientados por la emblemática' (2000b, p. 86). Particularly influential was Ripa's *Iconologia* (first published in Italian in 1593), which sets the rules of representation that were followed by several generations of *autores* and theatrical technicians, including the famous Cosimo Lotti of the Zarzuela and the Buen Retiro theatres (Alciato 1975, pp. 21-23). Richardson's English version of the *Iconologia* describes 'Misericordia', 'Mercy', as follows: 'the figure of a woman of beautiful aspect and mild complexion, with a garland of olives on her head. She holds a branch of the cedar tree with flowers on it, and both her arms are extended in an attitude of tenderness, and at her feet stands the figure of a rook. The aspect and mild complexion denote meekness, an inclination to pity and to pardon. The garland of olives is an emblem of peace and mercy; and the branch of cedar with the flowers, points out uniformity of sentiment, and that this virtue is ever disposed to regard the misfortunes of others with tenderness and compassion. Her extended arms are expressive of the readiness of this heavenly disposition, in embracing every opportunity to show pity and remission of severity. The rook was made an attribute to Mercy by the Egyptians' (1779, II, p. 105). The description of Justice is as follows: 'the figure of a woman, dressed in white robes; she holds a sword in the left hand, and in the right a pair of scales on the balance. She is fitted with a bandage over her eyes. The white robes and bandage over her eyes allude to incorrupt justice, disregarding every interested view, by distributing justice with rectitude and purity of mind, and protecting the innocent; the scales on the balance denote that this virtue directs to equity and upright judgment; and the sword is allusive to the punishment of a delinquent' (1779, II, p. 21). The original Italian also contains a description of Divine Justice, 'Giustizia Divina', which may be more pertinent: '[d]onna di singolare bellezza, vestita d'oro con una corona d'oro in testa, sopra alla quale vi sia una colomba circondata di splendore, avrà i capelli sparsi sopra le spalle, che con gli occhi miri como cosa bassa il mondo, tenendo nella destra la spada nuda, e nella sinistra le bilance' (1976, p. 202), 'A woman of singular beauty, dressed in gold with a golden crown on her head, with, on top, a dove surrounded with splendour, her hair loose at her shoulders; with her eyes she should look upon the world as upon a base thing; she should hold a drawn sword in her right hand and, in her left, a pair of scales'.

JUSTICIA Ya te escucho.
[DEMONIO] Pues si la tengo yo, ya tardas mucho;
dame a Ursino Gentil.
JUSTICIA Razón parece.
MISERICORDIA Lo que parece no es.
JUSTICIA Misericordia,
si en esto habemos de tener discordia,
álzate aquí con el poder divino.
MISERICORDIA ¡Piedad, Señor, del miserable Ursino!
[DEMONIO] ¡Justicia, demos voces! ¿Qué es aquesto?
¿No ha de haber más que enternecer llorando
el pecho del Juez?, pues los jueces
aun en la tierra juzgan por lo escrito,
cuanto y más un Juez tan infinito,
que está más dentro de los hombres mismos
que el alma que los rige, en los abismos,
en el cielo, en la tierra, en todo.
MISERICORDIA Advierte
el arrepentimiento de su muerte.
[DEMONIO] Advierte en el papel que traigo escrito:
dice primeramente que este hombre
no tiene más que de cristiano el nombre;
en los templos jamás estuvo atento,
ni les tuvo respeto, que es la cosa
a tu santa justicia más odiosa;
forzaba las doncellas y con ruegos
y dineros solícito vencía
las casadas, las libres, las viudas,
traidor a sus amigos, maldiciente
de cuanto vía, jurador, blasfemo,
jugador y voltario en todo extremo.
JUSTICIA La información parece que es bastante.
MISERICORDIA A ser éste, Señor, piedra o diamante.
[DEMONIO] Piedra es y ha sido.
MISERICORDIA Paso, que ya viene
la abogada del hombre miserable.
JUEZ No despegues la boca mientras hable.

Sale la VIRGEN.

VIRGEN ¡Juez divino!
JUEZ ¡Madre soberana,
digna de mayor trono que en la tierra
dio Salomón a Bersabé! ¿Qué quieres?

---

[419] *si la tengo*: that is, *si tengo justicia*.

[444] *vía*: the imperfect of *ver*, which descended from the Latin *videbam*, had two forms in Old Spanish: (in the third person singular) *vía* and *veía*. Eventually the latter form was imposed by the standard language, but the former is still being used in Lope's plays around 1614 (Penny 2002, p. 200).

[449] *abogada*: the Virgin Mary's role as man's defence advocate has a long tradition and is cited in the medieval Marian hymn, the *Salve Regina*, in which Mary is addressed as 'advocata nostra'. The role was

VIRGEN Puesto que mi Señor y mi Rey eres,
eres mi Hijo y yo, Señor, la Madre
del hombre miserable.
[DEMONIO] Ester divina,
¿cómo ruegas por pueblo tan ingrato?
JUEZ ¿No te he dicho que calles? ¡Calla un rato!
[DEMONIO] ¿Cómo puedo callar si ha tantos días
que dijiste, Señor, que esa Señora,
que el sol corona y que la luna adora,
con su divina planta rompería
la dura y cavilosa frente mía?
Si he de tener pleito, daré voces.
VIRGEN Ya, Juez divino, a Nicolás conoces,
y sabes que es el miserable Ursino,

---

famously discussed by the fifteenth-century Dominican friar Guillaume Pepin. Discussing Pepin's description of Mary's lawyerly skills, Diarmaid MacCulloch writes how she 'roundly humiliated the Devil in his lawsuit brought against humanity' (2004, p. 21). Lope's deployment of the Virgin Mary in this guise falls within that tradition. The *Salve Regina* and Mary's role as advocate are recalled again in ll. 749-753.

452-453 *digna de mayor trono que en la tierra dio Salomón a Bersabé*: Bathsheba, originally the wife of Uriah the Hittite, became King David's wife after he arranged Uriah's death on the battlefield. Bathsheba bore David a son, Solomon, who, largely thanks to the influence of Bathsheba and the prophet Nathan, succeeded David as king of Israel and Judah, instead of David's eldest surviving son, Adonijah (II Kings 11; III Kings 1. 11-31). Bathsheba was honoured by her son for the role she played in his triumph in a way that obviously foreshadows Christ's honouring of his mother: '[t]hen Bethsabee came to king Solomon, to speak to him for Adonias: and the king arose to meet her, and bowed to her, and sat down upon his throne. And a throne was set for the king's mother: and she sat on his right hand' (III Kings 2. 19). (The Vulgate divides the Book of Kings into four parts. In other versions of the Bible, books I and II are known at I & II Samuel and books III and IV are referred to as I and II Kings.)

455-456 *la Madre del hombre miserable*: 'When Jesus therefore had seen his mother and the disciple standing, whom he loved, he saith to his mother: Woman, behold thy son' (John 19. 26). In his exegesis on John's Gospel, Moloney writes '[t]he passage affirms the maternal role of the Mother of Jesus in the new family of Jesus established at the cross', that is, the Church (1998, p. 504).

456 *Ester divina*: the eponymous heroine of the Old Testament Book of Esther is considered a type, a prefiguration of the Virgin Mary. It is through the intercession of Esther that the Jews of the Persian Empire are saved from the massacre orchestrated by the wicked Haman. The parallel with the present situation is clear: it is thanks to Mary's intervention that Ursino will avoid damnation. A futher parallel is explained in Lope's *La limpieza no manchada* where St Bridget witnesses a metatheatrical representation of that Old Testament story (pp. 48-62): just as Esther was exempt from the threat of death hanging over all the Jews in King Ahasuerus's empire, Mary was born without the stain of Original Sin, according to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which is celebrated in that *comedia de santos*. Lope wrote a *comedia bíblica* about Old Testament Esther, *La hermosa Ester*, the subject of a study by Canning (2004, pp. 9-43).

460-463 *esa Señora, que el sol corona y que la luna adora*, etc.: this description of Mary is based on Revelation 12. 1: '[m]ulier amicta sole et luna sub pedibus ejus', 'a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet'. The reference to Mary crushing the serpent's (the devil's) head is derived from Jerome's Vulgate translation of Genesis 3. 15: '[i]nimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, | [e]t semen tuum et semen illius: | [i]psa conteret caput tuum, | [e]t tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus', 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel'. Since the fifteenth century, it has been common to give an alternative translation of the Hebrew, ascribing the crusher's role to the woman's seed (that is, Christ) rather than to the woman (Mary) herself, hence '*her seed* shall crush thy head'. In the Vulgate translation of Genesis quoted above, it is the woman – 'ipsa' – who will crush the serpent's head. 'Ipsa' must agree with the singular feminine noun 'mulier[em]'. 'Ipsa' could agree grammatically with the plural neuter noun 'semina', but it does not agree with the Vulgate's singular 'semen'. The Council of Trent's decision to declare the Vulgate the only canonical version of the Bible cemented this reading, which is considered a mistranslation by many modern biblical scholars. References to Mary crushing the serpent's head are common in Lope's saints' plays. It comes up again at ll. 484-485 and ll. 2434-2435 of *San Nicolás*.

que yace aquí, de Nicolás sobrino.
JUEZ ¿Qué quieres tú?
VIRGEN Que purgue los delitos,
de su contrario en el proceso escritos,
por las virtudes y oraciones santas
de Nicolás, hasta que tiempo sea
en que tu gloria y su descanso vea.
JUEZ ¡Hágase ansí!
[DEMONIO] ¡Replícale, Justicia!
JUSTICIA ¿Qué quieres que replique?
[DEMONIO] ¡Bueno es esto!
Rompo el papel y si no fuera espíritu
me rasgara los ojos y vertiera
cuanta sangre tuviera por las venas.
JUEZ Cerrad el Tribunal.

[Vanse el JUEZ DIVINO, *la* VIRGEN, *la* JUSTICIA *y la* MISERICORDIA.*]*

[DEMONIO] Ciérrese el cielo;
nunca le abriera tu divina llave,
ni entrara en él el labrador del suelo,
que tan de coro tu clemencia sabe.
¿Adónde habrá para mi fuego hielo?
Oh tú que convertiste el Eva en Ave,
¿hasta cuándo querrás quebrar mi frente

[475-477] The devil is furious at his failure to secure Ursino's damnation. Of course, as a spiritual being, the Devil has no eyes to scratch out and no blood in his veins. His comic frustration here sets Lope's Demonio within the tradition of the devil as a 'bungling loser', which stems from Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* and other *vita sanctorum* collections that describe the devil's inevitable defeat and humiliation at the hands of the saints (see H. Kelly 2006, pp. 218-229). The comic depiction of Lope's Demonio is developed below at line 492; the irony of his exclamation '¡vive el Hijo tuyo!' is clear.

[475] P: *rompo el papel, y sino fuera espiritu*. Sense requires the *sino* to be emended to *si no* in modern Spanish. M, S, R, A give *rompo el papel; si espíritu no fuera*. This re-ordering permits *fuera* to rhyme with *vertiera* at the end of l. 476, but this is a passage of *versos sueltos*, so rhyme is not obligatory. If the intention behind the removal of the conjunction was to remedy an apparently hypersyllabic line, it was misguided. P's text is not hypersyllabic: an *esdrújula* word at the end of a line of verse reduces the syllable count by one.

[480] *el labrador del suelo*: Christ, who was a carpenter, like St Joseph. According to some Christian traditions, the motive for the devil's rebellion against God was his fury that God should become incarnate in a creature so base as Man, and a humble man at that.

[482] *adónde*: in sixteenth-century Spanish 'the original force of the preposition *a* ("place to which") has been lost, so that *adónde* has become an equivalent of *dónde*' (Keniston 1937, p. 154).

[483] At the Fall, sin and death entered the world because of Eve's disobedience to God. Mary has long been seen as 'the second Eve who triumphs where the first Eve failed' (Warner 1985, p. 245). Here the devil remembers how, because of Mary's obedience to God, the curse of the Fall has been lifted and Mary has earned the love and veneration of mankind, conventionally expressed in the words of the 'Ave Maria' prayer, which begins with the 'Ave' of the Archangel Gabriel's greeting (Luke 1. 28). (Lope may also have intended an allusion to a bird, the 'ave fénix', as a symbol of the promise of resurrection, won thanks to Mary's co-operation with God.) Lope presumably expected the *oyente* to note that the letters of 'Ave' spell 'Eva' when reversed, a neat half-palindrome that illustrates the contrasting roles Eve and Mary have at each end of the story of man's salvation. Voster notes that several breviaries published in sixteenth-century Spain prescribe for Marian feast days readings that mention Eve as an antitype for Mary. The Eva-Ave anagram can be traced back at least as far as St Augustine: 'Latinum Ave est inversum Eva, quia Maria Evae maledictiones in benedictiones convertit', '[t]he Latin Ave is Eva in reverse, because Mary turned Eve's curses into blessings' (Vosters 1977, I, pp. 196-204, with my translation).

y ser amparo de la humana gente?
Por ser Gentil de Nicolás sobrino,
hoy me le sacas de mis hondos senos.
¿Que así enternezcas al Juez divino,
y tanto con tu amor puedan los buenos?
¿Que así me quites a Gentil Ursino,
por ruegos que en efeto son ajenos?
Pues ¡vive el Hijo tuyo! deste modo
que me lo ha de pagar Nicolás todo.
Yo le perseguiré, yo soy la estrella
que amanece primero que el sol mismo;
yo quien la tierra mísera atropella,
rey absoluto del profundo abismo.
Séaste tú Raquel hermosa y bella,
madre de aqueste humano barbarismo;
que yo seré un Labán, que no me quites
los ídolos por más que solicites.
Se sabe ya de su ejercicio santo,
y trae convertido a Peregrino.
Huirme quiero al reino del espanto.

Húyase y entre[n] NICOLÁS, RUPERTO *y* PEREGRINO.

NICOLÁS ¿Qué te parece?
PEREGRINO Que es un bien divino.
RUPERTO Bueno es, por Dios, si no doliera tanto.
PEREGRINO ¿Quién yace aquí?
NICOLÁS ¡Jesús! Gentil Ursino

494-495 Lucifer ('Lucero del Alba' in Spanish, 'Morning Star' or 'Day Star' in English) is the Latin name given to the dawn appearance of the planet Venus, the brightest star in the sky and the herald of sunrise. It is a name also commonly associated with the devil, because the Babylonian king described in Isaiah 14. 3-20 and referred to as Lucifer in the Vulgate, has traditionally been taken as an allegory for the devil. According to Isaiah, this Babylonian king, like the devil, was destined to be cast down as punishment for his attempt to place himself above God.

494-501 In the Book of Genesis, Rachel is Laban's younger daughter, who eventually marries Jacob, after Laban has already tricked Jacob into marrying his elder daughter, Leah. When Jacob runs away from Laban's lands with his wives and their children, unbeknownst to her husband, Rachel steals Laban's idols, his household gods: '[e]o tempore ierat Laban ad tondendas oves, et Rachel furata est idola patris sui', '[a]t that time Laban was gone to shear his sheep, and Rachel stole away her father's idols' (Genesis 31. 19). When Laban accuses Jacob of the theft, Jacob curses the thief asking that the thief be struck dead. Rachel dies in labour a short time later. She is a type for Mary: Rachel and her family were pursued by Laban and this may be seen as a precedent for the pursuit of Mary and the Holy Family out of Israel at the time of the slaughter of the Holy Innocents by Herod; indeed, Rachel is referred to by name in Matthew's account of the flight into Egypt (2. 18). Like Laban and Herod, the devil vows to pursue the one who threatens his power, in this case, Nicolás. Rachel, an Old Testament model of motherly love, weeps over the loss of her sons, just as Mary will weep for hers. In the previous scene, Mary reminded the Juez Divino of her status as his mother and the mother of 'el hombre miserable', Ursino (ll. 455-456). The idols stolen by Rachel are considered to have secured her independence and authority for herself and her lineage. Here, Mary has exercised authority too, founded principally upon her status as Mother of God and mother to all mankind. By vowing to deny Mary the *ídolos*, the devil is vowing to undermine her authority by intervening in Nicolás's fate.

506 Confirmation that the *canelones* offered in the priory that Nicolás, Peregrino and Ruperto have just visited are of the penitential variety (see note to line 261 above). Ruperto misses the point of this kind of penance, complaining that it hurts so terribly.

me parece este mozo.
PEREGRINO Él es sin duda.
NICOLÁS Dios a tu alma y tu remedio acuda.
RUPERTO ¿Quién le habrá muerto?
NICOLÁS Alguna loca espada,
que desde que se fue temí el suceso.
PEREGRINO La suya, Nicolás, tiene envainada.
RUPERTO ¿Daremos voces?
NICOLÁS No, que es loco exceso;
tómale en brazos.
RUPERTO No pesará nada,
a no ser más que de su peso el peso.
NICOLÁS ¿Ves esto, Peregrino?
PEREGRINO Ya lo veo;
huir del mundo, Nicolás, deseo.
Despacio te diré lo que he soñado
—si no ha sido visión, que es lo más cierto—
con que pienso, acogiéndome a sagrado,
tomar con esta luz seguro puerto.
NICOLÁS Pues de tantas maneras te ha llamado
este Señor por nuestras culpas muerto,
respóndele con alma agradecida.
PEREGRINO Tú lo verás, si me concede vida.

Vanse, y salen ROSELA, *dama con escudero y manto, y* FENISO.

ROSELA Digo que el lienzo le di
y que el diamante me dio.
FENISO Que lo digas siento yo.
ROSELA Libre, Feniso, nací;
si no te agradare ansí,
mira que estás en la calle.
FENISO No quieren celos que calle,
Rosela, tus sinrazones,
pues con Fulgencio me pones
en ocasión de matalle.
ROSELA Anda, que no matarás,

[518-519] During the Golden Age, there was considerable interest in the distinct ways in which God and other supernatural beings could communicate messages to men. See the section on the supernatural, in the introductory study, for a discussion in which these lines are considered.

[526-579] These three short exchanges between three pairs of minor characters seem intended to offer a stark contrast between the vain concerns of the secular world (the subject matter of the exchanges and the subject to which Fray Rogerio must be alluding in lines 703-709) and the call to embrace God's mercy, which is the message of the sermon that follows. It was an important role of friars belonging to the mendicant orders to engage with and challenge the worldliness of life in the urban centres that were growing fast at the period of their foundations. These three exchanges would probably have been performed as an *escena múltiple*, 'es decir, se prevé la actuación contemporánea en el tablado de grupos de actores que, sin embargo, no se relacionan entre sí, por convención, remiten cada uno a espacio dramático distinto (aunque el espacio escénico es, obviamente, el mismo). Se trata de escenas diferentes, que se solapan parcialmente, pues la una termina mientras la otra prosigue, y a su vez la segunda termina mientras ya ha empezado una tercerca' (Antonucci 2007b, p. 46).

[531-532] These lines end in an autorhyme, but of an acceptable kind: the first 'calle' is a noun and the second a verb (see the note to lines 73 & 76).

guardando el quinto preceto.
FENISO Que no lo haré te prometo,
por no enojarte jamás;
que aunque esta ocasión me das,
te adoro y temo de suerte
que antes me daré la muerte.
ROSELA ¡Jesús y qué necio amante!
FENISO Necio porque soy constante,
pero mi firmeza advierte.
ROSELA No prosigas, por tu vida,
porque en materia de amor,
ése es mayor amador
que más del amor se olvida;
que la más encarecida
pena de amor no se iguala
con el que sirve y regala,
que para ganar mil Troyas
no hay suspiros como joyas,
la tela, el oro y la gala.
FENISO Yo pensaba que el amor
era de mucha importancia.
ROSELA Amor es pueblos en Francia;
interés compra favor;
lo que hay de esclavo a señor,
hay desde amor a interés;
todo lo que dar no es,
no es amor, amor es dar,
por dar comienza el amar;
no amarás, mientras no des.

Salen HERACLIO *y* FABRICIO.

HERACLIO Por mil ducados, no más,
esta nave os aseguro.
FABRICIO Asegurarla procuro,
pero en alto precio estás.
HERACLIO ¿En efeto, qué me das?

[553] *ganar mil Troyas*: in Golden-Age literature, Troy stands, metaphorically, for a thing of great value and significance, of extremely difficult acquisition. Hence, in *Don Quijote* (II, 46) the great strength of Altisidora's sentiments is implied by the reference to that city in the following lines of her poetic rebuke to the *mal caballero*: '[l]lévaste dos mil suspiros, | que, a ser de fuego, pudieran | abrasar a dos mil Troyas, | si dos mil Troyas hubiera' (Cervantes 1997a, II, pp. 452-453). Lope uses the phrase 'ganar mil Troyas' in his *El cerco de Santa Fe* (also as a rhyme for *joyas*, incidentally). In an exchange with the Conde, the Capitán and Martín, the king offers generous rewards and much honour if his soldiers succeed in the military conquests they boastfully promise. Pulgar is so impressed by the scale of the rewards offered that he declares himself certain that, spurred on by thoughts of what they stand to gain, these soldiers will perform unprecedented military exploits: '[i]rán a ganar mil Troyas, | si así pretendes honrallos', he says to the king (p. 107).

[558] *es pueblos en Francia*: Bershas notes that the phrase occurs nine times in Lope's plays. He offers several explanations of its meaning, of which the most convincing in the context of line 558 are 'cosa que no existe, cosa que ha dejado de existir, cosa sin substancia' and 'an ironic or mocking significance [...] to be applied to things that, no sooner in one's grasp, slip from it, evaporate or disappear' (Bershas 1966, pp. 146 & 148).

FABRICIO Daré quinientos.
HERACLIO Es poco.

Sale[n] LIDIA *y* AURELIO.

AURELIO Mira que me vuelves loco.
LIDIA Amor me ha dado poder
para hacer y deshacer,
pero ya el poder revoco.
AURELIO ¿Por qué, Lidia?
LIDIA Porque estoy
celosa de quien tú sabes.
AURELIO Amor quiere que te alabes,
Lidia, de que tuyo soy.

Sale[n] fray ROGERIO, *agustino descalzo, y su compañero, [*ANTONIO*]*.

ROGERIO Sólo imaginando voy
de Dios el servicio, Antonio.
ANTONIO Harto claro testimonio
es predicar su palabra,
donde los oídos abra,
que a tantos cierra el demonio.
ROGERIO El predicar por las plazas
la evangélica verdad
mucho importa a esta ciudad.
ANTONIO Del cielo parecen trazas;
tal vez con las amenazas
se amedrenta el ignorante.

Salen NICOLÁS, *de canónigo, y* RUPERTO.

NICOLÁS ¿Va lejos?
RUPERTO Aquí delante.
NICOLÁS Éste parece.
RUPERTO Él es.
NICOLÁS Todos le besan los pies.
RUPERTO Es a un Pablo semejante.
NICOLÁS Ya en alto se sube.
RUPERTO Advierte

[594-595] *todos le besan los pies. Es a un Pablo semejante*: historical evidence suggests that skilled preachers could indeed develop a devoted following, winning fame for whipping up evangelical zeal, like St Paul, who spread the gospel across the eastern Mediterranean and as far as Rome. Smith notes how contemporary reports describe 'large congregations sitting (or standing) spellbound at the feet of a preacher who, by the sheer power of his eloquence and personal magnestism, was able to hold their attention for an hour or possibly longer', though she notes that the records may not be entirely unbiased and may tend towards the encomiastic (1978, p. 5). At line 784, after his sermon, Rogerio admits that he is tired, implying his delivery was energetic and spirited.

[596] *ya en alto se sube*: Nicolás's words here provide us with an extra stage direction: Rogerio will preach his sermon from the upper balcony of the *corral* stage, facing out towards the inner audience and the *corral* one, as though in a church pulpit.

su modestia y humildad.
NICOLÁS ¡Qué atenta está la ciudad!
RUPERTO A mucha gente convierte.
NICOLÁS Aquesto de infierno y muerte
hace temblar al más loco.
RUPERTO Cuando en el infierno toco,
su fuego me vuelve hielo.
NICOLÁS Piensa, Ruperto, en el cielo.
RUPERTO Ya lo intento.
NICOLÁS Escucha un poco.

Fray ROGERIO*, subido en lo alto, diga ansí:*

ROGERIO *«Homo quidam habuit duos filios et dixit» etc.*
Esta parábola santa
está de misterios llena;
tres personas se introducen,
oh pueblo cristiano, en ella:
un padre y dos hijos son.
El padre es Dios, cosa es cierta,
porque después que templó
la humana naturaleza
el rigor de la divina,
citan las sagradas letras
nombre del «Padre» piadoso
—de cuyo principio cuenta
san Agustín, nuestro padre,
con su divina agudeza—
tener Dios hijos, y ansí,
juntándose sobre aquellas
palabras de Juan que dicen,
de su historia las primeras,

[604] Lines 590-591 and 600-603 invite us to anticipate a sermon in the fire and brimstone tradition. Nicolás's call to focus instead on heaven leads the spectator in to an address that seeks to convert its audience by emphasizing God's boundless capacity to forgive sin. (See the section in the introductory study on Ruperto, for details of how Rogerio's sermon compares to the one detailed in the hagiographies.)

[606] *homo quidam habuit duos filios et dixit*: 'A certain man had two sons. And the younger of them said to his father' (Luke 15. 11-12). These are the words with which Jesus begins the parable of the Prodigal Son. It was (and still is) common for a sermon to begin with, and to go on to unpack, a scriptural quotation, particularly a sermon that, in the context of the mass, follows the liturgy of the word, when the relevant passages are likely to have been read out in full. The holdings of Madrid's Biblioteca Nacional include the transcripts of three sermons that concern Nicholas of Tolentino, composed, in each case, for his 10 September feast day. All three begin with quotations from the Vulgate (MSS/20280/28/1-3).

[618-628] St Augustine's 'Sermon LXIX' provides an exegesis of the two quotations from St John's Gospel given at lines 625 and 628. Augustine wonders at the eternal co-existence of the Father and the Son and at the fact – pertinent here – that, following the Incarnation, men might dare to consider themselves sons of God. Drawing on Vosters's *Lope de Vega y la tradición occidental* (1977), Dixon notes that Lope was acquainted with works by various Fathers of the Church, but that 'very possibly most of these, except St Bernard, were known to [him] best via authors of his own era' (2008, p. 19).

«Dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri»,
las que prosiguen después,
de quien cielo y tierra tiemblan,
«Verbum caro factum est»,
este nombre considera.
Para ser hijo de Dios,
tuvo caudal, tuvo fuerzas
el hombre, desde que vino
Dios a ser hombre a la tierra.
Crisóstomo, por los hijos
—y ésta es la opinión más cierta—
los justos y pecadores
quiere que en los dos se entienda.
El más mozo de los dos
dijo al padre: «De mi hacienda
me dad lo que me ha tocado,
padre, pues es justa deuda».
El padre, con sentimiento
justo, porque ya no eran
consejos parte, le dio
la que le tocaba della.
Juntó criados iguales
a su edad y en extranjeras
tierras, lejos de las suyas,
que locamente desprecia,
consumió su patrimonio
entre amigos y rameras,
que unos y otras acompañan
mientras dura la riqueza.
Desamparado de todos,
y habiendo en aquella tierra
hambre universal, el triste,

[625] *dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri*: '[q]uotquot autem receperunt eum, | [d]edit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri, | [h]is qui credunt in nomine eius', '[b]ut as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God, to them that believe in his name' (John 1. 12).

[628] *verbum caro factum est*: '[a]nd the Word was made flesh' (John 1. 14).

[634-637] St John Chrysostom's 'Homily X on the Gospel of John' contains an exegesis on John 1. 12, considering to whom it is that Christ offers the power to be a son of God. In answer to this question, Chrysostom writes: 'as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become sons of God. Whether bond or free, whether Greeks or barbarians or Scythians, unlearned or learned, female or male, children or old men, in honour in dishonour, rich or poor, rulers or private persons, all, He saith, are deemed worthy [of] the same privilege' (1848, p. 84). According to Chrysostom, then, it is both people with honour and people without honour who can become children of God. In Lope's words it is 'los justos y pecadores', a paraphrase that makes the point plainer for the sinful inner audience of Fray Rogerio's sermon, principal among whom we should count Ruperto.

[639-641] 'Pater, da mihi portionem substantiae quae me contingit', 'Father, give me the portion of substance that falleth to me' (Luke 15. 12).

[644] *ya no eran consejos parte*: 'no hubieran sido suficientes' is Rico's useful paraphrase in a footnote to his edition of *Don Quijote* (Cervantes 2010, p. 78). The meaning here must be that the father's words of advice fall on deaf ears. 'Parte', with its more common meaning, is the noun replaced by the pronoun 'la' in line 645. I am grateful to Ignacio Arellano for his assistance with this phrase.

[652] P, M, R: *otros*; S, A: *otras*. S's emendation (followed by A) is correct: the adjective must agree with the 'rameras' of line 651.

viéndose en tanta pobreza,
púsose a servir, y el dueño,
en el monte de una aldea,
le puso a guardar ganado
negro; ¡qué suerte tan negra!
Deseoso el miserable
de satisfacer siquiera
su hambre de las bellotas,
acordóse de la mesa
de su padre, y dijo a voces,
bañado en lágrimas tiernas:
«¡oh, cuántos criados míos
tienen abundancia en ella
de pan y yo muero aquí
de hambre!; más que pereza
me detiene, aunque es tan justa
por mi culpa, la vergüenza.
Levantaréme y diréle:
padre, a tus entrañas tiernas
viene un hijo tan indigno
de que éste su nombre sea;
padre, pequé contra ti
y contra el cielo y la tierra;
padre, confieso mi culpa;
dele iniquitatem meam».
Aquí, cristiana ciudad,
de mil maneras contemplan
los santos aquesta historia.
Pedro Crisólogo della
cinco sermones escribe,
porque es tan dulce materia
que obliga y mueve las plumas
y que enternece las piedras.
Mas, yo, que en esta ocasión
soy, por ventura, una dellas
—y no me la da el lugar
para que deciros pueda
altas consideraciones,
declarando cómo fuera

668-681 'Quanti mercenarii in domo patris mei abundant panibus, ego autem hic fame pereo! Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum, et dicam ei: Pater, peccavi in caelum, et coram te: iam non sum dignus vocari filius tuus: fac me sicut unum de mercenariis tuis', 'How many hired servants in my father's house abound with bread, and I here perish with hunger! I will arise and will go to my father and say to him: Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee. I am not worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants' (Luke 15. 17-19).

685-686 St Peter Chrysologus did indeed write five sermons on the parable of the Prodigal Son: 'The Prodigal Son and his Brother: The Prodigal's Departure'; 'The Son's Return to his Father'; 'The Father's Welcome to the Son'; 'The Elder Brother's Jealousy'; and 'The Two Sons as Types of the Gentiles and the Jews: the Allegorical Interpretation'. Each of the first four provides an exegesis of a short section of the parable text, whereas the fifth, as the title makes clear, is an allegorical interpretation of the parable as a whole. (See Chrysologus 1953.)

justo el amor deste padre,
la envidia y desobediencia
destos dos hijos, por quien
Cristo a la nación hebrea
quiso declararla suya—
sólo os diré que me lleva
el alma a considerar
un pecador cuando intenta
disipar bienes de bienes
en locuras de la tierra,
el pago que dan deleites
de la juventud, rameras
que desnudan y que obligan
a que viva entre las bestias.
Mas, como tocan al arma
la muerte y la pena eterna,
y entre blancos desengaños
las inspiraciones llegan,
levántase de sus culpas,
y a la casa de la Iglesia
camina a buscar su padre
que desde lejos le espera,
abiertos los dulces brazos
en una cruz, la cabeza
para llamarle inclinada,
y abiertas las cinco puertas,
mayormente la del pecho
por donde las almas entran.
Allí, puesto de rodillas,
sus pecados le confiesa,
su ingratitud, su ignorancia;
bañado en llanto y vergüenza,
«padre», le dice, «yo soy
aquella perdida oveja
que dejó vuestro rebaño,
la gloria y la gracia vuestra;
yo soy vuestro hijo ingrato;
pero sólo me consuela
que, aunque yo pierda de hijo
el nombre por mis bajezas,
vos no le podéis perder
de padre, ¡oh piedad inmensa!

[708] P: *desnudan*. M, S, R, A: *demudan*. Both readings seem plausible, but P's reading is to be preferred: first, because there seems to be no obvious semantic justification for the correction; and second, a search of Lope's playtexts shows that when he uses the verb *demudar* it is always either reflexively or transitively, never, as in this case, intransitively.

[721-723] *las cinco puertas*: in the description of the father in lines 716-722 Lope blends the father of Luke's parable with the image of the crucified Christ, with the 'Five Wounds' of his Passion. Souls might be said to enter through the wound of Jesus's pierced side because it is from this wound that the sacrements flow and man's salvation is revealed by, and acts through, the sacraments.

Los méritos de esa cruz
en mis pecados me alientan
a pediros, Jesús mío,
que mi llanto os enternezca,
que me abracéis, que me deis
vuestra bendición, que en ella
consiste el remedio mío,
que me volváis donde vea
vuestro rostro y, perdonado,
pueda sentarme a la mesa.
No vengo solo, Señor;
conmigo viene la Reina
del cielo a ser mi abogada;
ella, mi Jesús, os ruega;
como madre hablad, Señora,
vida y esperanza nuestra;
hablad, Virgen, y decidle
que no es razón que se pierda
el fruto de sus dolores,
de sus tormentos y penas».
La Virgen pide por él;
el dulce Señor desea
recibirle, que entre amantes
presto la paz se concierta.
Lavará el hombre las culpas;
los ministros de la Iglesia
vístenle ropas de gracia;
siéntase luego a la mesa;
comen Dios y el hombre juntos;
hacen los ángeles fiesta;
dase a sí mismo en manjar,
con cuyas divinas prendas,
aquí las tiene de gracia,
y goza la vida eterna.

ROSELA ¡Notable!

FENISO Es un grande santo.

LIDIA Todos el hábito besan;

---

[753] *vida y esperanza nuestra*: in the words of the *Salve Regina*, Mary is 'our life, our sweetness and our hope' ('vita, dulcedo et spes nostra'). The juxtaposition of this phrase with the idea of Mary being 'advocata nostra' suggests Lope had the *Salve Regina* in mind here (see the note to line 449).

[760] *amantes*: the human soul and Christ, the Spouse and the Bridegroom of the allegorical Song of Songs (see the note to line 2906).

[763] *los ministros de la Iglesia*: faced with the doubts expressed by the reformers, at Trent the Counter-Reformation Church reiterated its teaching that only bishops and priests are able to hear confession and grant absolution through which the sinner is restored to God's grace: '[i]f anyone denies that sacramental confession was instituted by divine law or is necessary to salvation; or says that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone [...] is at variance with the institution and command of Christ and is a human contrivance, let him be anathema' (*Canons* 1978, p. 103).

[767] *hacen los ángeles fiesta*: immediately prior to the recounting of the parable of the Prodigal Son, Jesus tells his audience of publicans and sinners that 'gaudium erit coram angelis Dei super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente', 'there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance' (Luke 15. 10).

yo llego, aunque indigna.
[AURELIO] Y yo.
HERACLIO ¿Quién hay que no se enternezca
con este varón del cielo?
FABRICIO ¡Qué bien el alma se muestra
en sus palabras!

Vayan besando el hábito y entrándose [y queden NICOLÁS, RUPERTO, *fray* ROGERIO *y fray* ANTONIO*]*.

NICOLÁS [*Aparte*] ¡Oh, padre
de piedad y de clemencia!
¿Quién no llega a vuestra cruz
con esperanzas tan ciertas?
[*A Rogerio*] ¿Quiere vuestra caridad
una palabra?
ROGERIO En buen hora,
aunque tan cansado agora.
NICOLÁS No lo parece en verdad;
¿conóceme?
ROGERIO Bien se ve
que de aquesta iglesia santa
es dignidad.
NICOLÁS Tierna planta
a sus umbrales llegué,
pero tan poco provecho
hice en su casa, que della
pudiera echarme.
ROGERIO Si en ella
fruto soberano ha hecho,
bien lo muestra su humildad.
NICOLÁS Padre, haga cuenta que aquí
sólo ha predicado a mí
de toda esta gran ciudad.
De suerte me ha enternecido
que vengo determinado
a dejar cuanto es cuidado
de honor del mundo y, rendido
a esos pies, pedir en ellos
el hábito de Agustín.
ROGERIO El que lleva a Dios por fin,
apenas ve los cabellos

[774] P, M, S, R, A have this 'Y yo' spoken by 'Ant' (Fray Antonio). Fray Antonio is Fray Rogerio's monastic confrere and it seems unlikely that Lope would include him as part of the internal audience reacting to the sermon. It is more likely that 'Ant' is a misprint for 'Aur' (Aurelio). Three pairs of characters appear in the scene preceding the sermon; two of those pairs (Feniso and Rosela; Fabricio and Heraclio) are shown, after, reacting to the sermon. It must be that the third pair (Aurelio and Lidia) was meant to appear now also and not an abandoned Lidia with Fray Antonio.

[804-807] The iconography of 'Ocasión' was well established and frequently referred to in the Golden Age. Richardson's translation of Ripa's *Iconologia* gives the following description of 'Opportunity': 'the figure of a young woman, having a large tuft of hair on her forehead, and the hinder part bald, with wings at her feet, and a

de la ocasión cuando intenta
que no se le vaya en vano.
¿Tiene padres?

NICOLÁS Padre anciano
y madre, aunque de mi renta
no tienen necesidad.

ROGERIO ¿Y tendrá dellos licencia?

NICOLÁS Tengo yo mucha experiencia
de su virtud y humildad.

ROGERIO Su licencia es menester.

NICOLÁS Yo la pediré.

ROGERIO Es estrecha
nuestra orden.

NICOLÁS Si sospecha,
padre, que no he de poder,
por ser hombre regalado,
salir con mi pensamiento,
óigame a solas.

ROGERIO Su intento
santo muestra en el cuidado
y afecto con que lo pide;
vaya al convento esta tarde
y hablaremos; Dios le guarde.

NICOLÁS A quien ama, no le impide
padre, madre, casa, hacienda,
ni comodidad alguna.

ROGERIO [*A fray Antonio*] Una alma llevamos y una
que de muchas será prenda.

Váyanse [fray ROGERIO *y fray* ANTONIO*]*.

RUPERTO ¿Qué es esto que has hecho?

NICOLÁS Ya,

---

piece of drapery waving around her; with one arm leaning on a wheel, and holding a razor in her hand; the razor denotes actual readiness to rescind or cut off every obstruction that comes in the way. The tuft of hair alludes to the necessity of seizing her the very moment of her appearance. The wings at her feet, and the wheel, are allusive to her flight and the rapidity of her course' (1779, I, pp. 101-102). Alciato's *Emblemata*, which informed Ripa's work and whose first edition in Spanish was published at Lyon in 1548-1549, also contains the figure of 'Ocasión', with an illustration that matches Ripa's description almost exactly (Alciato 1975, p. 68). Rogerio's comment too ties in with this traditional depiction: he explains to Nicolás that those whose lives are turned towards God grab hold of opportunity's hair as soon as they glimpse it. (For a discussion of the use of this emblem in the literature of Golden-Age Spain, see Cull 1992.)

815-816 References to the rigour of the relevant Order's rule abound in Lope's religious plays. For example, the abbot in *Púsoseme el sol, salióme la luna* remarks of his Carmelite foundation that 'los preceptos son | de nuestro gran Patriarca | y sagrado padre Elías | muy rigorosos, por tantas | penitencias y peligros | que los religiosos guardan' (1930, p. 19B). St Francis warns *el santo negro* that he must not be discouraged by the 'aspereza' (l. 1054) of the monastery that he plans to enter, in Lope's *El santo negro Rosambuco de la ciudad de Palermo*. This repeated emphasis is especially interesting in light of the laxer standards that seem to have been prevalent in many Spanish monasteries in Lope's day (see, for example, the chapter on anticlericalism in Caro Baroja 1985, pp. 189-211). Lope was presumably keen to ensure that his spectator would imagine an appropriately austere religious life, appropriately austere, that is, for the purpose of inspiring devotion to his saintly heroes.

Ruperto, el mundo acabó.
RUPERTO ¿Y qué tengo de hacer yo?
NICOLÁS Si Dios su favor te da,
lo mismo que ves en mí.
RUPERTO Pues, ¿no tienes tú experiencia
de mi condición?
NICOLÁS ¿Qué ciencia,
qué empresa, qué intento, di,
fácil al principio es?
RUPERTO Es verdad, pero mi humor
todo es contrario, señor,
a lo que has de ver después.
Es necesario humildad,
yo soy la misma arrogancia;
si ciencia, soy la ignorancia;
si obediencia, libertad.
Si es forzosa la abstinencia,
yo como, que es bendición;
si velar por la oración,
la pereza y negligencia
hallaron su centro en mí:
dormiré treinta semanas...
NICOLÁS Todas esas cosas llanas
hace amor.
RUPERTO Amarte a ti
a mucho puede obligar.
NICOLÁS A Dios, digo, que es por quien
has de obrar, para obrar bien.
RUPERTO Pues en llegando a tratar
de aquesto de canelones
tres días cada semana,
basta a darme una terciana.
NICOLÁS Ruperto, si no te pones
en el camino jamás,
jamás llegarás al fin.
RUPERTO En fin, te vas a Agustín.
NICOLÁS Yo sé que me importa más
que las honras de la tierra.
RUPERTO Pues, ¿canónigo no puedes
servir a Dios?
NICOLÁS Mil mercedes

848-850 *si velar por la oración* etc.: it is a standing joke in Lope's saints' plays that the *graciosos* fall asleep when they try to pray for any length of time. That is Calahorra's response when, in *Juan de Dios y Antón Martín*, Juan asks him if he has a rosary: 'duérmome en rezando, cierto' (p. 432A). Cosme, the *gracioso* in *La devoción del rosario* tries to diguise his negligence in prayer by claiming that he fell asleep only because he was meditating so intently on Christ's passion in the Garden of Gethsemane (pp. 98B-99A). Just like the disciples who fail to remain awake despite Jesus's injunction, so Cosme.

860 *terciana:* 'especie de calentura intermitente que repite al tercer día, de donde tomó el nombre' (*Aut*). Ruperto suspects that the effects of administering penitential self-flagellation three times a week will be similar to a bout of the tertian ague. According to the OED, this illness is 'characterized by the occurrence of a paroxysm every third (i.e. every alternate) day'.

espero al fin de la guerra,
por soldado de Agustín.
RUPERTO A casa habemos llegado.
NICOLÁS ¡Mis padres!
RUPERTO Este cuidado
ha de negociar su fin.

Salen el PADRE *y [la]* MADRE *de san Nicolás, y* CELIA, *criada.*

PADRE ¡Hijo querido!
NICOLÁS Señor.
MADRE ¡Mi Nicolás!
NICOLÁS Madre amada.
PADRE ¿Cómo has tardado?
NICOLÁS Pasando,
padres míos, por la plaza,
cierto descalzo agustino,
destos que ermitaños llaman,
con viva voz de un apóstol,
a la ciudad predicaba.
Paréme, escuché y movió
de manera mis entrañas
que del alma hasta los ojos
deshizo parte del alma.
El ejemplo de su vida
y sus divinas palabras
me han obligado al desprecio
del mundo y sus honras vanas.
Licencia os vengo a pedir
para dejar vuestra casa;
que su hábito me espera
y Agustín santo me aguarda
con la correa divina,
que ha de ser, padres, escala
por donde a los cielos suba.
PADRE Días ha que sospechaba,
Nicolás, tu pensamiento,
que de tus costumbres santas
no menos me prometían
la razón y la esperanza.
Tu madre y yo te pedimos

[895] Note the implied contrast: Nicolás will ascend to heaven with his 'escala'; Ursino used his to gain illicit access to his mistress's house, resulting in his death and risking damnation.

[901] *la razón y la esperanza*: P: *la razon es, y la esperança*; M, S, R, A provide the reading followed here. P's reading has no obvious sense and the line is hypersyllabic, unless 'esperanza' is pronounced, unnaturally, as an *esdrújula* word.

[902-906] According to the hagiographic tradition, Nicholas's parents, Compagnonus de Guarutti and Amata de Guidiani, longed for a child, having been unable to conceive despite many years of marriage. Amata prayed to St Nicholas of Bari, asking him to intercede with God and promising to visit his shrine in southern Italy. An angel appeared to them in a dream, announcing that, if they fulfilled their promise to St Nicholas, they would be granted the gift of a child. They went to Bari and, whilst they were asleep at St Nicholas's shrine, the

a Dios; tu nombre declara
el medio por quien te dio;
justamente te consagras
a su Iglesia, justamente
a sus celestiales aras.

MADRE Confieso que me enternece
el pensar que ya te apartas
del regalo de mis brazos,
y para ausencia tan larga.
La piedad hace su oficio,
las lágrimas acompañan
la voz; mas, pues Dios te dio,
y Dios, Nicolás, te llama,
no eres mío, de Dios eres.
Entra y diréte la causa
por qué no resiste amor
la ausencia con que me matas.

NICOLÁS Madre amada, ya sabía
que he nacido en vuestra casa
hijo de lágrimas, vuestros
ayunos, promesas varias
y continuas oraciones.

PADRE Entra; que antes que te vayas,
has de disponer las cosas
de tu hacienda.

NICOLÁS Las del alma
me importan sólo, señor.

*Éntrense [*NICOLÁS *y sus* PADRES*] y queden* RUPERTO *y* CELIA.

CELIA ¿Y tú, Ruperto, no alzas
la cara del suelo, a ver
ésta tu antigua criada?
¿Hate dado, por ventura,
algún pellizco en el alma
el intento de tu dueño?

RUPERTO Celia, cuando yo estudiaba
con Nicolás, entendí,
aunque era jornada larga,
llegarme a ver entre pulsos,
con sayo largo y gualdrapa.
Casarme entendí también,
y como aquí te criabas,
virtuosa, tal te venga

---

saint appeared to them in another dream, confirming the angel's words and instructing them that the child born to them should be named Nicholas. When they returned home, to Castel Sant'Angelo, Amata fell pregnant and Nicholas of Tolentino was born in due course, around 1246 (Navarro 1612, fols 8^{v}-11^{r}). The story is recounted by the Labrador at the start of Act 2 (ll. 1082-1199).

938-939 *entre pulsos, con sayo largo y gualdrapa*: Ignacio Arellano suggested to me that this line points to Ruperto's former intention to become a doctor. I am grateful to Professor Arellano.

la salud, pedirte a tu ama,
y llevarte a ser mi dueño.
Mas fueron promesas falsas
de la edad, que como ves,
siempre en el principio engañan.
Nicolás tenía en la Iglesia
aquesa prebenda honrada,
tócale Dios, y Dios suele,
como donde quiere alcanza,
matar con sola una piedra
dos pájaros.

CELIA ¿Tú te apartas
del mundo? ¿Tú religioso?
¿Tú dejas tu mesa y cama
por la oración y el ayuno?
¡Jesús, el mundo se acaba!

RUPERTO Echa en un par de perdices,
una es gorda y otra es flaca;
en un peso hay contrapeso;
en una principal casa,
jardín y caballeriza;
cuando Dios abre sus arcas
con igual rostro recibe
los menudos y la plata.
Vete con Dios, no me tientes;
los enemigos del alma
son tres; el mundo y el diablo
fácilmente desbarata
un cristiano, mas la carne
tiene no sé qué de blanda
que, como cuando llovizna,
quien no va a tiento resbala.

CELIA ¡Oh, qué gran santo has de ser!
Ya se te ven en la cara
los ayunos y oraciones.

RUPERTO Muy gran trabajo se pasa.

CELIA Tú, que en un poyo tendido
duermes de la noche al alba
y comes por treinta lobos,
¿en las noches más heladas
te levantarás?

RUPERTO ¿Pues no?
Demás que allá nunca faltan
ocupaciones conformes.

CELIA Paréceme que te encajan
la cocina y harán bien
si quieren cada semana,
haciéndote cocinero,
ayunar a pan y agua,
porque corre más peligro

la olla, si tú la guardas,
que entre cuantos gatos tiene
su religión por Italia.

RUPERTO Aora, Celia, aquesto es hecho;
mis camisas y sotanas,
zapatos y cartapacios
y otras tales zarandajas,
naipes viejos y sombreros,
reparte con mano franca
en los gorrones amigos,
y Dios alumbre tu alma.

CELIA ¡Mira que lloro!

RUPERTO ¿Y yo soy
de bronce?

CELIA Pues ¿no me abrazas?

RUPERTO No, Celia, que tengo el pie
en los umbrales de casa,
y dicen que, a los que salen
del mundo, en una ventana
está un gato que les dice
«tornau, tornau», si se paran.

1000 *gorrón*: 'estudiante que en las universidades anda de gorra y de esta manera se entremete a comer sin hacer gasto' (*Aut*).

1002-1003 *¡Mira que lloro!*: unable to be entirely serious, even in an emotional scene such as this, Ruperto responds as though Celia had said the (phonetically similar) words 'Mira que yo oro'. Ruperto's '¿Y yo soy de bronce?' response echoes the lament of long-suffering Job: '[n]ec fortitudo lapidum fortitudo mea, | [n]ec caro mea aenea est', 'My strength is not the strength of stones: nor is my flesh of brass' (Job 6. 12; other translations give 'bronze'). In the two acts that follow, Ruperto's constancy will be put to the test, as Job's was. Those keen on biographical readings of Lope's work might wonder if he is remembering, here, his own youth, when his attachment to Elena Osorio distracted him from becoming a priest straight after his time at Alcalá. As Lope recalls in his 'Epístola segunda, al doctor Gregorio de Ángulo': '[e]studié en Alcalá, bachilleréme, | [y] aun estuve de ser clérigo a pique. | Cegóme una mujer, aficionéme, | [p]erdóneselo Dios' (Vega 1621, fol. 114ᵛ).

1009 P: *tornau, tornau*. M, S, R, A: *tornad, tornad*. Lope must have intended 'tornau' to be interpreted as an imperative, but far from being a typesetter's error, P's spelling is deliberate: Ruperto ends Act 1 on a comic note by imitating the *miau* of the cat he has just mentioned. P's reading is to be preferred. There are precedents in Lope's theatre for the imitation of an animal's call. In Act 1 of *Fuenteovejuna*, for example (a play also composed in 1613 or 1614), Pascuala compares men to 'gorriones'. During the winter months, when these birds rely upon human generosity to survive, they chirp, endearingly, 'tío, tío'. In the summer, by contrast, when they can get by quite nicely by themselves, having extracted all they want from their 'tíos', their chirps change to the (at the time) insulting 'judío, judío' (ll. 249-272). There are three onomatopoeic neologisms in *San Nicolás*: this is the first, the second is the 'bor, bor, bor' of line 1612, and the third, the 'culchuchú' of line 2186.

ACTO SEGUNDO

Sale FISBERTO, *soldado roto.*

FISBERTO
Maldita la guerra sea
y el traidor que la inventó,
que, en fin, a la tierra dio
la cosa más triste y fea.
Aleto, furia infernal,
dicen que fue su inventora,
pero, en la primera aurora,
fue el Lucero celestial.
Mas, por su soberbio celo,
cayó de su clara esfera,
pues ¿cómo cosa tan fiera
pudo engendrarse en el cielo?
Mas, como allá no podía
vivir, que es reino de paz,
cayó su autor pertinaz
al centro de su osadía.
Huélgome que esté su autor
sepultado en el infierno
y que en su tormento eterno
pague su infame furor.
Bajó de Alemania Enrico

[1014] *Aleto*: Allecto is one of the three furies of Greek mythology, inhabitants of Hades and avengers of crime. Because of their iconography and their seat in Hades the furies came to be associated with the devil by Christian writers (Brumble 1998, p. 131) and the classical and Christian traditions are drawn together here. Lope's description of Allecto as the inventor of war could have been informed by book VII of Virgil's *Aeneid*, a work that Lope admired and knew well (Dixon 2008, p. 21). At Juno's instigation, Allecto sows the seeds of war between the Latins and the Trojans: '[h]aec ubi dicta dedit, terras horrenda petivit; | luctificam Allecto dirarum ab sede dearum | infernisque ciet tenebris, cui tristia bella | iraeque insidiaeque et crimina noxia cordi' (ll. 323-326), 'When [Juno] had uttered these words, with awful countenance she came to earth, and calls baleful Allecto from the home of the Dread Goddesses and the infernal shades—Allecto, whose heart is set on gloomy wars, passions, plots, and baneful crimes' (Virgil 2000, pp. 24-25).

[1016-1017] *en la primera aurora, fue el Lucero celestial*: regarding the devil's traditional association with the Morning Star, see the note to lines 494-495. The devil, long identified with the dragon of the Book of Revelation, caused the first war in heaven, which some believe took place at the beginning of time, hence 'la primera aurora': '[a]nd there was a great battle in heaven, Michael and his angels fought with the dragon, and the dragon fought, and his angels. And they prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven' (Revelation 12. 7-8).

[1030] *Enrico*: Henry of Luxembourg, King of the Romans from 1308 and Holy Roman Emperor from 1312. Henry crossed the Alps into Italy in October 1310, determined to establish effective imperial control over the empire's northern-Italian lands, which, for decades, had been racked by internecine struggles between the Guelph and Ghibelline factions (nominally pro-papacy and pro-empire, respectively). Henry met considerable resistance and attempted to suppress the hostile cities and towns by force of arms during the three tumultuous years leading to his death in 1313 (Bowsky 1960). Lope's allusion to the play's historical background explains the soldiers' hunger and desperation as they approach Nicolás's priory at Fermo in search of food. Whilst the region in which Nicholas lived was affected by the conflict, Lope introduces a slight anachronism here as Nicholas of Tolentino died in 1305, five years prior to Henry's descent into Italy. This background detail is not

contra la Italia, en quien crece
la hambre, la que empobrece
hasta el más soberbio y rico.
En fin, eres, Guerra fuerte,
madre de la Hambre, y ésta
de la Pestilencia presta,
de quien la engendra la Muerte.
¿Adónde tengo de ir?
¿Quién me dará de comer?

Sale RUTILIO*, soldado.*

RUTILIO Enséñame a obedecer;
no me enseñes a sufrir.
Yo seguiré tu bandera,
pero comiendo, alemán.

Sale una MUJER *[–*FABIA*–] con un niño y un* LABRADOR *cojo.*

FABIA Todos a la puerta están.
LABRADOR Ya solamente se espera
sustento del cielo y es
el cielo aqueste convento,
pues se halla en él el sustento,
como la salud después.
FABIA Si a mi hijo se la diese,
como ya lo espero en Dios,
seré su esclava.
LABRADOR Con vos
querría, Fabia, que fuese
tan liberal Nicolás
como con otros lo ha sido.
FISBERTO A este convento ha venido
gente pobre —si la hay más
que destos rotos soldados—
señal que en este convento
deben de darles sustento.
Digan, señores honrados,
¿hay por aquí caridad?
FABIA Aquí en este monasterio
nos dan algún refrigerio.
Llegad, señor, y llamad.
RUTILIO ¿Es posible que le dan
en esta guerra cruel?

---

developed further. Apparently the Guelph and Ghibelline wars were already familiar to Lope when he wrote *San Nicolás* around 1614. His 1604 *Peregrino* list includes a *comedia* entitled *Güelfos y Gibelinos* (p. 58), now lost unless, as La Barrera suggests, it is the play of the same name attributed to Francisco de Malaspina (1968, p. 430). Henry VII is the 'alto Arrigo' referred to in flattering terms in Dante's *Paradiso* (XXX, 137).

[1066] *le*: presumably meant as a direct-object pronoun, referring back to 'refrigerio'. In his study of the historical grammar of Spanish, Menéndez Pidal observes that '[e]n el uso, las funciones del dativo y acusativo

LABRADOR Sí, porque hay un santo en él
que bendice y crece el pan.
FISBERTO Santo, y más, que pienso yo
que habrá en él.
LABRADOR Éste lo es tanto
que a voces le llaman santo.
FABIA Si «voz de Dios» se llamó
la del pueblo, no dudéis
que le canoniza Dios.
RUTILIO Si su vida sabéis vos,
por Dios, que nos la contéis
mientras nos salen a dar
alguna limosna aquí.
LABRADOR Oíd.
FISBERTO Decid.
LABRADOR Pasa ansí,
si nos da el tiempo lugar:
Nicolás, que merecía
del mismo ingenio divino
de Agustín, su padre, ser
dignamente encarecido,
nació en Castro de Santángel,
que a no ser su nombre antiguo,
—pues un ángel nació en él—
fuera de su nombre digno.
La causa del nombre fue
que sus padres, afligidos
de no tener sucesión
siendo tan nobles y ricos,
después de oraciones santas
fueron con ánimo limpio
a Baro, en que está el sepulcro

---

aparecen bastante confundidas; el leísmo domina en Castilla, atribuyendo a *le* funciones del acusativo masculino *lo*' (1952, p. 254).

1073-1074 *Si «voz de Dios» se llamó la del pueblo*: a paraphrase of the proverb *voz del pueblo, voz de Dios*. The proverb has a long history; the earliest record of its use (in Latin: *vox populi, vox Dei*) is in a letter by the eighth-century English scholar and theologian Alcuin (*Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, p. 11). Correas comments that it is 'muy usado en el vulgo' (p. 450).

1084 *Agustín, su padre*: St Augustine is the founder of the Augustinian Order which Nicolás has joined between Acts 1 and 2; so Augustine is his spiritual father.

1086 *Castro de Santángel*: modern-day Sant'Angelo in Pontano, where Nicholas was born in 1245. The town is located in the Italian province of Macerata, in the Marche region, and its name celebrates local veneration of the Archangel Michael, the Labrador suggesting the archangel was born there. Even without the earlier link to St Michael, the Labrador observes, the town's name would have been justified because it was the birthplace of Nicolás, an angel in his eyes.

1096 *Baro*: a majority of the early modern hagioraphies of St Nicholas that have been examined for the purposes of this edition show the spelling 'Bari'. The town's name is given as 'Baro', though, in the two foundational, fourteenth-century, sources – the *Processus* and Monterubbiano's *Vita* – and in the hagiographical accounts by Villegas, Ribadeneira and Antonino de Florencia. Lope's choice of the rarer spelling might suggest that he consulted one or more of those hagiographies, since there is no obvious metrical reason why he should have preferred the less common spelling. The spelling of place names is generally subject to variation and inconsistency in the period, however. 'Baro' might simply be the form with which Lope was more familiar or the one he preferred.

de san Nicolás obispo,
donde, velando una noche,
el santo pastor —vestido
del alba sacerdotal
y el estrellado pellico
cubierto de mil diamantes,
el cayado de oro fino—
les apareció del modo
que andaba en la tierra vivo.
Que Dios oyó su oración,
con suave voz les dijo.
Viendo su justo deseo
por su intercesión cumplido,
voló el divino perlado
al coro del cielo impíreo,
donde es la Iglesia triunfante
y de ángeles el cabildo,
y los padres venturosos
a Castro, su patria y nido,
adonde Amada, su madre
—¡qué buen nombre!— parió un hijo
como de mano de Dios
y a ruego de su ministro.
Creció el santo Nicolás,
que este nombre en el bautismo
le dieron por aquel santo,
de la manera que os digo.
Apenas hablar sabía
cuando —¡qué extraños principios!—
tres días en la semana
ayunó el niño bendito.
Creció, estudió en breve tiempo,
tan humilde y tan benigno
con los pobres que mil veces
les dio su vestido mismo.
Fue tanta su devoción
al sacramento divino
que se llama «buena gracia»,
«pan angélico» y «pan vivo»
que, oyendo misa, en la hostia
vio muchas veces a Cristo,
resplandeciente y en forma

[1101] *pellico*: 'el zamarro del pastor u otro vestido de pieles, hecho a semejanza de él' (*Aut*).

[1110] *perlado*: the forms 'perlado' and 'prelado' are used interchangeably in *San Nicolás*.

[1121-1122] *este nombre... le dieron por aquel santo*: see note to lines 902-906.

[1117-1135] *«buena gracia», «pan angélico» y «pan vivo»*: three names for the Eucharistic Host. As explained in the Tridentine *Catecismo Romano* of 1566, the word *eucaristía* 'significa lo mismo que «buena gracia» o «acción de gracias»' (§395). The penultimate strophe of Aquinas's Corpus Christi hymn, the *Sacris solemniis*, describes the sacrament as 'panis angelicus', similar to the 'pan[is] angelorum' of Psalm 77 (78). 25. John's Gospel refers to Christ, present in the bread of the Eucharist, as living bread: '[e]go sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descendi', 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven' (6. 51).

de un bello y hermoso niño.
Graduóse y en las letras
a tan alta opinión vino
que una calonjía le dieron.
Mas, como un padre agustino
—destos santos ermitaños
del sayal negro ceñido
con la preciosa correa
que envidia el dorado cinto
por donde en un año el sol
esmalta los doce signos
porque tiene más estrellas,
gracias que le han concedido
los pescadores de Roma
que se hallan con el anillo—
predicase en una plaza,
quedó tan enternecido
para desprecio del mundo,
cuyo desprecio es un libro
que suelen entender pocos,

[1142] This line is hypersyllabic, unless the *ía* of 'calonjía' is pronounced as a diphthong and the word given *llana* stress.

[1145-1150] *sayal negro* etc.: Pope Alexander IV's bull of 9 April 1256, *Licet ecclesiae catholicae*, prescribed that friars of the newly united Augustinian Order should wear black habits and '[t]he black cowl and leather belt were considered by Augustinian writers of the fourteenth century to be the main visual signifiers of the Order of Augustinian Hermits' (Warr 2007, p. 20). Here describing a terracentric universe, Lope has the golden orbit of the sun envy the loop of the Augustinian belt because it, the belt, has more stars than can be found along the path of the sun's progress through the twelve signs of the zodiac. Stars are a prominent feature of the iconography of St Nicholas of Tolentino. Early modern pictorial representations of the saint often show his habit covered with them, though they are not generally limited just to the loop of his belt. Iturbe Sáiz confirms that the starred black habit with a long cincture is one of the features most commonly found in depictions of St Nicholas in Spain; the others are the resuscitated partridge and a cross (2006, pp. 118-122). In Act 3, Ruperto and the prior will watch as angels reward Nicolás with a star-spangled habit (see lines 2934-2961). The partridge appears at the end of this Act 2 and Nicolás is holding a cross on his deathbed, at the end of Act 3. Spaniards of Lope's day learned to recognize saints from paintings and sculptures of the kind common in churches and elsewhere. For example, the controversial prophetess, Lucrecia de León, who in many respects was a perfectly ordinary late sixteenth-century *madrileña*, explained at her Inquisition trial that she was able to identify in her dreams the figure of John the Baptist 'by his dress, which was like the figure of John the Baptist painted in the hospital of the Court' (Kagan 1990, p. 25). The iconography of the most imporant saints was standardized and is given by Pacheco in his *Arte de la pintura*, including that of John the Baptist (1649, pp. 551-557). Ruano confirms, with regard to characters such as pagan gods and the Virgin Mary, that 'trataban de reproducir con su vestuario el modelo tradicional, tal como aparece plasmado, por ejemplo, en el arte pictórico' (2000, p. 85). And Arellano confirms that the influence of the conventional iconography is 'omnipresente en el terreno de las figuras divinas y los santos' (2000b, p. 94).

[1149] *esmaltar*: 'metafóricamente vale adornar, hermosear e ilustrar' (*Aut*).

[1152-1153] *los pescadores de Roma que se hallan con el anillo*: a reference to the popes. As successor to St Peter, a fisherman by trade, the pope wears the Piscatory Ring as one of his papal insignia. Perhaps Lope envisaged the pope using that ring to seal the bull *Licet ecclesiae catholicae*, referred to above, although, in fact, it was only used to seal personal letters and, later, papal briefs; public documents, known as 'bulls', were so called because they were sealed with leaden bulls rather than wax seals (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIII, pp. 60-61).

[1156] *desprecio del mundo*: according to the hagiographic sources, this was indeed the theme of the sermon preached by the Augustinian friar, which convinced Nicholas to join that Order. Relevant extracts from several sources are reproduced at p. 74 above. In Act 1, though, the sermon composed by Lope focuses instead, interestingly, on the parable of the Prodigal Son. See the section on Ruperto in the introductory study for a discussion of a possible explanation for Lope's decision to depart here from the hagiographic accounts.

que, de sus padres y amigos
despedido, en Masareta
tomó el hábito y al siglo
dejó, como la culebra
todo el exterior vestido.
De allí le mudó el prelado
a este convento de Firmo,
donde, si por él no fuera,
de quien somos socorridos,
perecieran nuestras casas,
nuestras mujeres y hijos.
Él es de huérfanos padre
y hospital de peregrinos,
médico de los enfermos,
libertad de los cautivos.
Nadie le pidió remedio,
aunque no le hubiese visto,
que no escapase con vida
del más incierto peligro.
Hasta en el soberbio mar
tiene su imperio extendido;
el inobediente fuego,
las fieras y basiliscos,
los dolores le conocen;
y no soy yo mal testigo,
que haciendo en un monte leña,
por dar al tronco de un pino,
casi me rompí la pierna
y, aunque he sido socorrido
de cuanto alcanza el ingenio
con el arte y exquisitos
remedios, ninguno pudo
lo que Nicolás divino.
A su ejemplo, otros mancebos,
dejando el mundo y sus vicios,
se han metido en religión,
contra el poder del abismo.
Él viene a la portería,
con que veréis que no he dicho
cosa alguna en su alabanza,
que soy de alabarle indigno.

[1168] *perecieran*: to be understood as *perecerían*. This verbal form commonly had a conditional value in Golden-Age Spanish (Penny 2002, p. 167).

[1169] *y hijos*: Penny notes that in Old Spanish the conjunction *e* does give way to *y*, except before /i/, but that 'some writers use *y* before /i/ until the eighteenth century' (2002, p. 245), as Lope does here.

[1186] *casi me rompí la pierna*: according to the hagiographic sources, the woodman, Thomas, injured his foot, not his leg (see, for example, Monterubbiano [1326], p. 655C or Navarro 1612, fol. 13^{r}). Of the sources examined only Román and González de Critana specify that the woodman injured his leg (fol. [D7]^{r} & fol. 20^{r}, respectively). This factual coincidence bolsters the claims of these hagiographies to have numbered among Lope's sources for *San Nicolás* (see the section of the introductory study, which considers Lope's sources).

Salen fray NICOLÁS, *fray* RUPERTO *y el* PRIOR.

FABIA Miralle provoca a amor.
NICOLÁS ¿Si nos vio?
RUPERTO Pienso que sí.
PRIOR *Deo gratias*. ¿Qué lleva ahí?
NICOLÁS No es nada, padre prior.
PRIOR ¿En tanta necesidad
quita a la casa el sustento?
NICOLÁS Son hierbas, padre, no miento,
para cierta enfermedad.
PRIOR Tiene razón, hierbas son;
perdone. ¿Y el fray Ruperto?
RUPERTO Lechuguitas son del huerto
para que hagan colación.
PRIOR Muestre; a ver.
RUPERTO Velas ahí.
PRIOR Ésta una culebra es.
RUPERTO ¡Válgame Dios!
PRIOR Si después
que mintió se ha vuelto así,
en penitencia la tome
y del convento la saque.
RUPERTO Vuestra caridad se aplaque,
y esta carne inútil dome,
con otras mil penitencias,
y no me la mande asir.
PRIOR Nunca se han de diferir
ni trocar las obediencias;
cójala luego; ¿qué aguarda?
RUPERTO ¿Y si me muerde?
PRIOR No importa.
RUPERTO Pues es verdad que ella es corta;
¡Dios sea conmigo!
PRIOR ¿Qué tarda?
¿Con esa humildad celebra
la obediencia? ¡Empiece a asilla!
RUPERTO [*Aparte*] ¡Que trujese una morcilla
y se haya vuelto culebra!
PRIOR ¡Vaya! Llévela arrastrando.
RUPERTO Ya la saco.
PRIOR ¡Vaya, pues!

[1202] *deo gratias*: M, S, R, A prefer the hispanicized *deo gracias*. P consistently gives the Latin form, which adds an appropriate note of tradition and formality to meetings in the monastic setting of Acts 2 and 3, hence its retention here.

[1206] *son hierbas*: see the section of the introductory study focusing on Nicolás for a discussion of Lope's adaptation of the hagiographic record of this miracle and the implications of that adaptation for our understanding of Lope's intentions in his depiction of the saint. The 'miracle' of Ruperto's 'morcilla' turning into a snake is of course Lope's invention, as are all the episodes centred on the *gracioso*.

[1227] This line is hypersyllabic, unless, unusually, 'sea' is pronounced as a monosyllabic word.

RUPERTO ¿No se fuera por sus pies?
PRIOR Nicolás está esperando
que yo me vaya de aquí.
Hierbas se le ha vuelto el pan,
mas ellas se volverán
en el pan que yo no vi.
Dejarle repartir quiero
su limosna.

Vase [el PRIOR*] y llegan todos.*

NICOLÁS Ya se fue.
[RUTILIO] Padre, ¡limosna nos dé!
NICOLÁS Bendigámosla primero.
Tome, soldado.
FISBERTO Estoy manco,
padre.
NICOLÁS Tome aqueste pan,
que las manos que lo dan
son de un príncipe tan franco
que le pagará mejor
que el alemán que ha servido.
FISBERTO ¡La mano, padre, he extendido!
NICOLÁS Pues sirva a tan buen Señor.
FISBERTO Deme sus pies.
NICOLÁS Y él, ¿qué tiene?
RUTILIO Tantos males que me cansa
la vida.
NICOLÁS El morir descansa,
si en Dios a morir se viene.
«Bienaventurado aquel»,
que así le llama san Juan,

[1234] *fuera*: probably intended as a conditional (see note to line 253). The serpent lost its legs and was condemned to crawl on its belly as a punishment for its involvement in the Fall (Genesis 3. 14).

[1235] Monastic superiors in Golden-Age saints' plays are often antagonistic characters whose inclusion enables the playwright to create dramatically productive conflict. For example, the hostility of the abbot (who eventually welcomes transvestite Teodora into his monastery in Lope's *Púsoseme el sol, salióme la luna*) is evident from their first encounter: he refuses Teodora entry into his sanctuary, despite her patently dire predicament, allowing Lope to garner even more sympathy for her from the audience. Later, this abbot shows himself only too inclined to give credence to the slanders brought against Teodora by Zurdo and Alcina and he expels Teodora from the monastery. Cervantes's only saint's play, *El rufián dichoso*, contains an appeal to God against difficult superiors: Lagartija begs for protection against them, praying for 'un prior discreto, | afable y no cabezudo' (ll. 2354-5). As is typical, in *San Nicolás* the prior seems to have warmed to the hero by the start of Act 3. This could be the result of a greater appreciation of Nicolás's piety or it could be that the prior of Act 2 and the prior of Act 3 are meant to be different characters; historically, the action of these two acts almost certainly takes place in several distinct priories, each with its own head.

[1242] P, M, S, R, A ascribe this line to Ruperto. It is more likely that the hungry Rutilio is asking for alms. Presumably Nicolás's '[t]ome, soldado' is his response to a request by the soldier Rutilio, not by Ruperto. P's 'Rup' must be a misprint for 'Rut'.

[1249] *el alemán*: the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry of Luxembourg; see the note to line 1030.

[1252] *él*: a form of address meaning *you* 'especially favoured by dramatists of the seventeenth century for dialogues between serving people' (Spaulding 1943, p. 167).

«que muere en Dios»; tome pan.
RUPERTO Y salud, padre, con él.
NICOLÁS ¿Tienen rosarios?
LABRADOR Sí, padre.
NICOLÁS Pues récenlos cada día
a la divina María,
pura virgen, de Dios madre.
Tomen estas estampitas
y en ellas pueden rezar,
no se olvidando de dar
a Dios gracias infinitas
siempre que les da sustento.
Ea, vayan en buen hora.
LABRADOR ¡El cielo en sus labios mora!
NICOLÁS Vuelvan mañana al convento,
que Dios para todos da.
LABRADOR ¡Oh, qué bien se le divisa
la paz del alma en la risa!
¡Gozando del cielo está!

*Vanse [*FISBERTO, RUTILIO, *el* LABRADOR, FABIA *y el niño y* RUPERTO*]*.

NICOLÁS Dulce Señor, enamorado mío,
¿adónde vais con esa cruz pesada?
Volved el rostro a un alma lastimada
de que os pusiese tal su desvarío.
De sangre y llanto entre los dos un río
formemos hoy y, si a la vuestra agrada,
partamos el dolor y la jornada;
que de morir por vos en vos confío.
Hoy, divino Señor del alma mía,
¿si será Nicolás tan venturoso
que se transforme en vuestra cruz un día?,

1256 & 1258 *bienaventurado aquel... que muere en Dios*: '[e]t audivi vocem de caelo, dicentem mihi: Scribe: Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur', 'And I heard a voice from heaven, saying to me: Write: Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord' (Revelation 14. 13).

1264 *estampitas*: the diminutive of *estampas*, prayer cards, which have long been a feature of popular Catholic devotion. Morán and Portús claim that in Golden-Age Spain 'prácticamente toda la población haría alguna vez uso de ellas por razones devocionales' (1997, p. 263). They are small pieces of card depicting a saint or a religious scene, often with a short prayer printed underneath or on the reverse. *Estampas* were used during the Golden Age – mostly by the poor – for the purposes of veneration and for protection: they were commonly worn around the owner's neck, as a kind of talisman. Sometimes they were used to decorate humble homes, for example, Monipodio's, described in 'Rinconete y Cortadillo', with its 'imagen de Nuestra Señora, destas de mala estampa' (Morán and Portús 1997, pp. 257-277 and Cervantes 1997b, I, p. 209). *Estampas* are mentioned in several saints' plays by Lope. For example, in Act 1 of Lope's *Juan de Dios y Antón Martín*, the future saint, John of God, sells *estampitas* to the crowds gathering to hear a sermon. Often they were given as gifts, as they are here by Nicolás. Iturbe Sáiz has reproduced some seventeenth-century Spanish examples of Nicholas of Tolentino *estampas* (2006, pp. 121 & 122). The images of St Nicholas printed on these prayer cards are homogenous and they may well have informed Lope's descriptions of Nicolás's appearance here, although these could also have been influenced by paintings and polychrome statues in churches, monasteries and elsewhere. According to Iturbe Sáiz, until 1931 there was a beautiful statue of Nicholas of Tolentino at St Augustine's convent in Seville. Perhaps Lope knew it from one of his stays in that city.

1281 *a la vuestra*: that is, *a vuestra alma*.

bajad de vuestros cielos amoroso
y, si merece quien con vos porfía,
¡dadme esos brazos, soberano Esposo!

Salen la CARNE *y el* DEMONIO.

DEMONIO ¡Llega, Carne! ¡Que se quiere
con las cadenas herir!
CARNE ¿Qué le tengo de decir?
DEMONIO Que ¿por qué se azota y hiere?
CARNE No me entenderá, que está
en los cielos elevado;
que de su carne olvidado
ya tras su alma se va.
¡Ah, Nicolás! ¿Qué es aquesto?
¿Soy yo piedra que me matas
a azotes? ¿Por qué me tratas
con tal rigor, siendo honesto?
¿Qué tienes tú, casto y puro
y limpio, que castigar?
¿Qué sirve mortificar
tu carne en hierro tan duro?
¡Con veinticinco eslabones
de una cadena me azotas!

*[*NICOLÁS*], elevado, dice:*

NICOLÁS Carne, ¿por qué te alborotas?
CARNE Porque a la muerte me pones.
NICOLÁS Carne, has de ser al revés:
que si eslabones encienden,
éstos encender defienden
la fragilidad que ves.

1299-1300 *¿soy yo de piedra que me matas a azotes?*: a traditional iconographical depiction of 'Carne' does not appear in Ripa's *Iconologia* (see note to line 411) *per se*, but Carne can be assumed to be similar to Voluptuousness, in Richardson's version: 'a handsome woman, of a lascivious and lively aspect. In her right hand, she holds a ball of glass with two wings, and she is situated on a precipice, overspread with roses and myrtle, in the attitude of walking. The figure and aspect denote the wanton disposition of this lascivious character. The attitude of walking and the ball of glass with wings signify that earthly gratifications are momentary and pass away with velocity and swiftness. The precipice alludes to the inconsiderateness and danger of this depraved course of life. The roses and myrtle were dedicated to Venus, the goddess of pleasure. The rose is also a symbol of short life and of human frailty' (1779, II, p. 44). Carne (and other minions of the devil) would conventionally be represented on stage as physically extended creatures, subject to the devil's dominion and clearly visible to the audience. However, Carne's words to Nicolás suggest that the spectator is meant to understand that Carne's temptation is an internal struggle in Nicolás's mind. Carne's voice seems to be a dramatic externalization of an inner voice, ostensibly the voice of Nicolás's own flesh, begging him to temper his mortification. Nicolás's response at line 1324 makes it clear that he understands Carne's voice to be the voice of his own body – 'Paciencia, cuerpo'. This and later scenes problematize a general conclusion that the figures that assist the devil in *San Nicolás* are mere allegories. See the section of the introductory study that deals with the supernatural characters for a discussion of their nature.

(stage direction before line 1308) *elevado*: see the note to the stage direction before line 2057 (to which Ruano de la Haza refers specifically) for details of how this 'elevación' might have been staged.

Tiene significación
cada eslabón para ti.
CARNE Si en mi vida te ofendí;
¿qué sirve tanto eslabón?
¿Qué pretende tu pureza,
tu abstinencia y tu templanza?
NICOLÁS Para que no hagas mudanza,
sujetar tu fortaleza.
CARNE Yo no te doy pesadumbre,
¿por qué me la das a mi?
NICOLÁS Paciencia, cuerpo.
CARNE ¿Yo?
NICOLÁS Sí,
que si mudamos costumbre
haréis algún rebelión.
DEMONIO Peregrino viene.
CARNE Estamos.
DEMONIO ¡Flacos combates le damos!
CARNE ¡Como de vencidos son!
DEMONIO Poco vales.
CARNE ¿Qué he de hacer,
si con cadenas estoy
presa?
DEMONIO Desdichado soy;
mas ¿no lo tengo de ser
si Dios me aborrece tanto?

[Vanse el DEMONIO *y la* CARNE *y] [s]ale fray* PEREGRINO.

PEREGRINO Por aquí debe de estar.
Fuese a Dios; quiero besar
esos pies, Nicolás santo,
pues agora no sentís.
NICOLÁS ¿Qué es eso, fray Peregrino?
PEREGRINO Aquí Margarita vino
—de quien vos siempre decís
cuánto la debe el convento—
llorando, porque expiró
su hijo y, movido yo
de su tierno sentimiento,
de rodillas me ponía
a suplicaros rogueís
por él a Dios.
NICOLÁS Bien sabéis,
padre, la miseria mía.

[1316] *en mi vida te ofendí*: the meaning here is '*never* have I offended you', as when Mencía speaks these same words to Gutierre in Act 2 of Calderón's *El médico de su honra* (l. 1379).

[1326] *rebelión*: a feminine noun in modern Spanish, but Lope often gives it as masculine, generally for metrical reasons, as here. For example, in *Los embustes de Fabia*, where the Senador explains: '[e]ntiendo que provee Celibio Craso | que el rebelión castigue y que reduzga | la gente amotinada' (p. 836).

PEREGRINO Nicolás, por vuestro ejemplo
estoy en la religión.
NICOLÁS Yo sé con la perfección
que os tiene Dios en su templo.
PEREGRINO Id a ver a esta señora.
NICOLÁS Por obedeceros voy.

Vase NICOLÁS.

PEREGRINO Contento en extremo estoy
de verme tan libre agora,
mundo, de tus desvaríos,
a ejemplo de Nicolás;
pues, no volverán atrás
ya los pensamientos míos,
una vez puesto en prisión
de la religión, mi madre.

Sale el PRIOR.

PRIOR ¿Fray Peregrino?
PEREGRINO Mi padre.
PRIOR ¿Cómo va de profesión?
PEREGRINO En haciéndola me vi
…….
en el centro del descanso;
sepa que en el mundo fui
notablemente perdido.
PRIOR Fray Nicolás me contó
que una noche le llevó,
forzado y mal prevenido,
a un ejercicio y que en él
Dios le dio su luz.
PEREGRINO De todo
quiero referirle el modo,
padre, si es que gusta dél.
PRIOR Yo estoy con el alma atento.
……
PEREGRINO Pasé la flor de mis años
con lasciva inclinación
en amar a las criaturas
y en desamar al Criador;
y, como si fuera un indio,

[1367] The second or third line of this *redondilla* quatrain is missing.

[1374] *ejercicio*: '[acto] de oración y penitencia que en ciertos días del año ejecutan los individuos de algunas congregaciones y otras personas devotas, juntándose a este fin en capillas particulares u oratorios públicos' (*Aut*).

[1379] The second line of this section of *romance* is missing.

[1384] *indio*: 'el natural de la India, originario de aquellos reinos, hijo de padres indios' (*Aut*). Presumably *la India* here refers to Spain's American colonies. The definition of the phrase '¿Somos indios?' given by

dejé engañar mi razón
de afeite, gala y criados,
vencido de propio amor.
No hallaba ningún deleite,
descanso ni duración;
que el que imaginé más grande,
más pequeño me salió.
Nicolás llevóme un día
a una casa de oración,
donde, en matando las luces,
David al arpa cantó,
a cuyo son cierta dama
repartió su colación,
que la da la penitencia
en platos de Dios a Dios.
Como vi tantos azotes,
lágrimas, pena y dolor,
turbéme y diome un desmayo
que el alma me arrebató;
y estando yo sin sentido,
me pareció que en visión
vía al ángel de mi guarda
armado al traje español,
suelto el cabello, que hacía
ventaja a los de Absalón,
con una cruz de diamantes
en lugar de murrión.
Éste me dijo: «yo quiero
que conozcas, pecador,
lo que pierdes en perderte
y ganas sirviendo a Dios».
Enseñóme el ángel mío
—¡déle Dios buen galardón!—
no aquel santo paraíso

Autoridades helps with an understanding of Peregrino's meaning here: 'los indios [...] se tienen por bárbaros o fáciles de persuadir'.

[1395] *David al arpa cantó*: King David was famous for his skill as a musician. As a young man he would sooth King Saul by playing his harp, driving away evil spirits (I Kings 16. 14-23). Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz offers an explanation for the source of the harp's power, writing in her *Respuesta* that David's harp was triangular, like the mysterious symbol on King Solomon's ring. She notes that in the ring's symbol 'había unas lejanas luces y representaciones de la Santísima Trinidad, en virtud de lo cual obraba tantos prodigios y maravillas; y la misma [figura] que dicen tuvo el arpa de David, y que por eso sanaba Saúl a su sonido' (Cruz 1994, p. 74).

[1397] *colación*: see notes to lines 260 -261 of Act 1, where Ruperto guesses immediately that the only 'colación' on offer in the *convento* to which Peregrino now refers will come in the form of the 'canalón', the 'azotes' referred to here.

[1409] *los de Absalón*: that is, *los [cabellos] de Absalón*. The third son of King David was reputedly the most handsome man in his father's kingdom. In particular it is said that he had long, luxuriant hair (II Kings 14. 25-26).

[1411] *murrión*: M, S, R, A emend to *morrión*, but the 1803 edition of the *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana* confirms that *murrión* is '[l]o mismo que morrión'.

donde están Elías y Enoc,
sino dos montes de fuego,
más que Lipas y Estrombol,
en cuyas llamas estaba
una serpiente feroz,
que a la vista parecía
la que a mi padre engañó,
los colmillos de elefante,
los ojos de girasol,
la escama de cocodrilo,
y las alas de dragón.
Muchos vicios la cercaban,
gigante fiero el mayor
y, entre la Gula y la Ira,
un blasfemo jugador.
Otro, más lleno de sierpes
que el sacerdote Laocón,
el corazón se comía
sin ser gavilán ni azor.

[1419] This line is hypersyllabic, unless the *ía* of 'Elías' is pronounced as a diphthong and the name given *llana* stress; alternatively, 'Enoc' could be stressed as a *llana* word rather than an *aguda* one.

[1419b] *Elías y Enoc*: neither Elijah nor Enoch died, according to biblical tradition. Instead they were taken into heaven alive. Elijah was mysteriously assumed into heaven by a whirlwind (IV Kings 2. 11) and Enoch is said to have been taken by God, to walk no more (Genesis 5. 24). Because of these biblical statements, theologians have felt reasonably comfortable affirming that Elijah and Enoch, at least, are in paradise with God and the heavenly host.

[1421] *Lipas y Estrombol*: Lipari and Stromboli are volcanoes north of Sicily.

[1423] *una serpiente feroz*: the devil, associated with the serpent of the Garden of Eden and the Fall of Adam by some of the early Fathers of the Church, including Justin Martyr (H. Kelly 2006, p. 176). Regarding the painting of demons, Pacheco confirms that '[l]a pintura más común es de dragón y serpiente. Que esta forma tomó él para engañar a nuestros primeros padres' (1649, pp. 478-479).

[1425] *mi padre*: Adam is 'padre universal del género humano' (Covarrubias).

[1428] *cocodrilo*: P: *cocodrillo*. Both spellings can be found in Lope's dramatic texts, though *cocodrilo* is more common. It appears that *cocodrillo* is never used by Lope in rhyme position, always *cocodrilo*. That might suggest that *cocodrilo* is Lope's preferred spelling, with *cocodrillo* a mis-print or a mis-spelling introduced into the published texts by the typesetters.

[1435] *Laocón*: P, M, S, R, A: *Leocón*. This is the only reference to a 'Leocón' in Lope's drama. Lope must mean Laocoön, the character from Virgil's *Aeneid*, usually Laoconte in Spanish. Laocoön is the man who warns the Trojans against the Greeks' wooden horse. Virgil describes him as a priest ('sacerdos') of Neptune. He is killed by two giant serpents who seize his two sons and feed on their limbs and then, when Laocoön attempts to rescue them, wrap themselves around him and smother him to death (*Aeneid*, book II, l. 201ff.). Covarrubias's entry on this character comes under 'Laocón', so the shortening of the name in Spanish has a Golden-Age precedent. The line is hypersyllabic unless the *ao* of Laocón is pronounced as a diphthong.

[1436-1437] *el corazón se comía sin ser gavilán ni azor*: the question of whether goshawks and sparrowhawks (the two were often confused) eat the hearts of their prey was a controversial one in classical and medieval natural histories. Aristotle (*Historia animalium*, 7(8), 11, 615a 4-6 and 8(9), 11, 615a 5) and Pliny (*Historia naturalis* 10, 24) erroneously deny it (*Brill's Encyclopedia*, XIII, col. 690). Albertus Magnus affirms it (*De animalibus*, 23): 'si aliquid de praeda concupiscunt, cor accipiunt: ideo auem quam capiunt ad latus perforant, & cor extractum deuorant' (1651, pp. 613-614), 'If they desire any part of their prey, it is the heart that they take. They therefore tear into the side of the captured bird, draw out the heart, and devour it'. Theory aside, discussing Hugh de Fouilloy's twelfth-century *Aviarium*, Gualtieri remarks that '[i]t was common practice to give the hawk the heart of the bird it had caught as a reward' (2005, p. 25). Góngora exploits the belief in his 1582 ballad 'Diez años vivió Belerma'. For ten years Doña Belerma has faithfully cherished the heart of her dead lover, Durandarte, when Doña Alda advises her that enough is enough. Alda urges her friend

Uno vi más deshonesto
que Cómodo emperador,
mas tenía la Escritura
cual preso a Roma Nerón;
otro, bañado en letargo,
aunque luego despertó,
porque un ministro del fuego
le llamó con un tizón.
Allí vi con los soberbios
al arrogante Nembrot,
con los crueles a Herodes
y entre Datán y Abirón,
Caín, con los envidiosos;
con los tiranos Creón
y, por la Gula y el vino,
a Holofernes y a Milón;
a Midas con los avaros;
y a Judas Escariot,
que dio por treinta dineros

to return the heart to Montesinos, who brought it to her following the battle of Roncesvalles: '[v]olved luego a Montesinos | ese corazón que os trujo, | y enviadle a preguntar | si por gavilán os tuvo' (ll. 41-44).

[1439] *Cómodo*: Commodus was Roman emperor from A.D. 180 to 192. According to Gibbon, he was a man who attained the 'summit of vice and infamy', 'every sentiment of virtue and humanity was extinct in [his] mind'. In a note that may have struck a chord with the audience watching *San Nicolás* around 1614, during the reign of Philip III, Commodus was famous for having 'abandoned the reins of empire to unworthy favourites' and, again according to Gibbon, 'he valued nothing except the unbounded licence of indulging his sensual appetites' (1910, I, ch. 4).

[1447] *Nembrot*: Nimrod is traditionally identified as leader of the men who tried to reach up into heaven by building the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11. 1-9). He is the archetype of arrogance and this reputation explains Mardocheo's refererence to him in *La hermosa Ester*: 'Dios de mis padres, no es soberbia mía | no me rendir a Amán, tan arrogante | como Nembrot' (p. 113).

[1448] *Herodes*: King Herod stands as another archetype of cruelty for his ordering of the massacre of the Holy Innocents (Matthew 2. 16-18).

[1449] *Datán y Abirón*: Dathan and Abiram were descendents of Jacob's eldest son, Ruben. They rebelled against the authority of Moses and Aaron, angry that these men had deprived them of the leadership they considered their birthright as Rubenites. God punished them by having the earth swallow them up, whereupon they were carried straight to Sheol (Numbers 16). They represent envy, like Cain, who killed his brother, Abel, envious of the favour God had shown him.

[1451] *Creón*: Creon, more often 'Creonte' in Spanish, was king of Thebes. He is depicted as a tyrant in Sophocles's *Antigone*. He legislated in his own interests and against Natural Law when he refused to allow the burial of Polynices, ignoring the sage advice of his counsellors.

[1453] *a Holofernes y a Milón*: Holofernes was the chief general of Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Assyrians, and a central character in the deuterocanonical Book of Judith. Nebuchadnezzar sends Holofernes to defeat the cities that had refused to join him in war against King Arphaxad of the Medes. Whilst laying siege to the town of Bethulia, he is seduced by a beautiful Hebrew widow, Judith, who attends a banquet he hosts. Intoxicated, Holofernes invites Judith back to his tent, where she beheads him and thereby saves her people. It makes sense, then, that Lope picks Holofernes as a noteable drunk. Milón (Milo of Croton) was a wrestler from Greek southern Italy, who lived in the later sixth century BC. He is famous for his wrestling victories at the Olympian Games and 'he is said to have carried a heifer down the course, killed it with one blow, and eaten it all in one day', hence his identification by Lope with gluttony (*Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 981).

[1454] *Midas*: when Bacchus offered to grant Midas a reward for the return of his tutor, Silenus, Midas asked that everything he touched would turn to gold. His greed was punished when this power came close to resulting in his starvation, as all the food he touched became instantly inedible and all the water, undrinkable. This myth is narrated in book XI of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1986, ll. 101-194).

[1456] *por treinta dineros*: Judas received thirty pieces of silver to betray Christ (Matthew 26. 15).

la sangre de su Señor,
en un corro de traidores,
que los más infames son.
Mostróme una silla un ángel,
de piedra azufre y carbón,
porque me dijeron que era
polvorista el escultor,
y díjome: «aquélla es tuya,
que ayer se desocupó,
porque la Muerte ya quiere
pedir mandamiento a Dios
para hacerte, por su deuda
en la vida, ejecución».
Y luego en un tribunal,
mejor que el de Salomón,
de zafir, electro y fuego
y lleno de resplandor,
me enseñó el ángel a Cristo,
airado como un león,
cubierto el desnudo cuerpo
de la púrpura de Edón,
por vara una roja espada,
que un rayo me pareció;
por relator el arcángel
que dijo: «¿quién como Dios?»;
un mozo hermoso escribiendo;
y por fiscal promotor
un mulato de mal gesto,
malhablado y regañón,
cuyos pies, que descubría

[1463] *polvorista*: the chair is made from two of the principal ingredients used in the manufacture of gunpowder, as its sculptor is a 'polvorista'. But of course sulphur and the carbon that keeps the fires of hell burning, are associated with the devil.

[1477] *la púrpura de Edón*: Edom is a land mentioned several times in the Old Testament, located to the south-east of the Dead Sea. Its name is derived from a Semitic root meaning red, ruddy, and the name was probably given to the land because of its reddish sandstone earth (*Anchor Bible Dictionary*, II, p. 287). According to the definition in *Autoridades*, the best *púrpura* was actually pure red, Lope's lines are orthodox, then, in light of Matthew's Gospel, which describes the Roman soldiers dressing Christ in a red cloak: 'et exuentes eum, chlamydem coccineam circumdederunt ei', 'And, stripping him, they put a scarlet cloak about him' (27. 28). Lope uses the phrase 'la púrpura de Edón' again in the seventh of his *Soloquios amorosos de un alma a Dios* (l. 236, first published in Madrid in 1626) where it describes the colour of Christ's blood, confirming, again, that the colour is actually red (p. 258). This colour of Christ's garment is mentioned again at line 1511, a 'rojo manto'.

[1481] *¿Quién como Dios?*: 'Quis ut Deus?' is a literal translation of the Archangel Michael's Hebrew name.

[1484] *mulato*: the devil is often black in medieval paintings. Pacheco notes that he is sometimes represented 'en figuras humanas de hombres desnudos, feos y oscuros' (1649, p. 479). Traditionally, blackness suggests evil and pollution, in contrast to the pure white of the angels; indeed, the devil is described in certain apochryphal texts as a black Ethiopian. Link observes that in 'the Acts of Peter (XXII), for example, Peter sees the Devil in the shape of a foul-looking woman who was all "black and filthy like an Ethiopian, not like an Egyptian"' (1995, pp. 52-53).

[1486-1489] *pies... colgados en san Antón*: pigs were traditionally slaughtered on St Anthony's Day (17 January) and their carcasses, including their trotters, hung up. The 'fiscal promotor' that Peregrino is describing

por un sayo de sayón,
parece que habían estado
colgados en san Antón.
Cuando vi que me acusaba,
y que, para más rigor,
de un proceso que tenía
bastaba el menor renglón,
miré si había en la sala
abogado en mi favor,
y vi a la diestra de Cristo
la rosa de Jericó,
a la puerta de Ezequiel,
y la escala de Jacob,
la hermosura del Carmelo,
la fértil vara de Aarón,
la paloma que la oliva
trujo por señal del sol.
En viéndola dije: «madre,
por mí sois madre de Dios;
haced, soberana Reina,
oficio de lo que sois».
Ella entonces a su Hijo
mi remedio le pidió,
mas, viendo que estaba airado,
del rojo manto le asió
y, descubriendo el costado,
Cristo la llaga miró
y respondió: «madre mía,
por vos le daré perdón,
si a vos os da la palabra
de no ofender a los dos».
Cobré entonces el sentido,
porque entonces se acabó
la música que le hacían
disciplina y oración.
Salí llorando y pensando
mi peligro y perdición;
volví otra noche a la fiesta,
aunque al demonio pesó,

---

is obviously the devil; his feet are reminiscent of 'san Antón' because he has cloven hooves, like a pig's. See the note to line 408 regarding the devil's role as chief prosecutor before the heavenly tribunal.

1487 *sayón*: 'el verdugo que ejecutaba la pena de muerte u otra a que eran condenados los reos. Covarrubias dice que tomó el nombre del vestido que traían, que era un saco de sayal' (*Aut*).

1503 *trujo*: this old form of the third-person singular preterite of 'traer', still common in the Golden Age, has been replaced by 'trajo' in modern Spanish. The modern form was also used by Lope (see line 2044, for example).

1497-1503 *la rosa de Jericó*, etc.: each of these is an epithet for the Virgin Mary, and several are explained in Antonio Navarro's 1604 *Abecedario virginal*, which lists and discusses 228 of Mary's names. For example, Navarro writes that the epithet 'rose of Jericho' is derived from Ecclesiasticus 24. 18: 'quasi plantatio rosae in Hiericho', 'as a rose-plant in Jericho' (fols 68^{v}-69^{r}).

y truje mis canelones
para tomar colación;
no me supieron tan mal
como lo pensaba yo.
Hallé luego un buen maestro;
buenos consejos me dio;
hice apriesa lo que pude,
aunque miserable soy.
Desprecié lo que tenía
en alta veneración;
puse en razón mis sentidos,
y con este mi reloj,
quien ángel me parecía
demonio me pareció.
Tratéme mal cuanto pude,
y pienso que no fue error;
peor fuera en el infierno
mucho palo y mucha coz.
Lavéme y fuime a la mesa
con vestido de color
de aquel cordero divino
de los montes de Sion,
de quien espero remedio,
que es pan de tal bendición
que da vida a quien le come
mientras que Dios fuere Dios.

PRIOR Admiración me ha causado,
fray Peregrino, su historia;
dése a Dios toda la gloria.

PEREGRINO Padre, yo estoy en sagrado
y debo a fray Nicolás
la reducción de mi vida,
ganada cuanto perdida.

Sale RUPERTO.

RUPERTO ¿Cómo albricias no me das?
El provincial ha venido.

PRIOR Alégrome en todo extremo.

RUPERTO Solamente, padre, temo
que el provincial no ha comido.

PEREGRINO Traza tú, Ruperto, hermano,

[1526] *canelones*: see the note to line 261. Peregrino's comment that these 'canelones' 'no me supieron tan mal' reinforces the multivalency of the word; he is referring to the penitential flagellation he has endured, but the verb *saber*, in this case 'to taste', would more conventionally be used in relation to the other meaning of 'canelón'.

[1537] *reloj*: often used in Lope's plays as a metaphor for a system by which one's life is regulated. Peregrino must mean his new-found reason and piety.

[1551] *mientras que Dios fuere Dios*: that is, eternally.

[1560] *provincial*: 'en las religiones tienen divididas sus casas por provincias, y los que las gobiernan se llaman provinciales' (Covarrubias).

una comida famosa.
RUPERTO ¡Será en extremo famosa,
trazándola de mi mano!
Primeramente ha de haber,
por principio, dos novicios,
puestos en limpios servicios,
que el rey los pueda comer.
PRIOR ¿Qué dice?
RUPERTO Quiero decir
que habrá lindos orejones;
luego, del coro, capones
gordos a puro gruñir.
Habrá una olla que huela
por toda la vecindad,
con carne de honestidad
que esté manida a cautela.
Habrá fruta de sartén
de algún huevo mal cocido
y postres de haber comido,
que es a la postre, también;

1565-1566 *famosa*: these lines end in an autorhyme with identical meaning, a kind criticized by early modern *preceptistas*, though its use was not uncommon. It may be that Lope's rhyme here could have been justified because each use of the word 'famosa' occurs in a different type of sentence, an imperative one, in the first instance, and an exclamatory one, in the second (see Arjona 1953, pp. 297-298).

1569 *novicio*: 'el que en la religión no ha hecho aún la profesión de sus reglas, instituto y votos, conforme al establecimiento de cada una' (*Aut*). Ruperto is suggesting, sarcastically, that, in the absence of conventional food, the community will have to resort to cannibalism, eating, first, its most junior members. See the section of the introductory study that focuses on the *gracioso* for an explanation of the wordplay that is a prominent feature of this scene of *San Nicolás* and the next.

1570 *servicios*: that is, *servicios de mesa:* 'los platos, vajilla y otras cosas que se usan en ella para la comida' (*Aut*).

1573 *orejones*: 'pedazo de melocotón en forma de lonja, sin cáscara, curado al aire y al sol. Díjose así por la semejanza que después de secos tienen con las orejas' (*Aut*). But Ruperto might also intend, sarcastically, the ears of the 'novicios'. More likely, the meaning is lewd: 'orejón de carne' was a term used to designate the *membrum virile* (Cela 1969-1971, II, pp. 371-372). Cela illustrates the usage by quoting from Quevedo's 'En el ardor de una siesta': a young man destined to be a friar is admiring an attractive young woman and the poetic voice observes scurrilously:

> ¡Qué alegre que se pondría
> aquel orejón de carne
> de aquel casi vivo entonces,
> o de aquel difunto casi! (ll. 41-44)

The kind of sexual innuendo present in this scene is likely to have been responsible in part for the *moralistas*' indignant objections to the *comedia de santos*, a genre intended as edifying, at least in part, but one that often slides between extremes of vulgar, secular comedy and moving, inspiring piety. The hybridity of the genre might also have contributed to its popularity. Further research is required to establish whether the lewd wordplay that is a prominent feature of this Act 2 is detectable more generally in Lope's saints' plays.

1574 *capones*: 'el que es castrado. Lo que se entiende así de los hombres, como de los animales; si bien entre estos con especialidad del gallo' (*Aut*). So, most obviously comestible capons, but, since the priory has none, Ruperto must intend the choir's *castrati* or maybe its boy sopranos or counter-tenors, whose singing he describes as grunting. This latter interpretation seems more likely given the juxtaposition in Ruperto's recipe of the word 'huevos', not hens' eggs, but the choirboys' testicles (see Cela 1969-1971, I, pp.163-170 for ample examples of the historical use of this euphemism). If the result of their 'grunting' is swelling ('gordos') perhaps the suggestion is that the grunting might not be singing, after all, but noisy lusting.

1578 *carne de honestidad*: 'carne' too can signify the penis (*Poesía erótica* 1983, p. 332).

le echará la bendición
su caridad, donde espero
que le alcance al cocinero,
que de carne y hueso son.

PRIOR Él lo traza cuerdamente,
pero mejor lo dará;
vamos a verle.

PEREGRINO Él traerá
regalos, que es diligente.

Vanse [el PRIOR *y fray* PEREGRINO*]*.

RUPERTO Quisiéralos para mí,
que de hambre estoy muriendo;
mucho resisto, perdiendo
el humor con que nací.
Mas, como ha de ser por Dios,
lindamente me consuelo,
porque no se gana el cielo,
mundo, como pensáis vos...
Por el hábito divino
de Agustín, que cuando espumo
las ollas, ¡que me consumo!;
pues cuando miro el tocino
y los garbanzos salir
peleando con los nabos,
tan arrogantes y bravos,
¡no hay quien lo pueda sufrir!
¿Hay gracia como mirar
una hermana olla hirviendo,
que le está a un hombre diciendo,
«hombre, bien puedes llegar;
madura estoy, bor, bor, bor»?
Pienso que es griego o caldeo.
Mas vase en humo el deseo
y el gusto aumenta el olor.

[1590] This line is hypersyllabic, unless the *ae* of 'traerá' is pronounced as a diphthong.

[1596] *como ha de ser por Dios*: note how Ruperto is still acting piously here, in the absence of an internal audience and straight after the vulgarity of his comic recipe. This evidence of the reformation of his character is placed tellingly before his reunion with Celia, when his decision to abstain will be thoroughly tested by the appearance of *carne* – in the form of the meat Celia brings in her basket and also her own sensuous flesh. Remember that Ruperto has already confessed that flesh is a great weakness of his (ll. 970-973)

[1609] *una hermana olla*: an affectionate reference to the stew pot about which Ruperto is fantasizing. Canning comments: '[s]uch is Ruperto's love of food that he imagines a blood connection with a pot [...]. In addition, the religious significance of *hermana* means that Ruperto's description of his affiliation with the pot is fitting for his new holy environment' (2008, p. 151).

[1612] *bor, bor, bor*: the bubbling of the talking stew pot as imagined by the *gracioso*.

[1613] *caldeo*: 'la lengua llamada también aramea que fue hablada por la familia de Abraham en Ur de Caldea y por los hebreos desde su exilio a Babilonia. Por eso cuando volvieron a Jerusalén necesitaron explicaciones de la Biblia en caldeo. Es la lengua de los libros de Esdrás y de Daniel. Jesús hablaba arameo y hebreo' (Arellano 2000a, p. 50). The pun here is based upon the phonetic link with *caldero*, 'caldeo' intended as the language of cauldrons, 'bor, bor, bor' being an example, Ruperto jokes.

Sale fray GIL.

GIL Una criada que fue
del padre de Nicolás
le llama, padre.
RUPERTO ¡Jamás
tal lealtad imaginé!
¿Dónde está?
GIL En la portería.
RUPERTO Ya llego, padre fray Gil.

[Vase fray GIL *y] [s]ale* CELIA.

CELIA *Deo gratias*.
RUPERTO [*Aparte*] Mas ¡qué sutil
entrar la Carne porfía
con nombre de caridad!
CELIA ¿Cómo va, hermano Ruperto?
RUPERTO Como quien espera el puerto
después de la tempestad.
¿Está buena?
CELIA Buena estoy
y más viéndole tan santo.
RUPERTO Santo no, pero, entretanto,
por la mejor senda voy.
CELIA ¿Está el padre Nicolás
con salud?
RUPERTO No anda muy bueno,
aunque está de bienes lleno,
que no le faltan jamás.
CELIA Eso creo yo muy bien,
porque a quien el cielo santo
favorece y quiere tanto
no hay bienes que en él no estén.
Mas, diga, padre Ruperto,
¿no le ruega a Dios por mí?
RUPERTO Sí, cierto.
CELIA ¿No más de «sí»?
RUPERTO ¿No basta decir «sí, cierto»?
CELIA ¿Qué siente del siglo más?
RUPERTO Celia mía… el no comer.
CELIA ¿Memorias no?
RUPERTO De mujer…

[1645] *Celia mía... el no comer*: Celia wants to hear Ruperto concede that she is the thing he misses most from the secular world. Part of the humour of this encounter rests on Ruperto's shaky attempts to avoid compromising his vocation by admitting to his desires. On stage, Celia's face might light up as Ruperto answers her question with 'Celia mía...', only to drop again, when she realises that food is actually what he plumps for: '...el no comer'. The ellipses added to the text in this section indicate where an actor playing Ruperto might choose to pause for comic effect.

no las consiento jamás....
Por lo que de carne tienen
tal vez me detengo un poco,
¡la hambre me vuelve loco!
CELIA ¿Estas memorias le vienen?
RUPERTO Acuérdome de los días
y acuérdome, por mi mal,
que la olla universal
hermosa... Celia… ponías;
y estánme haciendo cosquillas
las berzas, cebollas y ajos
y, entre estos rotos andrajos,
me carcomo y hago astillas.
Pero ¡paciencia!, que así
he de conquistar el cielo.
CELIA Alce los ojos del suelo;
mire qué le traigo aquí.
RUPERTO No, Celia; mirar mujer,
y mujer que se ha querido,
aun a seglares ha sido
ocasión para perder
todo el resto de la vida.
CELIA No quiero que a mí me crea;
que no quiera Dios que sea
quien tanta quietud le impida.
RUPERTO Pues, ¿qué trae?
CELIA Una cestilla
con pan, carne, vino y queso.
RUPERTO ¿El pan es tierno?
CELIA Por eso
lo truje; es una rosquilla.
RUPERTO ¿La carne?
CELIA Una polla es,
criada en casa.
RUPERTO ¿Y el vino?
CELIA Es de tres altos.

[1651] *le*: P: *te*. In this interview, Celia consistently uses polite verbal and nominal forms to address Ruperto and there is no obvious reason why this pronoun should be an exception. It is more likely to be an error on the part of playwright or typesetter.

[1654ff.] *olla, berzas, cebollas, ajos*: see the section of the introductory study that focuses on Ruperto for a discussion of the erotic connotations of these words and others that appear in this scene.

[1662] *alce los ojos del suelo*: an important indication of Ruperto's demeanour in this reunion scene: Ruperto is averting his gaze, trying hard to resist the temptations presented by Celia.

[1670] *no quiera Dios que sea*: to be read as *no quiera Dios que sea [yo] / quien tanta quietud le impida.*

[1676] *una polla es*: presumably Celia is referring to her *pudenda*; it is possible to assume this by analogy with words like *pájaro, palomo* and the masculine form *pollo,* all of which could have this meaning, in an appopriately vulgar context (see *Poesía erótica* 1983, p. 75).

[1678] *de tres altos*: M, S, R, A *de tres años.* The emendation made by the play's modern editors is unnecessary. As used here, 'de tres altos' means top quality. The phrase originally described the best brocade – *brocado de tres altos* – but came to be used more generally as an augmentative, often, though not here, with a pejorative sense (see James Crosby's footnote explaining the phrase *clérigo de bonete de tres altos* in 'El alguacil endemoniado' (Quevedo 1993, p.158)).

RUPERTO ¿Tan fino?
CELIA Allá lo verá después.
RUPERTO ¿El queso es añejo?
CELIA Y tanto
que algún hidalgo quisiera
su antigüedad.
RUPERTO Bien quisiera
mirarlo.
CELIA Mientras no es santo
bien puede alzar la cabeza.
RUPERTO Ya la miro, gorda está,
¿vale bien?
CELIA Muy bien me va.
RUPERTO ¿En qué entiende? [*Aparte*] ¡Ah, vil flaqueza!
CELIA Coso... lavo y almidono.
RUPERTO ¿Adereza todavía
los menudos que solía?
¿Canta con el mismo tono?
CELIA Algunos sábados, sí.
RUPERTO ¿Y hace aquellos obispillos?
CELIA También.
RUPERTO ¿Fríe menudillos
con huevos?
CELIA Ayer los di
a almorzar a mi señor.
RUPERTO Es cosa muy cordial.

[1684] *alzar la cabeza*: in erotic contexts, this phrase can mean to have an erection. For example, in the sonnet 'Viendo una dama que un galán moría', when the day comes for the *galán* to enjoy his *dama*, 'o por mucha vergüenza, o por contento, | no pudo alzar cabeza el istrumento | para los dos formar dulce harmonía' (see *Poesía erótica* 1983, p. 59, ll. 6-8).

[1685] *ya la miro*: at lines 1682-1683 Ruperto says he would like to see the cheese: 'bien quisiera mirarlo'. There the pronoun refers, most naturally, to 'el queso'. By line 1685 the grammatical gender of the object of Ruperto's enraptured attention has changed: 'ya la miro', he says. The pronoun refers back to the 'polla' (or maybe 'la cabeza'), which is a vulgar colloquialism that designates the *membrum virile*. This smutty interpretation is supported by Ruperto's subsequent comment: 'gorda está'. Whether or not Ruperto has the noun 'polla' in mind, the feminine pronoun 'la' usually refers, in crude language, to the penis and Cela's *Diccionario secreto* explains that 'tenerla gorda', referring to the penis, 'señala su estado de erección' (1969-1971, II, pp. 325-328). At line 1687, Ruperto, *aparte*, chastizes himself, presumably for this momentary lapse, horrified that perhaps Celia, with her 'muy bien me va', has caught his mind's unintended drift.

[1687] *entender*: 'significa [...] estar empleado y ocupado en hacer alguna cosa, cuidar de ella y tenerla a su cargo' (*Aut*). Ruperto rapidly changes the subject with his polite enquiry here.

[1688] *coso*: sewing is a euphemism for the sexual act (see *Poesía erótica*, pp. 131-132).

[1690] *menudo*: 'se llama [...] el vientre, manos y sangre de las reses que se matan' (*Aut*).

[1693] *obispillos*: 'un cierto morcillón que suelen hacer cuando se matan puercos y los regalados son de huevos y especias y carne picada muy menuda; los demás suelen ser de huesos de las costillas que han descarnado y del espinazo' (Covarrubias). Canning comments that Ruperto's interest in these 'obispillos' and the 'puerco en sal' mentioned at line 1698 substantiates his position as a 'cristiano viejo'. She also notes how Covarrubias's alternative definition of 'obispillo' can be linked to Nicholas of Tolentino: '[t]he boy bishop, who led the fesitivities of the choirboys on 28 December, Holy Innocents' Day, was usually chosen on 6 December, the Feast of St Nicholas of Myra (or Bari)' after whom Nicholas was named (2008, p. 151). The primary meaning of 'obispillos' is the one that makes sense here, but perhaps Lope also enjoyed this recondite connection with his hero.

[1694] *menudillos*: 'lo interior de las aves que se reduce a higadillo, molleja, sangre, madrecilla y yemas' (*Aut*).

¿Has echado puerco en sal?
CELIA Tres, por amor del dotor.
RUPERTO Quien con un torrezno asado
se desayuna, o con migas,
al dotor le da cien higas.
CELIA Agradézcame el cuidado
en rogar a Dios por mí.
RUPERTO Muestre la cesta.
CELIA A Dios quede.

*Vase [*CELIA*]*.

RUPERTO ¡Oh, cuánto la hambre puede!
Pero venceréla: así
a san Antonio traía
un cuervo el pan y a mí, agora,
un ángel; ¿hay tal señora?,
¿hay tal reina, panza mía?
Haced fiesta en hacimiento.
Mas Nicolás viene aquí;
siempre desdichado fui;
siempre está en mi pensamiento.
Si me la ve, la ha de dar
a algún pobre; esconder quiero

[1698] *¿has echado puerco en sal?*: this seems to be an activity for which women of peasant stock could win considerable admiration in early modern Spain. Here, Ruperto remembers Celia's skill fondly. More famously, in the margins of the Arabic manuscript that the 'morisco aljamiado' translated for the 'segundo autor' of *Don Quijote*, an anonymous hand had written: '[e]sta Dulcinea del Toboso, tantas veces en esta historia referida, dicen que tuvo la mejor mano para salar puercos que otra mujer de toda la Mancha' (I, 9; Cervantes 1997a, I, p. 158).

[1699] *por amor del dotor*: this phrase does not appear to be proverbial, so it is unclear to whom 'el dotor' refers. Up to this point in the play, no doctor has appeared or been mentioned. A 'Médico judío', referred to as '[el] señor dotor', does appear later in this Act 2, though. If this is the doctor Celia has in mind, her expression of affectionate indulgence would have to be understood, instead, as a joke at the expense of this Jewish physician and as a foretaste of Ruperto's anti-Semitic outburst in the scene between lines 1987 and 2040. Of course, 'dotor' does not necessarily indicate a physician and the fact that the joke is made before the Médico Judío is introduced suggests that this is an unlikely interpretation (unless, perhaps: the Jewish doctor was meant to appear on stage fleetingly for the purposes of this line; Lope forgot that the 'Médico judío' had not yet been introduced; or the scenes of Act 2 had originally be composed in a different order). Alternatively, read in light of Ruperto's response at lines 1700-1702, Celia's comment might express a belief – perhaps ironic – that a meat-rich diet is a healthy one that guarantees the local doctor a quiet life.

[1702] *higa*: 'la acción que se hace con la mano cerrado el puño, mostrando el dedo pulgar por entre el dedo índice y el de en medio, con la cual se señalaba a las personas infames y torpes o se hacía burla y desprecio de ellas' (*Aut*). A (less offensive) English paraphrase of lines 1700-1702 might read something like 'a rack of ribs a day keeps the doctor away'.

[1705] *muestre la cesta*: eventually, then, Ruperto is defeated by his hunger, though he just about manages to resist Celia herself. The spectator would inevitably contrast Ruperto's lapse to Nicolás's impressive self-control in resisting temptation.

[1708] *a san Antonio traía un cuervo el pan*: when St Anthony the Great was visiting the hermit St Paul of Thebes in the desert, a raven is said to have brought them bread (Butler 1949, I, p. 53), just as a raven brought bread to Elijah (see note to lines 2075-2076).

[1712] *hacimiento*: *Autoridades* considers this word a synonym of 'acción de gracias': 'el acto devoto, rendido y humilde, con que se reconoce y da gracias a la Majestad Divina por los beneficios recibidos. Dícese también «hacimiento de gracias»'.

la cesta, pues cierto espero
que la podré manducar.
Este cuadro de la huerta
la guardará.

Sale[n] NICOLÁS *y* FLORO, *estudiante.*

NICOLÁS Tiempo pierdes;
……..
de tu ignorancia despierta.
FLORO Padre, que es difícil, digo,
de conocer el mortal
pecado o el venial.
NICOLÁS Lo mismo afirmo contigo.
RUPERTO [*Aparte*] Ellos vienen arguyendo;
por la huerta se andarán;
mis tripas también están
sus argumentos haciendo.
NICOLÁS El mortal pecado es
«*quod aufert gratiam*».
FLORO *Concedo*.
NICOLÁS La gracia del alma es vida.
La primera razón quiero
que dé su etimología,
pues derivarse sabemos
el mortal «*a morte culpae*»;

[1722] The third (or possibly the second) line of this *redondilla* is missing.

[1733] *quod aufert gratiam*: 'which takes away [God's] grace'. Canonica claims that Lope takes this quotation from St Anselm's *Cur Deus homo,* book II, chapter 5 (2006, p. 49). He quotes '*quod* sit necessitas quae *aufert gratiam* aut minuit, et sit necessitas quae auget' (emphasis added), '[t]here is a necessity which takes away or lessens obligation to the benefactor, and there is a necessity by which a greater obligation for the benefit is due' (Anselm [1886], p. 117). This quotation comes, in Anselm, in the context of a discussion of the effect, on man's sense of gratitude to God, of the idea that the Incarnation was a necessity. This discussion has nothing to do with the distinction between mortal and venial sin and their impact on God's grace, which is the subject of Nicolás's debate with Floro. Also, were this Lope's source, his quotation would count as a very distorted one. A more likely source of Lope's quotation is the exegetical work of the respected Valencian theologian and philosopher, Benito Pereira: *Prior Tomus Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim*. In a section of that work in which the author considers the effect of mortal and venial sin on Adam's state of innocence, Pereira sets out the following proposition: 'status innocentiae non poterat destrui, nisi per peccatum mortale, quippè *quod aufert gratiam* Dei, & hominem Dei amore, ac beneficiis reddit indignum. Peccatum igitur veniale non poterat destruere illum statum' (Pereira 1594, p. 552, emphasis added), 'the state of innocence cannot be destroyed, except by mortal sin; for indeed that which takes away the grace of God, and removes man from God's love, also renders him unworthy of gifts. Therefore, venial sin cannot destroy that state'. Here Pereira draws exactly the same distinction as Nicolás draws for Floro: only mortal sin deprives man of God's grace.

[1733b] *concedo*: as at the start of Act 1, we have here the language of scholastic disputation.

[1738] *a morte culpae*: 'from death [caused] by sin'. In his treatise on absolution, *De forma absolutionis*, Aquinas writes how the anonymous author whose views of confession he is challenging holds that 'nihil valet absolutio sacerdotis antequam homo a Deo sit vivificatus per gratiam et suscitatus *a morte culpae*; ergo sacerdos non potest super culpam' (1968, emphasis added), 'absolution by the priest is without effect before the man is revived by God through grace and brought back to life following his death caused by sin; so the priest has no power to give remission from sins'. Canonica identifies *De forma absolutionis* as the source of Lope's quote and notes how Nicolás's etymological claim is incorrect (2006, p. 49). Nicolás is saying that life and grace are the

la segunda, porque es cierto
que, en perdiéndose la gracia,
sale Dios del alma huyendo
y hase de seguir la muerte.
Con este claro argumento
lo prueba Agustín, mi padre:
el alma es vida del cuerpo;
la vida del alma es Dios;
si perdida el alma, luego
muere el cuerpo, que es su vida,
su ánima «*amisso Deo*».

FLORO Claro está que ha de morir.

NICOLÁS *«Moritur, quia vita est eius.»*

RUPERTO [*Aparte*] ¡Malditos sean los latines!
Ellos se van encendiendo.

NICOLÁS Ésta es la muerte que Dios
dijo a Adán: «luego en comiendo
de aquel árbol, morirás».
¿Por qué Adán no murió luego?
Mas murió cuanto a su alma,
gracia y justicia perdiendo,
y, por consecuencia, a Dios,
del alma vital aliento.
Es el pecado mortal
la malicia, de quien leo
vio Salomón que por él
el hombre su alma ha muerto.
«In iniquitate sua
unusquisque morietur»,
Jeremías treinta y uno
dice; requiere lo mesmo

---

same thing, because without God's grace the soul is as dead and without the soul the body is dead, as he goes on to explain.

1745-1751 *el alma es vida... quia vita est eius*: Nicolás's lines paraphrase part of St Augustine's discussion on the immortality of the soul: '[v]ita carnis tuae, anima tua: vita animae tuae, Deus tuus. Quomodo moritur caro amissa anima, quae vita est ejus; sic moritur anima *amisso Deo*, *qui vita est ejus*' (Augustine 1844-1855, III (XXXIV), p. 1737, emphasis added), '[t]he life of thy flesh is thy soul: the life of thy soul, thy God. As the flesh dies by losing the soul which is its life, so the soul dies by losing God, who is its life' (Augustine 1849, II, p. 629). Canonica identifies the source of Lope's Latin quote as Tractatus 47 of Augustine's *Epistola ad Johanni ad Parthos*, presumably intending his *In Epistolam Iohannis ad Parthos* (2006, p. 49). The source is actually Tractatus 47 of Augustine's *In Evangelium Ioannis*. *In Epistolam* contains only ten homilies. Canonica notes correctly that Lope's quotation is a misreading of the source text, which reads 'qui vita est eius', rather than 'quia vita est eius'. The 'eius' at the end of line 1751 does not quite fit the é-o assonance of the *romance*.

1755-1756 *«luego en comiendo de aquel árbol, morirás»*: '[d]e ligno autem scientiae boni et mali ne comedas, in quocumque enim die comederis ex eo, morte morieris', '[b]ut of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death' (Genesis 2. 17).

1762-1765 *es el pecado mortal...su alma ha muerto*: '[h]omo autem occidit quidem per malitiam; | [e]t cum exierit spiritus, no revertetur, | [n]ec revocabit animam quae recepta est', '[a] man indeed killeth through malice, and when the spirit is gone forth, it shall not return, neither shall he call back the soul that is received' (Wisdom 16. 14). The Book of Wisdom is traditionally believed to have been written by King Solomon.

1766-1767 *«in iniquitate sua unusquisque morietur»*: '[s]ed unusquisque in iniquitate sua morietur', '[b]ut every one shall die for his own iniquity' (Jeremiah 31. 30). Again, the Latin does not quite fit the assonance here.

que la muerte, pues tenía
los hombres en el infierno
como ovejas, David dijo;
y éste es el pozo de fuego
de Juan en su Apocalipsi.
Y viene a sacarse desto
que el que le comete, muere,
si no le socorren presto
penitencia y contrición.

FLORO Ya, padre, venir podemos
a la conclusión.

RUPERTO [*Aparte*] ¡Concluyan,
o diré que son más necios
que una visita enfadosa!

NICOLÁS El venial pecado, es cierto
que a nadie quita la gracia.

RUPERTO [*Aparte*] Ni la hambre, a lo que creo,
porque la tengo mayor
después destos argumentos.

FLORO ¿Cuál es la razón?

NICOLÁS Por ser
compatible, estéme atento,
con la gracia y caridad;
como dicen los Proverbios:
«*septies in die cadit iustus*».

RUPERTO ¡Otro latín!

NICOLÁS ¿Es Ruperto?

RUPERTO ¿No me ves?

NICOLÁS ¿Qué haces aquí?

RUPERTO A los dos estaba oyendo.

NICOLÁS ¿Tienes qué dar a este hermano,
que es pobre y estudia?

RUPERTO Tengo
hambre, padre, que le dar.

NICOLÁS Búscalo.

RUPERTO ¿Dónde?

NICOLÁS En el cielo.

1770-1772 *tenía los hombres en el infierno como ovejas, David dijo*: '[s]icut oves in inferno positi sunt: | [m]ors depascet eos', '[t]hey are laid in hell like sheep: death shall feed upon them' (Psalm 48(49). 15). King David is traditionally believed to have composed many of the Psalms.

1773-1775 *éste es el pozo de fuego de Juan en su Apocalipsi*: hell is the pool of fire that is mentioned several times in Revelation (also known as Apocalypse, 19. 20, 20. 10, 20. 14-15 and 21. 8), a place of eternal punishment.

1792 *«septies in die cadit iustus»*: '[s]epties enim cadet iustus, et resurget: | [i]mpii autem corruent in malum', '[f]or a just man shall fall seven times and shall rise again: but the wicked shall fall down into evil' (Proverbs 24. 16). The line is quoted by St Augustine in 'Sermo 306/C' and *In eumdem Psalmum 118*, Sermon 31. In both places he explains that seven times is intended to denote many times or always, and in both texts Augustine also quotes the line '[s]epties in die laudem dixi tibi', '[s]even times a day I have given praise to thee' (Psalm 118 (119). 164), with which Lope has seemingly conflated Proverbs 24. 16 in his quotation. Nicolás is explaining to Floro that it is human nature to sin, even those described as 'just' sin and God's grace is not lost provided the sins are venial and not mortal. This line of Latin is octosyllabic, if read in accordance with the rules of Castilian prosody. It fits the assonance of this section of *romance*.

RUPERTO Eso a ti te está mejor,
que no le pides, sospecho,
cosa que no te conceda.
NICOLÁS Pídele al refitolero
alguna cosa.
RUPERTO Ha dos días
que en el refitorio no entro;
que dice que le comí
catorce pares de huevos
para la comunidad,
más estrellados que frescos.
NICOLÁS Pues, ¿hase de ir desta suerte?
RUPERTO Vaya, padre, a otro convento.
NICOLÁS Aora bien, Floro, no vayas
sin algo de casa; quiero
cortarte un par de lechugas
y rábanos deste huerto
para que mojes la boca.
Bendigámoslas primero.
Hortaliza que Dios cría,
dad a este pobre sustento,
en su nombre, yo las cojo.
RUPERTO [*Aparte*] ¡Perdido soy!
NICOLÁS ¿Qué es aquesto?
RUPERTO Déjelo, padre, no es nada;
aquí lo trujo un mancebo
para un enfermo de casa.
NICOLÁS Pues será Floro el enfermo.
RUPERTO No, por Dios; deje la cesta.
NICOLÁS Deja la cesta, Ruperto.
RUPERTO ¡Dale la mitad siquiera!
NICOLÁS Eso no, que si este huerto
la da entera para un pobre,
partirla será mal hecho.
Toma y vete a comer.
FLORO Padre,
pague la limosna el cielo.
RUPERTO ¡A mí me la ha de pagar,
que yo soy el que la pierdo!

Vase FLORO.

1807-1809 *huevos... más estrellados que frescos*: *huevos estrellados*: '[s]on los fritos con aceite o manteca en una sartén; y como al tiempo de echarlos a freír, por estar ya la manteca o el aceite caliente, saltan a una parte y a otra algunas puntas formadas de la clara de los huevos en forma de rayos, parece se les dió el nombre de estrellados' (*Aut*). Ruperto might be attempting to 'mentir con la verdad', hoping Nicolás will assume that the eggs he gobbled up were unfit for consumption, 'estrellados' in another sense – broken, ruined – not fried eggs but eggs 'derriba[dos] con violencia, arroja[dos] de golpe [...] haciéndo[los] pedazos' (*Aut*).

1828 *dale:* there is some inconsistency in the verbal forms Ruperto uses when addressing Nicolás in this scene. From here to the end of the scene he uses the 'tú' forms. It is possible that Ruperto's frustration results in this lapse in etiquette and so the inconsistency has been preserved.

NICOLÁS Ruperto, de la abstinencia
tenemos grandes ejemplos.
Nicolás de Mira, obispo,
siendo niño tan pequeño,
dos días en la semana
una vez tomaba el pecho.
De Mayolo y Bonifacio,
de Edmundo, Antonio y Severo,
de Jerónimo, de Paula,
de Eufrasia y de otros leemos
que por ayunos llegaron
a conservar en su extremo
las virtudes que hoy laurean
sus cabezas en el cielo.
Basilio al ayuno llama
«imagen del vivir quieto
del paraíso» y dos alas
Bernardo al ayuno ha puesto:
la justicia y la oración;
y Crisóstomo «alimento
del alma» llamó al ayuno;
y Jerónimo, Ruperto,
«la madre de la salud».

[1842] *Mayolo*: P: *Mayoro*. M, S, R, A: *Mayoto*. The Roman Martyrology does not record a San Mayoro or a San Mayoto. The very full list of saints kept by the Benedictine Monastery of St Augustine in Ramsgate does, though, list a St Majolus (San Mayolo in Spanish), a tenth-century abbot of Cluny, whose brief hagiography is consistent with the suggested life of abstinence (1921, p. 175).

[1851-1852] «*imagen del vivir quieto del paraíso*»: Basil's *De Jejunio Homilia I* contains the following, which might have been the inspiration for Lope's quotation: '[p]er jejunium satisfico Deo. Quin et ipsa *in paradiso vita, jejunii simulacrum est*, non ob id modo quod homo, communi cum angelis vivendi ratione utens, ipsi efficiebatur similis, utpote paucis contentus; verum etiam quod quaecunque post hominum cogitatio commenta est, ea nondum degentibus in paradiso excogitata erant: nondum vini potatio, nondum pecudum mactatio, non alia quae cunque perturbant mentem humanam' (Basil the Great 1857-1866, III (XXXI), p. 167, emphasis added). An English translation can be found in the appendix to Cardinal Pole's *Treatie on Iustification*: '[b]y fasting therefore purge thyself to God. But even the life itself in Paradise is an image of fasting. Not only because man being a companion and fellow dweller with angels did by being content with few things attain to be like unto them, but also because whatsoever things the sharpness and fineness of man's wit did afterward find out, were not yet devised of them that lived in Paradise. For neither the drinking of wine nor the killing of quick and living things, nor aught else that troubleth the mind of man were there as yet then practised' (Basil the Great 1569, fol. 49v).

[1852-1853] *dos alas Bernardo al ayuno ha puesto: la justicia y la oración*: '[s]int ergo jejunio nostro, ut facile coelos penetret, *alae duae, orationis* scilicet atque *justitiae*' (Bernard of Clairvaux 1857-1866, II (183), p. 177, emphasis added), '[l]et our fasting have two wings, then, so that it may penetrate the heavens easily, justice and prayer'.

[1855-1856] *«alimento del alma»*: the quotation is from the first of St John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis 1-17*: '[f]asting is *nourishment for the soul*, you see, and just as bodily nourishment fattens the body, so fasting invigorates the soul, provides it with nimble wings, lifts it on high, enables it to contemplate things that are above, and renders it superior to the pleasures and attractions of this present life' (John Chrysostom 1986, p. 26, emphasis added).

[1858] «*la madre de la salud*»: it is likely that Lope used collections of quotations when compiling erudite lists such as the present one. One such collection – Andre de Resende's 1593 *Sententiarum Memorabilium* – contains, under the heading 'abstinentia', the quotations by St Basil, St Bernard and St John Chrysostom detailed above. It also attibutes the words 'mater sanitatis est abstinentia' to St Jerome, giving his 'Epistola ad Furiam' as the source. (Whilst Jerome's epistle does touch upon the subject of fasting, it does not contain the

RUPERTO Padre, yo estoy satisfecho
de las gracias del ayuno;
ya que sin la cesta quedo,
¡no me prediques, por Dios!
NICOLÁS Un poco estoy indispuesto;
queda con Dios.

Vase [NICOLÁS]

RUPERTO Él te guarde.
Notables desgracias tengo.
¿Por quién jamás ha pasado
tan desdichado suceso?
Algún ángel se lo dijo,
que hablan con él por momentos.
¡Ay, cesta de mis entrañas!
¡Cuál os estará metiendo
debajo de la nariz
aquel estudiante hambriento!
¡Qué vino y pan que llevaba!
¡Qué polla tierna y qué queso!

Sale[n] el PRIOR *y fray* PEREGRINO.

PRIOR ¿Que vive el niño, padre?
PEREGRINO Soy testigo
de ver el niño ya resucitado.
PRIOR ¡Al cielo alabo! ¡A Nicolás bendigo!
PEREGRINO El rostro en tiernas lágrimas bañado,
el suelo está besando Margarita,
de sus dichosas plantas estampado.
La gente de los brazos se le quita,
incrédula de ver que vivir pueda.

---

words attributed to it by Resende.) Line 1857 in P reads 'Jerónimo y Ruperto'. If, rather than naming his *gracioso* friend, Nicolás is indeed referring to another saintly advocate of fasting, then 'Ruperto' might refer to the Roman Catholic apologist St Robert Ballarmine, a contemporary of Lope. Bellarmine wrote about fasting in various works, but these do not appear to contain the phrase that Nicolás attributes to 'Ruperto', making P's reading of this line the less likely.

1863 *un poco estoy indispuesto*: note the sudden shift from a humorous tone to a more serious one, as the discovery of Nicolás's miracles gathers pace and he suffers a decline in health as a consequence of the number and intensity of his intercessory prayers.

1869 *por momentos*: 'sucesiva y continuadamente, sin intermisión en lo que se ejecuta o se espera' (*Aut*).

1876-1885 Lope may be conflating at least two separate miracles here, deliberately or unwittingly. Navarro recounts that Margarita, a woman from Tolentino, gave birth on multiple occasions to stillborn children. Her only child to have been born healthy had died aged eight or nine. Pregnant again and mindful of past misfortunes, Margarita feared this child too would be stillborn. Nicholas learned of Margarita's predicament and felt pity for her. He prayed for her and then informed her that the child with which she was pregnant, a girl, would be born healthy and would live for many years. It happened just as Nicholas said and, from then on, all the babies born to Margarita were born healthy (1612, fols 11^{v}-12^{r} of book II). Monterubbiano's account of Nicholas's dealings with the woman called Margarita is essentially the same ([1326], p. 653), as is Critana's (1612, fol. 18^{r}). Nicholas's intercessions did result in the bringing back to life of several dead children, but not Margarita's; for example, see the account of the resuscitation of Thomas's unbaptized son (Monterubbiano ([1326], p. 660).

RUPERTO ¡Ya Nicolás los muertos resucita!
A verlo voy.

*Vase [*RUPERTO*]*.

PRIOR El cielo me conceda
vida con que su fin alcance.
PEREGRINO Es cosa
que, encarecida, menos alta queda,
padre prior, su vida milagrosa:
sus azotes, su ayuno, su abstinencia,
con su humildad, su caridad piadosa.
A los ciegos da luz y, en mi presencia,
salud ha dado a sordos y a tullidos
y a los que con tiránica violencia
tiene el demonio atados y oprimidos;
……..
y aquí vienen cautivos redimidos.
Decirte de los vicios que se enmiendan
muchas personas es contar las flores
del verde campo.
PRIOR ¡A su valor suspendan
los más altos poetas y oradores
la lira y lengua en alabanza ajena,
que en Nicolás hallamos las mayores,
y en número que vence al mar la arena!

Sale el refitolero, [fray GIL*]*.

GIL *Deo gratias*, padre nuestro.
PRIOR ¿Qué me quiere?
GIL Padre, sepa que estoy con mucha pena;
las once han dado ya; ya no hay que espere;
no se toca a comer porque no hay cosa
y la comunidad de hambre muere.
PRIOR ¿Que no hay cosa ninguna?
GIL Más ociosa
está la mesa que el caballo muerto,
la silla en polvo y en quietud reposa.
PRIOR ¿No hay fruta alguna en este seco huerto?
GIL ¿Qué importa, si no hay pan?
PRIOR Pues, padre, toque;
demos gracias a Dios, sustento cierto,
y su nombre santísimo se invoque.

Sale RUPERTO

RUPERTO Mande su caridad darnos licencia,

[1887] *encarecer*: ‘ponderar con exceso las cosas, alabándolas y engrandeciéndolas’ (*Aut*).
[1895] The middle line of this *terceto* is missing.

y la piadosa causa le provoque
para poder tomar, y a su presencia
traer, lo que ha enviado Margarita,
que no será esta vez contra conciencia;
pagarnos el muchacho solicita
en darnos de comer la nueva Marta,
que Dios por Nicolás le resucita;
pues aunque en ocho días se reparta,
no se podrá comer en su convento.

PRIOR ¡Gracias a Dios! A recebirlo parta,
padre fray Gil.

GIL ¡Yo estoy con gran contento!

[Vase fray GIL*]*

PEREGRINO Padre, quien pone en Dios sus esperanzas,
no le podrá jamás faltar sustento.

PRIOR ¿Dónde está Nicolás?

RUPERTO Estas bonanzas
se pagan todas con que enfermo queda.

PRIOR También a Dios le demos alabanzas.

RUPERTO No hay remedio con él que comer pueda
cosa que le aproveche.

PRIOR A verle entremos.

PEREGRINO Su vida, padre, el cielo nos conceda.

PRIOR Por él vivimos.

RUPERTO Y por él comemos.

Vanse [el PRIOR, *fray* PEREGRINO *y* RUPERTO*] y sale* NICOLÁS.

NICOLÁS Si se aumenta la virtud,
Señor, con la enfermedad,
enfermedades me dad,
que yo no quiero salud;
y si con mayor quietud

[1922] *la nueva Marta*: Martha is the sister of Mary and Lazarus. There are two things that link Margarita to Martha. First, like Margarita's child, Martha's dead brother, Lazarus, was brought back to life by Christ (John 11. 38-44). Second, in contrast to her more contemplative sister Mary, Martha is characterized in the gospels as a woman concerned with practical tasks. Just as here Margarita provides the monastery with desperately needed food, Martha cared for Christ's physical needs when he was a guest in her home (Luke 10. 38-42) and when she served him a meal at Bethany, six days before Passover (John 12. 1-2).

[1932] *también a Dios le demos alabanzas*: the doctrine of the Church is insistent on this point – when miracles are worked through men (including saints) it is God who is using them as instruments; miracles can only properly be ascribed to God and not to saints. Through their prayers the saints act as intermediaries, intercessors between God and mankind and their merits can deserve God's favour (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, X, p. 350). Faced with accusations of idolatry made by some reformers, at Trent the Roman Catholic Church was at pains to clarify the subordinate role of saints in the working of miracles. The twenty-fifth session commanded all bishops and priests to teach that 'the saints [...] offer up their prayers to God for men, that it is good and beneficial suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, assistance and support in order to obtain favors from God through His Son, Jesus Christ Our Lord, who alone is our redeemer and saviour' (*Canons* 1978, p. 218). The same point is emphasized twice in Act 3, at lines 2230 and 2650.

del alma os hablo sin ella,
merezca veros por ella;
a lo menos yo me humillo
como el cordero al cuchillo,
que los simples labios sella.
Mi Dios, yo no quiero vida
más que a vos vivir en mí,
que ésa es vida para mí,
a mis potencias asida;
vos sois vida y tan querida
de mi alma que, sin vos,
no quiero vida, mi Dios,
que ésa es vida solamente
que en unión tan excelente
enlaza y junta a los dos.
¡Ay, mi bien! ¿Quién tiene bien
sin el bien que de vos viene?
Mas ¿qué bien el hombre tiene
que esas manos no le den?
Mis bienes en vos estén,
que sois toda mi riqueza,
mi gloria y mi fortaleza,
y un Dios tan lleno de amor
que, con ser quien sois, Señor,
no despreciáis mi bajeza.
Si tuviere Nicolás
fuera de vos pensamiento,
cese mi vida al momento,
no dure un instante más.
Si me olvidare jamás
de lo que os debo y confío,
que me tratéis con desvío.
Mas vanos recelos son,
siendo vos mi corazón
y teniendo vos el mío.
Juntóme a vos Agustín,
que fue divino tercero
de amor sin fin, verdadero;
que sois Dios y en Dios no hay fin.
El fuego de un serafín
quisiera que me abrasara;
¡quién la cárcel desatara
del alma, aunque vivís dentro,
porque vos solo sois centro
donde mi esperanza para!

[1971] *olvidare*: M, S, R, A *olvidase*. The emendation is unnecessary: this is an example of an 'open' conditional clause using the future subjunctive, which disappeared from normal use only after the eighteenth century (Penny 2002, p. 216).

[1981] *serafín*: a type of celestial being, the six-winged seraph has a name that means 'burning one' and so Nicolás's wish, for his life to be consumed by a seraph's fire, is an apt one.

Sale[n] el PRIOR, *fray* PEREGRINO *y un* MÉDICO JUDÍO *y* RUPERTO.

RUPERTO Aquí está; Dios, Nicolás,
te dé salud.
NICOLÁS ¿Padre amado?
PRIOR Ruperto nos ha contado
que con calentura estás.
Da el pulso al señor dotor.
NICOLÁS Por obedecerle sea.
RUPERTO Pésame que éste le vea;
¿no hallasteis otro mejor?
PEREGRINO En toda Italia es famoso.
RUPERTO No puede ningún judío
hacer cosa buena.
NICOLÁS El mío
es pulso débil.
RUPERTO ¡Qué odioso
es este linaje de hombres
para mí!
MÉDICO El poco sustento

1993-2030 *pésame que éste le vea*: Ruperto's objection to the doctor is founded solely on his being a Jew and he goes on to associate the doctor, by reason of his race, with the betrayal and execution of Christ. Similarly, in Act 3 (lines 2485-2488) Nicolás comments that the Jews set themselves against Christ's innocence and sought his death. This stance is found elsewhere in Lope's theatre, although it is by no means the only attitude to Jews that Lope's characters advance. Considering Lope's *El niño inocente de La Guardia* and its historical context, and in particular Juan Martínez Silíceo's letter to Charles V justifying the now infamous 'estatuto de limpieza de sangre' of Toledo's cathedral chapter, Samson notes, for example, that '[f]or Silíceo the ['martyrdom' of the 'niño santo'] was a repetition and renewal of the death of Christ, an event that the Jews were destined to replay forever. Imitation was a necessary consequence of the notion of the participation of a people in the crimes of their ancestors: the sins of the fathers were the sins of the sons' (2002, p. 111). Clearly, Ruperto agrees; for him, the prescription the doctor signs may as well be Christ's death warrant. Whilst this, along with the blood libel, was a commonplace of early modern anti-Semitism, it is interesting to note that none of the other characters here takes the bait. On the contrary, Peregrino dismisses Ruperto's objection to the doctor, highlighting his great fame, and wonders, perplexed, why Ruperto is staring at the physician. Perhaps, then, Ruperto's anti-Semitic outbursts were intended to rouse only the rabble, the *mosqueteros*. It does seem, though, that only Christian doctors are acceptable to some of Lope's characters. *La Dorotea*'s Don Fernando, often seen as a Lopean alter ego and well-born in contrast to Ruperto, laments the mere mention of the Moorish physician Avicena: '¿[p]or fuerza había de ser moro? ¿No hallaste otro médico?' (p. 286). The circumstances seem to invite the reader to interpret Fernando's words in jest, however. Lida de Malkiel, who studied Jewish characters and attitudes to them in Lope's work (1973), argues that Lope's own private views do not dictate the presentation of Jews in his plays or elsewhere. Rather, she concludes that Lope 'ante todo es dramaturgo' (p. 81) and that the Jewish characters that appear, and the non-Jewish characters that interact with them, obey their own 'internal logic' as fictional characters: 'cada personaje es lo que pide que sea la página de la obra en que aparece' (p. 83). The result is that Lope's literary output is inconsistent and often contradictory in its presentation of Jews and attitudes to them. There is insufficient material in *San Nicolás* to add a great deal to Lida's conclusions, but the evidence that there is does not contradict them: Ruperto is a low-born character and so he expresses the views expected of the *vulgo*. Lope actively chose to provoke the *mosqueteros* in this way, though: whilst a doctor (sometimes several) is mentioned in the hagiographies, his race and religion is not given. See Herskovits 2005 for a recent study of Golden-Age theatre that seeks to demonstrate 'that the image of the Jew in the *comedia* is more open to a positive interpretation that has previously been acknowledged by most critics'. He concludes that 'the negative image of the Jew in the *comedias* analysed was often subverted by irony and ridicule' or by 'allowing the Jew to appear as a sympathetic character' (pp. 13 & 319). In *San Nicolás* the Jewish doctor seems to be presented rather neutrally. It is possible that the silence with which Ruperto's anti-Jewish comments are met suggests an attempt by Lope to marginalize such views.

le debilita; al momento…
NICOLÁS Si es carne, no me la nombres.
MÉDICO ... al momento, asada un ave.
RUPERTO ¿Una perdiz será buena?
MÉDICO Buena.
RUPERTO Pues no tenga pena.

*Vase [*RUPERTO*]*.

PRIOR ¡Presto, Ruperto!
NICOLÁS ¿No sabe,
padre, vuestra caridad,
el voto que tengo hecho?
PRIOR Que no se extiende, sospecho,
el voto en la enfermedad.
NICOLÁS ¡Jesús, padre! ¡Aunque muriera
mil veces...!
PRIOR Por su salud
yo se lo mando en virtud
de la obediencia.
NICOLÁS Quisiera...
PRIOR No hay que querer.

Sale RUPERTO.

RUPERTO ¡Soy un viento!
La perdiz hallé pelada
de Margarita enviada
con otras once al convento.
PRIOR ¿No la puso a asar?
RUPERTO Ya queda
espetándola fray Gil.
PRIOR Bien hizo.
RUPERTO El aire sutil
la ventaja me conceda
en cosas de Nicolás.
MÉDICO ¿Hay papel?
RUPERTO Yo voy por él.

2008 *el voto que tengo hecho*: Critana's hagiography of St Nicholas confirms that the saint did not eat meat (or eggs, lard, milk, cheese, fish or fruit) after his entry into the Augustinian Order (1612, fol. 8r). Abstention from meat-eating was a penitential vow particularly associated with the Hermits of Brettino, one of the groups that became part of the Grand Union of Augustinians in 1256 (Gregorio 2004, p. 8). The Brettini were based in the Marche region of Italy, where Nicholas lived and his spiritual formation was greatly influenced by them. The house where Nicholas professed belonged to the Brettini before the Grand Union.

2017 *de Margarita enviada*: P, M, S, R, A: *que Margarita enviaba.* 'Enviaba' does not rhyme with line 2016's 'pelada'. The line must have been intended to read 'de Margarita enviada', which does rhyme, hence my emendation.

2020 *espetándola*: M, S, R, A *esperándola*; since both readings make good sense, we should prefer P's *espetándola*, which is the *lectio difficilior*.

2024 *él*: P: *ello*. The emendation made by the play's modern editors is adopted here. Unlike P's reading, it fits the *redondilla* rhyme scheme. The unspecific *ello* is not appropriate here; 'él' stands in place of the noun 'papel'.

MÉDICO ¡Volando!
RUPERTO Aquí está el papel.
MÉDICO Esto le darán, no más.
PRIOR Escribe.
MÉDICO *Récipe*…
RUPERTO ¿Ha visto,
padre?
PEREGRINO ¿Qué le está mirando?
RUPERTO Parece que está firmando
en la sentencia de Cristo.
MÉDICO Traigan esto y a la tarde
yo volveré.
PRIOR ¿Qué ha sentido?
MÉDICO Denle a comer.
PEREGRINO ¿No ha querido
decirlo?
PRIOR Dios nos le guarde.
Vaya, Ruperto, a saber
si se asa.
RUPERTO Ya el olor
lo está diciendo mejor.
PEREGRINO Éntrese, padre, a comer,
que está aguardando el convento.
PRIOR Vamos.

Vanse [el PRIOR, *fray* PEREGRINO, *fray* RUPERTO *y el* MÉDICO JUDÍO.*]*

NICOLÁS Mi Dios, ¿qué he de hacer?
Carne tengo de comer;
¿hay más notable tormento?
Virgen, paloma cándida, que al suelo
trajo la verde paz; arco divino
que con las tres colores a dar vino
fe del concierto entre la tierra y cielo.
Dadme remedio, pues sabéis mi celo.
No coma carne yo, porque imagino
que sólo he de comer, puesto que indigno,
la de mi dulce amor en blanco velo.

[2027] *récipe*: the imperative of the Latin verb *recipere*, 'to take', appearing at the start of medical prescriptions, directed the user to gather the necessary ingredients.

[2032] *sentir*: 'juzgar, opinar, formar parecer o dictamen acerca de alguna cosa' (*Aut*).

[2045] *las*: M, S, R, A: *los*. 'Color' was 'masculine in Latin but most usually feminine in Old Spanish, revert[ing] to masculine after the Golden Age' (Penny 2002, p. 125). The rainbow is the sign of the covenant between God and the earth that was sealed following the great flood (Genesis 9. 13). 'El arco iris tiene tres colores en los textos áureos: verde, rojo y pálido o pajizo' (Arellano 2000a, p. 30). As Arellano's entry on 'arco de paz' illustrates, there is no consensus on the symbolism of these colours: green seems to symbolize hope, and red, trust in the blood of Christ's sacrifice, according to lines 565-570 of Calderón's *El divino Jasón*; for St Basil, the fact that there are three colours recalls the Trinity; alternatively, in his 1676 *Teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad*, Fray Baltasar de Vitoria interprets the rainbow as a reminder of the crucified Christ: the yellow is his lifeless body, the green, his bruises, and the red, his blood.

[2050] *la de mi dulce señor en blanco velo*: the Eucharistic body of Christ, which has the form of bread.

No me dejéis, cristífera María,
y vos, mi padre amado, Agustín santo,
y más si llega de mi muerte el día.
Dadme los dos favor, pues podéis tanto,
si mereciere la esperanza mía
que del sol que pisáis pase mi llanto.

San NICOLÁS *se vaya levantando en alto y de arriba vengan abajo hasta él, por las dos partes, la* VIRGEN *y san* AGUSTÍN.

VIRGEN Hijo mío, Nicolás.
NICOLÁS ¿Hermosa Reina del cielo?
AGUSTÍN Honor de mi religión.
NICOLÁS ¿Agustín, padre y maestro?
VIRGEN ¿Por qué estás desconsolado?
NICOLÁS Con este dulce consuelo,
con esta dulce visita,
ningún desconsuelo temo.
VIRGEN Haz, Nicolás, que te den
un panecito pequeño,
a la traza de una forma,
cortina del pan del cielo.
Cómele mojado en agua;
que las calenturas luego
irán huyendo del pan.
NICOLÁS Basta ser vuestro el remedio.
También vos, Señora mía,
como aquel médico eterno,
curáis con pan.
VIRGEN Como a Elías,
te doy con mi pan sustento.
Y porque desta visita
quede memoria en el suelo,

(stage direction before line 2057): *comedias de santos* were famous for the elaborate theatrical effects deployed in their staging. Ruano notes that this scene would require the simultaneous use of three *pescantes*, one for each of the Virgin Mary, Agustín and Nicolás (2000, p. 253). The *pescante* (also called *elevación* or *canal*) was a 'small platform attached to a short upright which moved up and down along a greased groove by means of ropes and pulleys. When used for the ascent or descent of angels, saints, souls, devils and other supernatural creatures, the *canal* was usually covered by a cut-out piece of cardboard painted as a cloud' (Ruano 2008, p. 45, including helpful illustrations).

2057-2104 *panecito*: to this day communities with a strong attachment to Nicholas of Tolentino – such as the towns of Felanitx, Majorca, and Almonacid de la Sierra, Zaragoza – continue to bless and distribute these *panecillos* (Carmona Moreno 2005, pp. 612 & 617).

2067 *forma*: 'el pedacito de pan ácimo u oblea, cortado regularmente en figura circular, en el cual se consagra el cuerpo de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo, para dar la comunión a los fieles, y se le da el nombre de forma, aun después de consagrada' (*Aut*).

2068 *cortina*: 'metafóricamente se toma por cualquier cosa no material que oculta, encubre o disimula a otra' (*Aut*). The 'forma', the bread, is a curtain, a veil covering the bread of heaven in that, once transubstantiation has taken place, the bread is the body of Christ but that body is hidden from human sight beneath the 'form' or accident of bread, according to Catholic eucharistic theology.

2075-2076 *como a Elías, te doy con mi pan sustento*: the prophet Elijah was fed by ravens during the drought that befell Israel as divine punishment for King Ahab's worship of the gods of Baal (III Kings 17. 4). He was also given food by angels (III Kings 19. 5-6).

quiere mi Hijo que el pan
haga a todos buen provecho
y que, bendito en su nombre
y el tuyo, dé a los enfermos
salud, sosiegue los mares
y temple el rigor del fuego.

NICOLÁS Padre Agustín, pues que sois
el más soberano ingenio
que la Iglesia ha conocido,
decidle dulces requiebros,
pagadle aquesta visita,
que soy ignorante.

AGUSTÍN Pienso,
Nicolás, que tú, ni yo,
ni los ángeles podremos.
En fin, tú tendrás salud
con médico tan excelso,
que le trajo en sus entrañas
para todo el mundo enfermo.
Importa a mi religión
que vivas.

NICOLÁS Si vivo quedo,
llevándome el alma allá,
que se va tras los deseos
—¡quién fuera luna en los pies
más que los ángeles bellos!—
padre Agustín, bendecidme;
¡ay Dios, quién fuera con ellos!

Vase bajando san NICOLÁS, *ellos suban y sale* RUPERTO *con una mesilla.*

RUPERTO Ea, padre, que ya viene
la perdiz.

NICOLÁS Vaya, Ruperto,
y de un poquito de harina
haga un panecito luego,
y cuézamele en las brasas.

RUPERTO Si es antojo, voy corriendo.

[Vase RUPERTO *y] [s]ale[n] el* PRIOR *y fray* PEREGRINO.

PEREGRINO Aunque en virtud de obediencia
se lo ha mandado, sospecho
que importa que esté delante.

PRIOR Padre Nicolás, ¿qué es esto?

2101-2102 *¡quién fuera luna en los pies...!*: images of the Virgin Mary often show her standing on a crescent moon. See, for example, El Greco's 1577 *Asunción de la Virgen*. Christian tradition associates the 'woman' of Revelation 12 as Mary. She is described standing on the moon: '[m]ulier amicta sole et luna sub pedibus eius, et in capite eius corona stellarum duodecim', 'a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars'.

¿Cómo va? ¿Qué siente agora?
NICOLÁS Padre, calentura tengo,
pero espero en Dios que agora
tendrá templanza su fuego.

Sale[n] RUPERTO *y fray* GIL *con una perdiz en un plato.*

RUPERTO Ya, padre, su panecito
queda fray Ángel cociendo,
porque estaba el horno a punto
para entrar los del convento.
GIL Aquí tiene la perdiz...
PEREGRINO Muestre, fray Gil.
GIL …y sospecho
que puede sólo el olor
abrirle la gana a un muerto.
Mire, padre, ¡qué limón!
Ea, ¿qué aguarda?
PRIOR De presto,
padre Nicolás, que yo
a ver si la come vengo.
RUPERTO Ea, padre, esa pechuga,
¿hay manjar blanco más tierno?
En quitándole la carne
me pienso comer los huesos.
Ea, ¿qué le está mirando?
Que me retoza acá dentro
una hambre, ¡que la como
por las narices!
NICOLÁS ¿Qué? ¿Puedo
pensarlo no más?
PRIOR Ya sabe
que la obediencia es más cierto
sacrificio.
NICOLÁS Bendicirla
antes de comerla quiero.
Ave de Dios, Dios bendiga
tu carne… ¡cúbrete presto
de tus plumas!
PRIOR ¡Levantóse
y sobre el plato se ha puesto!

2120 *fray Ángel*: P's *dramatis personae* list gives 'Fray Ángel', which is the name given here. However, line 3067 gives 'Ángelo'. The inconsistency is not easily resolved. Changing 'Ángel' to 'Ángelo' here would make line 2120 hypersyllabic, whereas 'Ángel' (rather than 'Ángelo) at line 3067 would interrupt the á-o *romance* assonance. So this inconsistency must remain unresolved.

2147 *¿No estaba asada? ¡Y partida!*: live birds were sometimes used on the *comedia* stage. They are required, for example, by the stage directions in Ana Caro's *El conde Partinuplés*: 'al tomarla [la fuente] ábrela y salen cuatro o seis pájaros vivos della'. Where live birds were not used, mechanical ones or puppets could be deployed instead (Ruano 2000, p. 289). Either way, the miracle that provides the climax to the action of Act 2 would have been intended to surprise and impress the spectator. Iturbe Sáiz claims that, in Spain, the resuscitation of the partridge is one of the most popular of St Nicholas's miracles, to judge from the saint's

PEREGRINO ¿No estaba asada?
RUPERTO ¡Y partida!
NICOLÁS ¡Bendígate Dios, que has hecho
que le alaben estos padres!
GIL ¡Mis propios ojos no creo;
yo la asé con estas manos!
NICOLÁS ¿Hay coral más rojo y bello
que tiene los pies y el pico?
Pues tienes pico, te ruego
que alabes a Dios, perdiz.
RUPERTO ¡Yo le alabara comiendo
sus pechugas!
NICOLÁS Padre, vaya
por el panecito luego.
RUPERTO Voy.

[Vase RUPERTO.*]*

PRIOR Pues, ¿qué es esto, padre?
NICOLÁS Después sabrán cuánto debo
a un médico celestial.
PRIOR Padre Nicolás, yo veo
que aquí vive sin salud;
mudarle a otra parte quiero;
bien estará en Villacanes
o en Tolentino.

Sale RUPERTO.

RUPERTO Yo pienso
que, estando viva la carne,
no será el pan de provecho.
[NICOLÁS] Muestre y deme el vaso de agua.
RUPERTO Tome.
NICOLÁS Aquí mojarle quiero.
GIL ¿Para qué come aquel pan?
RUPERTO ¡Zampóselo todo entero!
NICOLÁS Padres, ya tengo salud;
que de la Reina del cielo
es aquesta medicina.
Vengan y diréles luego
los misterios deste pan.
PRIOR Toda tu vida es misterios.
RUPERTO Yo llevaré la perdiz
y a fe, que si os tuerzo el cuello,
que no os levantéis del plato.
GIL Guárdela, padre…
RUPERTO ¡En el pecho!

Spanish iconography (2006, p. 123). The miracle enabled Nicolás simultaneously to keep his vow of obedience and to observe his ascetically motivated vegetarianism.

GIL ¿No ve que es milagro?
RUPERTO Sí,
pero aunque el milagro veo,
¡por Dios, que me ha de decir
culchuchú dentro del cuerpo!

[2183] *¿No ves que fue milagro?*: despite the resuscitation of the partridge being miraculous, Ruperto would like nothing better than to eat it up. This attitude is typical of Lope's saint's play *graciosos*. Dassbach notes: '[c]on frecuencia en las comedias de santos se observa que los graciosos perciben sucesos sobrenaturales, como milagros o intervenciones del demonio, como algo natural y que no les produce asombro [...]. El gracioso, pues, parece reflejar las creencias del vulgo, siempre presto a aceptar lo sobrenatural sin ningún tipo de duda' (1997, p. 148). Later, faced with another miracle, when Nicolás gets water from a stone, Ruperto will adopt the same attitude, requesting that his master procure from God 'un licor más puro' (l. 2663).

ACTO TERCERO

Salen fray PEREGRINO *y un* SECRETARIO.

PEREGRINO Con poca salud llegué
a la gran ciudad de Roma,
que reina del mundo fue,
la que siete montes doma
las cabezas con su pie.
A negocios he venido
de mi convento.
SECRETARIO Habrá sido
del camino la inquietud
causa de haber la salud
por la distancia perdido.
No sé si ha sido prudencia
venir a pie.
PEREGRINO La obediencia
es la prudencia mayor.
SECRETARIO Sin duda, y donde mejor
se ejercita la paciencia.
PEREGRINO ¿Cómo está su señoría
del cardenal?
SECRETARIO Bueno está.
PEREGRINO Yo he llegado en santo día.
SECRETARIO Hoy el sudario verá
desde la sagrada vía.

2190 *la que siete montes doma*: M, S, R, A: *la que a siete montes doma.* The modern editors of *San Nicolás* have added the preposition *a*, perhaps to clarify that the 'siete montes' are the object of the verb. The fact that the verb is singular, though, renders this unnecessary. Even if there were potential for ambiguity, Keniston notes that, in the sixteenth century, 'before nouns or pronouns referring to indefinite persons or to things, the use of *a* is rare' (p. 8). P's reading has been preserved.

2202-2203 *su señoría del cardenal*: M, S, R, A: *su señoría el cardenal*. 'Instead of a noun in apposition, the preposition *de* is often used [in the sixteenth century] to connect the name of a definite person, particularly a proper name, with the noun' (Keniston 1937, p. 39). Keniston gives several examples, including 'el diablo del toro' from *Lazarillo de Tormes*.

2205 *el sudario*: Covarrubias offers three definitions: (i) 'el lienzo con que nos limpiamos el sudor del rostro'; (ii) 'la sábana o lienzo con que José [de Arimatea] cubrió el cuerpo de Cristo cuando le bajó de la cruz'; and (iii) 'el lienzo que se pone sobre el rostro de los difuntos'. There are historical relics corresponding to each of these descriptions. In the first place there is the cloth Veronica used to wipe the sweat from Christ's face as he carried the cross along the Via Dolosora, known as the Veil of Veronica. Second, there is the full-size burial cloth known as the Turin Shroud. Third there is the smaller cloth used to cover Christ's face when he was taken down from the cross, kept at Oviedo Cathedral. Later, at lines 2277-2281, Peregrino explains that Christ's dead body was wrapped in the 'sudario', which detail suggests that the Turin Shroud is the item in question. A replica would have been made for the staging of this scene. Such an item was included in the *memoria de demasías* that

PEREGRINO Si de aquesta enfermedad
mi fin determina el cielo,
será del cielo piedad,
y para mí de consuelo,
morir en esta ciudad.
¿Cuándo muestran el sudario?
SECRETARIO Agora, y es necesario
tomar decente lugar
para poderle adorar,
porque es el concurso vario.
PEREGRINO Pues aquí estaremos bien.
SECRETARIO Cuénteme de Nicolás
entretanto que le ven
mis ojos.
PEREGRINO Diciendo más
se dice menos también.
Basta saber que le aclaman
por santo y la voz derraman
los pueblos de que lo es tanto
que, con estar vivo, «el santo
de los milagros» le llaman.
No se sabe que jamás
cosa nadie le pidiese
sin hacerla Nicolás,
digo, Dios por él.

Salen FABIA *y* LAURENCIA.

FABIA Si viese
tanto bien, no quiero más.
LAURENCIA Aquí dicen que se muestra.
FABIA Será gran ventura nuestra
si le alcanzamos a ver.

Salen TEODORO *y* LUDOVICO.

---

listed the props required for the Calderón *autos* to be performed in 1662: 'una túnica de lienzo con su rostro de muerte' (Escudero and Zafra 2003, p. 72).

[2210] *para mí de consuelo*: M, S, R, A: *para mí desconsuelo*. It makes little sense for Peregrino to consider an act of divine mercy a matter for his 'desconsuelo'. Rather, to die in the capital of the Christian world would be a great consolation for him. He welcomes the prospect of death: see lines 2274-2276.

[2216] *concurso vario*: the suggestion is that Peregrino and the Secretario will need to contend with large crowds. The phrase is used with the same meaning in Lope's *El niño inocente de La Guardia*, when Juanico's mother explains how she and her husband lost sight of him: '[e]ntrado en el templo habemos, | en cuyo concurso vario | le perdimos' (ll. 1333-1335).

[2218] *cuénteme*: P: *cuéntame*. In line 2205 the Secretario used the formal 'verá' when addressing Peregrino, so the correction made for the sake of consistency by M, S, R, A is adopted here.

[2219] *entretanto*: 'mientras, ínterin o durante algún tiempo intermedio' (*Aut* 1884). The Secretario asks Peregrino to tell him about Nicolás whilst he venerates the image of Christ on the 'sudario', to which the 'le', a direct object pronoun here, must refer. Peregrino's brief account of Nicolás's holiness, given with the spectator's eyes fixed on the holy relic, might suggest a connection between Jesus and the hero of our play. The parallel between Nicolás and Christ is amplified in the next scene, beginning at line 2297.

[2230] *digo, Dios por él*: see note to line 1932, on the subordinate role of saints in the working of miracles.

TEODORO Si al balcón se han de poner,
tomemos la mano diestra.
LUDOVICO Por aquí pienso, Teodoro,
que le veremos mejor.
TEODORO Siempre desde aquí le adoro.
LUDOVICO Prenda de tanto valor
requiere tan gran decoro.

Tócanse chirimías y se corra una cortina, y se vean dos cardenales teniendo el santo sudario y dos estudiantes con sobrepellices y dos hachas.

PEREGRINO Ésta es la sábana santa,
adonde impresa quedó
esta imagen sacrosanta.
SECRETARIO Que es retrato pienso yo.
PEREGRINO ¡Oh, cuánto al alma levanta
a la consideración
de su sagrada pasión!
FABIA ¿Hay más tesoro en la tierra?
LAURENCIA Ya la cortina se cierra.
FABIA Del cielo también lo son.

Ciérrense con música.

TEODORO No hay más que ver, Ludovico.
LUDOVICO Dichoso quien ver merece
tesoro tan alto y rico.
TEODORO El alma se me enternece
si al muerto Cristo la aplico.
FABIA La coluna y el pesebre
mucho me mueven, Laurencia,
y es bien que los dos celebre;
mas de Cristo la presencia
no hay corazón que no quiebre;
digo presencia, el retrato
que en la sábana se ve.
LAURENCIA ¡Qué breve aunque dulce rato!
FABIA Parece que el tiempo fue

[2237] This line is hypersyllabic unless the *eo* of 'Teodoro' is pronounced as a diphthong.

(stage direction before line 2242): *se corra una cortina, y se vean dos cardenales... con... dos hachas*: the reference to a curtain suggests that the exposition of the shroud would take place within the discovery space, at the back of the stage (or on one of the balconies) with the inner audience facing towards it on the main stage. The shroud would be hidden from view until the opportune moment, when the curtains would be opened. Scenes to be staged in the discovery space often required the presence of torches because, without their light, it could be difficult for the audience to see into this shadowy area (see Ruano 2000, p. 266).

[2251] *son*: the intended subject here must be 'cortinas', even though only the singular, 'cortina', is given before. The stage direction confirms this, with its plural 'ciérrense', whose implied subject is also 'cortinas'. The singular 'cortina' is used in line 2250 to ensure the correct rhyme between 'tierra' and the singular verb 'cierra'.

[2257] *la coluna y el pesebre*: the column of the Flagellation of Christ and the manger of the Nativity.

[2259] *las dos*: presumbaly, *las dos cosas*.

con nuestros ojos ingrato.

*Vanse [*FABIA, LAURENCIA, LUDOVICO *y* TEODORO*]*.

PEREGRINO Aunque el ver reliquia igual
me pudiera dar salud,
pienso que crece mi mal;
y ha sido mayor virtud,
y fuerza más celestial,
porque yo no la pedí,
que, antes, le dije entre mí
me llevase a ver el dueño;
y no será bien pequeño,
sino el mayor para mí.
[*Aparte*] Dulce Señor, que, quitado
de la cruz, envuelto fuistes
en este lienzo sagrado,
donde con sangre esculpistes
vuestro cuerpo delicado,
si llega mi postrer día,
dadme, por vuestra pasión,
la mano que al cielo guía.
SECRETARIO Padre, en aquesta ocasión
es vuestra casa la mía.
En ella os quiero curar;
que Dios os dará salud.
PEREGRINO Poco la puedo ocupar,
y pues sé vuestra virtud,
la quiero y debo aceptar.
SECRETARIO Vamos, pues, que en esto os muestro
la igualdad del amor nuestro.
PEREGRINO [*Aparte*] Si es ya llegado mi fin,
favoreced, Agustín,
un peregrino, hijo vuestro.

[2278] *fuistes*: the *vos* form of the verb *ser* in the Old Spanish preterite, which later evolved into the modern *fuisteis* (Penny 2002, p. 161). Elsewhere in *San Nicolás de Tolentino* the modern form is used. In this respect as in others linguistic usage is inconsistent.

Vanse [fray PEREGRINO *y el* SECRETARIO*], y sale* NICOLÁS *con un hábito, aguja y hilo.*

NICOLÁS
Mientras tenemos lugar,
y nos le da la obediencia,
a quien habéis de imitar,
túnica, prestad paciencia,
que os hemos de remendar.
Asentémonos aquí
y este remiendo os pondremos;
que yo os prometo que ansí
mejor el año pasemos
—¡que os reís mucho de mí!—,
aunque de veros, recelo,
abierta por mi consuelo,
que hacéis en vos celosías
para que las carnes mías
acechen por vos el cielo.
Téngase el príncipe allá
telas que pueda vestir,
y vos remendaos acá,
que dellas se ha de morir
a la mortaja que va.
Aora bien, ellos reposen,
pues Dios les hace merced
de que nunca se descosen;
cantemos, porque sabed

(stage direction before line 2297): *sale Nicolás con un hábito*: the habit Nicolás will repair in this scene is a visual reminder of Christ's 'sudario', seen at the start of this act, and, as such, would tend to reinforce the connection between Nicolás and Jesus. That could explain the otherwise seemingly arbitrary inclusion of the 'sudario'. Whilst the hagiographies do narrate an episode during which the devil attacks Nicholas as he mends his habit (see, for example, Navarro 1612, fols 84ᵛ-85ᵛ), there is no reference to Christ's shroud. As Thompson notes, baroque hagiographies often sought to establish 'parallels between the lives of saints and the life of Christ' (2002, p. 25) and, in this hagiographical play, Lope appears to be emulating this tradition. The deteriorated state of the habit is a reminder of the saint's avowed poverty. The worn habit is also a recognized memento of the fleetingness of life. Quevedo, in his 'Sueño del Infierno', for example, lists 'vestido que se gasta' as one everyday item that reminds us of death (1993, p. 226). This reminder of the nearness of death is apposite here at the start of this Act 3, which will see Nicolás ail and finally succumb. Clothing features prominently in *San Nicolás de Tolentino* and it is endowed with powerful symbolism, particularly at moments of transition and transformation. In Act 1 Nicolás's Christian charity was demonstrated by the gift of the cloak he offered to the pilgrim. In Act 2 the saint's new status as an Augustinian religious is made visible to the spectator by his black habit. And towards the end of this Act 3, Nicolás's apotheosis will be foreshadowed by the angels' gift of a new habit covered with stars.

2300 *túnica, prestad paciencia*: Nicolás addresses his giggling tunic directly on several occasions in this scene. This portrayal of the saint, in the intimacy of his cell, is more obviously sympathetic than the one Lope offers at the start of Act 1. Here, Lope's characterization of Nicolás seems in tune with the hagiographic model of the *santo bobo*: simple, humble, pure-hearted saints such as Isidro de Madrid or Diego de Alcalá, both heroes of Lope saints' plays. Diego also addresses an inanimate part of God's creation: as he picks a flower and begs its forgiveness, '[p]erdonad, lirio' (Vega, *San Diego de Alcalá*, l. 297). In her article on manual labour in three Lope saints' plays, Sinouet reminds us how the devil is said to make work for idle hands. She suggests Nicolás's busyness could be a deliberate tactic intended to distract his mind from demonic temptation (2005, p. 5).

2307 The most meaningful reading would seem to be: 'aunque de veros abierta, recelo que, por mi consuelo, hacéis en vos celosías para que las carnes mías acechen por vos el cielo'.

que han de cantar los que cosen.

Uno es uno,
mas que no lo entiende ninguno.

La Música, dentro:

MÚSICA *Uno es uno,*
mas que no lo entiende ninguno.
NICOLÁS *Dos son dos,*
mas que no lo entendéis vos.
MÚSICA *Dos son dos,*
mas que no lo entendéis vos.
NICOLÁS *Tres son tres,*
apostad que no lo entendéis.
MÚSICA *Tres son tres,*
apostad que no lo entendéis.

NICOLÁS Uno es uno que contiene
a los tres, aunque uno es;
pero como es uno, es tres,
y con tres uno conviene;
y, como una esencia tiene
a tres personas distintas,
y, en un lazo de tres cintas,
el principio sólo es uno.

MÚSICA *Uno es uno,*
mas que no lo entiende ninguno.

NICOLÁS ¿Cómo es el Padre increado,
y de ninguno procede?

2322 *uno es uno* etc.: this song about the Trinity almost certainly pre-dates the composition of *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. It appears in a sixteenth-century manuscript held by the Hispanic Society of America (B 2476, fol. 95v). In addition, the first couplet has been found in two other documents: (i) the *Cancionero de Fuenmayor*, dated between 1560 and 1600; and (ii) *Poética silva* (a manuscript discovered by Bartolomé José Gallardo, I, col. 1062). Finally, the couplet – 'Tres son tres, / apostad que no lo entendéis' – appears in González de Eslava's *Coloquios espirituales y sacramentales y canciones divinas* (Mexico, 1610) (Alín and Barrio Alonso 1997, p. 120). The Holy Trinity is one of the ineffable mysteries of the Christian faith: 'solamente se puede conocer por revelación [...]. [L]a razón natural, aun después de la revelación divina, no puede alcanzar evidencia intrínseca del dogma trinitario [...]. Es, pues, suprarracional, pero no irracional' (Arellano 2000a, p. 219), or in Nicolás's own words, at line 2361: 'sólo para Dios es'.

(stage direction before line 2324) *La Música*: below, at lines 2370-2373, the devil identifies as angels the singers that are here labelled 'La Música'. 'Ángeles en las comedias de santos [...] intervienen a veces cantando. El objetivo es claramente situarlos en un plano diferente de la realidad escénica' (Ruano 2000, p. 118).

2334-2363 This section is made up of three strophes. Each begins as a décima (i.e. abbaaccd...), but then, rather than ending with the expected dc rhyme, the *estribillo* of the preceding song is added, with the rhyme dd (to give abbaaccddd). Also, the penultimate line of each strophe is clearly hyposyllabic and ll. 2342 and 2362 are hypersyllabic.

2340 *lazo*: P, M, S, R, A: *lado*. A single plait or knot formed by three interwoven ribbons, perhaps in the form of the traditional triquetra, works as a symbol of the Trinity; a 'side' with three ribbons seems to make little sense.

¿Y cómo el Hijo ser puede
eternamente engendrado?
¿Cómo le ha comunicado
por generación su esencia,
y desta correspondencia
sale aquel amor que es Dios?

MÚSICA *Dos son dos,*
mas que no lo entendéis vos.

NICOLÁS Piérdese el ángel de vista;
de la esencia en la unidad
como la pluralidad
de las personas asista;
y, que esta unidad consista
en la Trinidad, es cosa
tan alta y dificultosa
que sólo para Dios es.

MÚSICA *Tres son tres,*
apostad que no lo entendéis.

NICOLÁS Y MÚSICA *Uno es uno,*
mas que no lo entiende ninguno.
Dos son dos,
mas que no lo entendéis vos.
Tres son tres,
apostad que no lo entendéis.

Sale el DEMONIO.

DEMONIO [*Aparte*] ¿Qué música es ésta, cielos?
¿A un hombre que se remienda
los ángeles le entretienen
con música? ¿Hay más que vea?

NICOLÁS Ya, pues habemos cantado,
sabed, mi túnica vieja,
que os quiero contar un cuento;
pero habéis de estar atenta.

2344-2351 There are echoes here of the Nicene Creed, which dates from the fourth century (aside from the 'filioque clause' added in the sixth century). The Creed expresses the Church's Trinitarian doctrine: the Father exists from all eternity and the Son is 'eternamente engendrado', 'ex Patre natum ante omnia saecula'; the Father has 'comunicado [...] su esencia' to the Son, 'consubstantialem Patri'; the Holy Spirit, 'aquel Amor', proceeds from the Father and the Son, 'ex Patre Filioque procedit', from their mutual love, their 'correspondencia'. These echoes are repeated in lines 2386-2388 below.

2370 *cielos*: it is with an irony characteristic of the devil in Lope's religious drama that the Demonio here invokes heaven.

2373 *¿hay más que vea?*: a common construction in Lope's drama, equivalent to '¿hay más que ver?' in modern Spanish. Here it expresses the devil's incredulity.

2374 *habemos*: *habemos* and *hemos* were both frequent for the first-person plural form of the verb *haber* when it had auxiliary function (Penny 2002, p. 194).

Érase que era después
el que será, el que es y el que era...
—¡mirad si le viene bien
decirle érase que se era!,
y también, bien le vendrá,
que el bien para todos sea,
que es bien que todos gocemos
el bien de la vida eterna—
era un Dios y tres personas:
el Padre, que al Hijo engendra,
y el que procede de entrambos.

DEMONIO ¡Ved las cosas que le cuenta!

NICOLÁS Sabed, pues, túnica mía,
que Dios tenía una huerta,
donde puso al primer hombre.

DEMONIO Bien el cuento se me acuerda.

NICOLÁS Mandóle que no comiese
de un árbol; su mujer, Eva
— era mujer, en efeto,
desde entonces son ligeras...
¡No os riáis! Oíd la historia.

DEMONIO ¿Quién ha de tener paciencia
para oír cuento tan viejo?

NICOLÁS Andábase una culebra
por el paraíso entonces,
entre las flores y hierbas.
Ésta —¿quién pensáis que fue?—
fue una luz más que el sol bella,
que quiso igualarse a Dios;
mas costóle la soberbia
echarle a palos del cielo
otra luz de mayor fuerza.
Éste es un grande bellaco...

DEMONIO ¡Bien me trata!

NICOLÁS ... y cuya fiera
envidia de ver que el hombre
se viese en tanta grandeza…

2378 *érase que se era*: M, S, R, A: *erase que fuera*. Nicolás is suggesting that this formula, often found at the start of fairy-tales and equivalent to the English 'once upon a time', is highly inappropriate when the subject of his 'cuento' is the living, eternal God, since the formula functions by immediately transporting the reader or listener back to a fictional past. Nicolás's adaptation of the formula is intended to avoid heresy by clarifying that the God that was, once upon a time, still is and ever shall be.

2394 *mandóle que no comiese de un árbol*: Genesis 2. 17.

2398 *¡no os riáis!*: interestingly, the (presumably imagined) response of the 'túnica' to Nicolás's comment about woman's inconstancy – a ubiquitous topos of Golden-Age literature – suggests that such misogynistic opinions were typically meant to elicit laughter.

2405 *fue una luz más que el sol bella*: another reference to Lucifer, the Morning Star, who, according to traditional interpretations of Isaiah and Revelation, was expelled from heaven by the Archangel Michael. The 'otra luz de mayor fuerza' could refer to St Michael or perhaps God.

2412-2413 *envidia de ver que el hombre se viese en tanta grandeza*: one traditional interpretation has it that the devil was expelled from heaven because of the sin of pride.

DEMONIO Pues ¿no he de tener envidia?
NICOLÁS ... engañó la mujer, y ella
al hombre, y comiendo pierden
la justicia y la inocencia.
Enojado estuvo Dios
larga edad contra la tierra,
mas, prometiendo a Abraham
que, en fin, de su descendencia
saldría el remedio al mundo,
en su consejo decreta
que el Verbo tomase carne.
¿No es linda historia? ¿No es buena?
DEMONIO ¡No fue para mí muy linda,
pues tanta pena me cuesta!
NICOLÁS Érase una doncellita,
natural de Galilea,
de una ciudad que se llama
Nazaret.
DEMONIO ¡Si trata de ella,
taparéme los oídos!
NICOLÁS Oíd, túnica, que es ésta
la que a la sierpe que os dije
le quebrantó la cabeza.
Era tan honesta y pura
que, enamorándose della
el mismo Dios…
DEMONIO ¿Esto sufro?
¡Con qué flema me atormenta!
NICOLÁS ... envióle con un ángel
un recaudo, y ella, honesta,
dijo que sí, y dijo bien,
pues los cielos le celebran
y fue de los hombres vida.
DEMONIO ¿Y mi muerte, no dijeras?
NICOLÁS Parió, túnica, esta niña,
quedando virgen y entera,
un niño, un hombre y un Dios;
que estas dos naturalezas
se juntaron en su claustro.
Hubo entonces grandes fiestas
de reyes y de pastores;
pero nunca falta en ellas

2421-2422 *en fin de su descendencia saldría el remedio al mundo*: Jesus, the Messiah, is the *remedio del mundo*. The account of Jesus's genealogy at the very start of Matthew's Gospel begins with Abraham. God promised Abraham: 'in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed' (Genesis 22.18). St Paul interprets this singular 'seed' as Christ: '[t]o Abraham were the promises made and to his seed. He saith not, And to his seeds, as of many: but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ' (Galatians 3.16).

2433-2435 *es ésta la que a la sierpe que os dije le quebrantó la cabeza*: see note to lines 460-463.

2440-2441 *envióle con un ángel un recaudo* etc.: Luke 1. 28-38.

2450 *claustro*: 'figuradamente el seno o vientre que en sí contiene o encierra alguna cosa' (*Aut*).

algún malintencionado
que las perturbe y revuelva.
Huyó este niño bendito,
deste coco, a las riberas
del Nilo; mas, de diez años,
volvió a vivir a su tierra.
A los doce era letrado,
que la ley y los profetas
allá en el templo enseñaba;
pero, ¿qué mucho, si era
catedrático de prima
de la celestial escuela,
sabiendo desde el instante
de su concepción las letras
que sabe Dios como Dios?

DEMONIO ¡Que aun este fraile no sepa
estar ocioso un instante
que la túnica remienda!
¿Hay tal pureza de vida?

NICOLÁS Túnica, a la fe, que llega
el cuento a tal ocasión
que podéis prestar paciencia.
Desde doce hasta treinta años,
no tenemos quién refiera
lo que hizo este Señor;
pero, en cumpliendo los treinta,
un águila, un león, un toro

[2457] *este coco*: 'en lenguaje de los niños vale figura que causa espanto y ninguna tanto como las que están a lo oscuro o muestran color negro' (Covarrubias), for example, Lazarillo's ugly, black step-father, who is famously called a 'coco' by Lazarillo's half-brother in the first treatise of his *Vida* (*La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* 2011, p. 93). Here, the 'coco malintencionado' must be Herod the Great, one of the Gospels' leading villains, who ordered the massacre of the Holy Innocents, causing the Holy Family to flee to Egypt (Matthew 2. 16-23).

[2461] *que la ley y los profetas*: M, S, R, A: *que la ley, á los Profetas*. This is a misleading emendation: those whom the twelve-year-old Christ taught in the Temple were not prophets but learned men, 'doctores' in the Vulgate (Luke 2. 42-50). 'La ley y los profetas' refers, rather, to the subject of Jesus's teaching. It is a common phrase in the New Testament that refers to the Hebrew Scriptures (Harrington 1991, p. 81); for example, according to Matthew's Gospel, Christ warned the crowds during his Sermon on the Mount: 'nolite putare quoniam veni solvere legem, aut prophetas: non veni solvere, sed adimplere', '[d]o not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil' (5.17).

[2464] *catedrático de prima*: the *cátedra de prima* was usually occupied by the most prestigious scholar in the faculty. It was the chair of choice, since its occupant would give his classes first thing in the morning, when he and his students would, in theory, feel wide awake and refreshed. Jesus is described as the 'catedrático de prima' because he, God, being omniscient, is obviously the indisputable expert in 'the law and the prophets' (and everything else). In Calderón's *El mágico prodigioso* the Demonio alludes obliquely to his failed attempt to rebel against God when he tells Cipriano that 'a la cátedra de prima | me opuse' (ll. 149-150).

[2469-2470] *que aun... no sepa estar ocioso un instante*: the devil's objection here supports Sinouet's contention that he wants Nicolás to be idle so as better to be able to tempt him (see note to line 2300).

[2476] *desde doce hasta treinta años*: the account of Jesus's life contained in the Gospels includes this hiatus between the episode where Christ taught at the Temple in Jerusalem aged twelve (Luke 2. 42-50) and the start of his ministry, when he was about thirty years old (Luke 3. 23).

[2480] This line is hypersyllabic unless the *eo* of 'león' is pronounced as a diphthong.

y un ángel, con plumas bellas,
de sus sermones y hazañas
escriben cosas que elevan.
La Envidia, por quien la Muerte
entró en el mundo, tan fiera
se metió en unos judíos
contra su pura inocencia,
que trazaron de matarle;
y luego le puso en venta
un despensero bellaco;
sisador y aun ladrón era.
Y bien lo podéis creer,
túnica, por cosa cierta,
pues dice san Juan que fue
«*fur, et loculos habebat*».
Dióle a dinero por año,
quitando tres, pues son treinta.
Prendiéronle los traidores,
y a la muerte le sentencian.
Aquí, túnica, llorad;
lloremos, pues estáis tierna
de traída.

DEMONIO ¡Qué notables
burlas! ¡Qué divinas veras!

Sale RUPERTO.

RUPERTO ¿Cómo le había de hallar,
padre, si se esconde así?

NICOLÁS ¿Es algo que importe?

RUPERTO Sí;
de coser puede dejar

2480-2481 *un águila, un león, un toro y un ángel*: the symbols of, respectively, John, Mark, Luke and Matthew, the Four Evangelists. These symbols have their origins in Ezekiel 1. 10 and Revelation 4. 7. Each is usually depicted with angelic wings. The 'plumas bellas' refer, then, simultaneously to the feathers of their wings and to the quills with which they wrote the Gospels.

2484-2485 *la Envidia, por quien la Muerte entró en el mundo*: envy caused Cain to commit the first murder when he killed his brother Abel. He was envious of Abel because God had approved of Abel's sacrifice of the firstlings of his flock, but had spurned Cain's own sacrifice of the fruit of the ground (Genesis 4. 1-16).

2490-2491 *un despensero bellaco, sisador y aun ladrón era*: Judas Iscariot was the disciple charged with keeping the common purse, the 'loculos' of the Vulgate (John 13. 29). *Autoridades* defines 'sisar' as 'tomar o quitar de lo que se compra o se gasta alguna pequeña parte'. See the note to line 2494-2495 for the source of the allegation that Judas was a thief.

2494-2495 *dice san Juan que fue «fur, et loculos habebat»*: when Jesus was the guest of Lazarus, Mary and Martha in Bethany (see note to line 1922 above), Mary anointed him with a whole jar of precious perfume. Judas objected that this was a waste and that the perfume should be sold and the proceeds given to the poor. John the Evangelist writes '[d]ixit autem hoc, non quia de egenis pertinebat ad eum, sed quia fur erat, et loculos habens, ea quae mittebantur, portabat', '[n]ow he said this, not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief and, having the purse, carried the things that were put therein' (John 12. 6). This line of Latin fits the metre and assonance of this section of *romance*, if read in accordance with the rules of Castilian prosody.

2496-2497 *dióle a dinero por año, quitando tres, pues son treinta*: according to Christian tradition, Jesus was thirty-three when he was crucified. Judas betrayed him for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26. 15). So, Judas was paid one piece of silver for each year of Christ's life, subtracting three.

porque le llama el prior.
NICOLÁS Pues, paro; [*a la túnica*] quedaos un rato
mientras vuelvo.
RUPERTO Fuera ingrato,
padre, al general amor
que este convento le tiene,
si en esta fuerte ocasión
no hiciera con su oración
—pues el bien por ella viene—
que Dios la sed remediara
que aquesta casa padece.
NICOLÁS Ya sé que la falta crece.
RUPERTO Pues, pídale a Dios la vara
con que hirió el santo Moisés
la piedra de Rafidín.
NICOLÁS Vamos al prior.
RUPERTO En fin,
¿qué dice?
NICOLÁS Que Dios lo es.

*Vanse [*NICOLÁS *y* RUPERTO*]*.

DEMONIO ¿Que me traiga este fraile sin sentido,
y que viva tan cándida paloma
con plumas negras de Agustín, que ha sido
quien a su cargo su defensa toma…?
¡Pues no tengo de darme por vencido
hasta que suba a la triunfante Roma!
¡Cómo me vengaré de lo que ha hecho!
¡Con qué de envidia se me abrasa el pecho!
Hurtarle quiero el paño que cosía;
¡mas qué bajeza y justo desconsuelo
para un ladrón que quiso hurtar un día
la gloria a Dios y la hermosura al cielo!
Mas, por cumplir con esta envidia mía,
el negro paño más que el azul cielo
del cielo estimo, aunque remiendo sea,

2509 This line is hypersyllabic unless the *ao* of 'quedaos' is pronounced as a diphthong.

2519-2521 *la vara con que hirió el santo Moisés la piedra de Rafidín*: on their journey out of Egypt the Israelites camped at Rephadim. There was nothing to drink, so Moses prayed for water. God instructed him to strike a rock with his staff and, when he did, water poured out (Exodus 17). Like Moses, Nicolás is being asked to save his people by interceding with God. Discussing a similar miracle in Tirso's *La joya de las montañas*, Arellano holds that, to stage it, 'seguramente bastaría un sencillo mecanismo de tubos aprovechando el principio de los pozos artesianos' (1999, p. 251).

2523 *que Dios lo es*: a play on Ruperto's 'en fin', Nicolás means that God is 'el fin de todo'.

2525-2526 *paloma cándida con plumas negras*: Nicolás is described as a white dove because of his gentleness and purity. He is a white dove with black feathers because he is wearing the black habit of an Augustinian (see note to line 1145-1150 above).

2529 *la triunfante Roma*: sense requires that Lope must mean heaven by this, although the usage is not corroborated by the use of the phrase in other Lope *comedias*.

porque se enoje cuando no le vea.

Salgan tres damas: la INOBEDIENCIA*, la* CARNE *y la* IRA.

INOBEDIENCIA ¿Qué nos tienes aquí, príncipe fiero,
vanamente ocupadas con un santo?
CARNE Con tierna cera deshacer acero,
no es de tu ingenio, rey del negro espanto.
IRA Tendrá esperanza hasta su fin postrero;
en un hombre que duerme sobre un canto,
cantando a Dios como David cantaba,
…….
DEMONIO Inobediencia, Carne, Ira, yo veo
que aqueste Nicolás es piedra dura;
si presumís que vanamente empleo
vuestra solicitud, furia y blandura,
sabed que es inquietalle mi deseo,
ganarle no; que aquella Virgen pura,
coronada del sol, le favorece,
con que en divina castidad florece.
Bien sé que aquel obispo, aquel divino,
ingenioso, no bárbaro africano
—sino más sabio que Platón, pues vino

[2539] *porque*: '*[p]ara que* is the most frequent of the conjunctions which introduce clauses of purpose, although there are texts [...] in which *porque* predominates' (Keniston 1937, p. 388). The devil hopes that he can cause Nicolás to sin by making him angry, as he explains at line 2568.

(Stage direction before line 2540): in his widely-consulted work of iconography, Ripa gives the following descriptions of these personifications (taken from Richardson's English version): 'Disobedience' should appear as a 'surly looking woman, in dark coloured garments, crowned with peacock feathers, and in the attitude of stopping her ears with her fingers, and trampling on a bridle, a broken yoke, and a torn book, upon which is the figure of an asp. She is dressed in dark coloured garments in allusion to the moroseness and gloomy disposition of a disobedient mind; and her surly look denotes unwillingness to obey. As disobedience arises from presumption and pride, she is crowned with peacock feathers to characterize her insolence, haughtiness and want of duty to her superiors. The action of stopping her ears, signifies untractableness, opposition and unwillingness to bear reproof. David compares Disobedience to the deaf adder, for which reason the asp is placed on the book. The torn book indicates the violation and contempt of lawful authority, and the bridle and broken yoke under her feet show that the disobedient arrogate to themselves an unbecoming superiority by their unjustifiable behaviour' (1779, II, pp. 116-117). The English version of Ripa seems not to contain an entry corresponding to the 'Ira' of the Italian original: a 'Donna giovane, di carnagione rossa, scura, e perché appartiene all'abitudine del corpo degli iracondi, como dice Aristotele al sesto e nono capitolo della Fisionomia, avere le spalle grandi, la faccia gonfia, gli occhi rossi, la fronte rotonda, il naso acuto, e le narici aperte, si potrà osservare ancora questo; sarà armata, e per cimiero porterà una testa d'orso, della quale ne esca[no] fiamma e fumo; terrà nella destra mano una spada ignuda, e nella sinistra avrà una facella accesa, e sarà vestita di rosso' (p. 264), 'a young woman, with a red complexion, dark and, because she has the body type of the hot-tempered, as Aristotle says in the sixth and ninth chapters of the *Physiognomonica*, she should have broad shoulders, a fleshy face, red eyes, a broad forehead, a pointy nose, and flared nostrils, all of which should be noticeable; she should be armed and she should wear, as a helmet, a bear's head, emitting fire; in her right hand should have a drawn sword, and in her left, a lighted firebrand; she should be dressed in red'.

[2546] *como David cantaba*: Old Testament David was a skilled musician and is traditionally credited with the composition of seventy-three of the Bible's 150 psalms.

[2547] The final line of this *octava real* is missing.

[2556-2557] *aquel obispo, aquel divino ingenio, no bárbaro africano*: St Augustine was born in north Africa and served as bishop of Hippo. He is one of the Doctors of the Church and so no barbarian. Augustine is the hero of Lope's saint's play *El divino africano*.

a exceder el mortal límite humano—
en su defensa es muro diamantino,
y que con fuerte y poderosa mano
resiste mis intentos porque sea
mi eterno azote su inmortal correa.
Ved cuál estoy, pues este pobre paño
a Nicolás hurté, que era remiendo
de su túnica vil.

IRA Pues bien, ¿qué engaño
resulta deso?

DEMONIO Que enojarle entiendo,
y del enojo ya le viene daño,
con que su pura integridad ofendo.

CARNE Quedo, que viene.

Sale NICOLÁS.

NICOLÁS Yo, Señor, querría
hartar con vos la sed eterna mía.
Agua me piden, fuente de agua os llaman,
dadles agua, Señor, sed los aflige;
piden agua, mi Dios, y agua derraman
al mar eterno que las fuentes rige.
Oíd, Señor, que os llaman los que os aman.
Haced que aquí sus puras aguas fije
una perenne fuente, pues sois fuente
de la vida, que vive eternamente.
Túnica mía, aquí os dejé… ¿Qué es esto?
¿Adónde está el remiendo que os echaba?
¿En mi descuido sois…? ¿Cómo tan presto
os le hurtaron de aquí? Pues, aquí estaba.
¡Huélgome, cierto, y es placer honesto,
si el que os hurtó, por dicha, remendaba
algún hábito suyo!

DEMONIO ¿Hay tal paciencia?

CARNE Ira, ¿qué aguardas?

IRA ¡Huye, Inobediencia!

DEMONIO Pues no podemos por aquí engañarle,
demos en darle palos, golpes, coces.

CARNE Pues a su celda vamos a esperarle.

NICOLÁS Túnica, estáte así, ya me conoces.

DEMONIO No le hemos de dejar hasta matarle.

[2568] *del enojo ya le viene daño*: St Paul warns the Christians of Ephesus that they should not let the sun go down on their anger, for to do so would make room for the devil (Ephesians 4. 26).

[2571] *hartar con vos la sed eterna mía*: S: *hartar con voz la sed eterna mía*. Nicolás's monastic confreres are thirsting for water, whereas Nicolás is thirsting for God, like the psalmist: '[s]itivit anima mea ad Deum fortem, vivum; [q]uando veniam, et apparebo ante faciem Dei?', '[m]y soul hath thirsted after the strong living God: when shall I come and appear before the face of God?' (Psalm 41 (42). 3; and, similarly, Psalm 62 (63). 2).

[2572] *fuente de agua os llaman*: the Prophet Jeremiah refers to God as the 'fon[s] aquae vivae', 'the fountain of living water' and the 'ven[a] aquarum viventium', 'the vein of living waters' (2. 13 and 17. 13).

Vanse [el DEMONIO, *la* INOBEDIENCIA, *la* CARNE *y la* IRA*]*.

NICOLÁS Poderoso Señor, oíd las voces
de vuestros siervos; dadles agua en tanto
que os la pagan, Señor, en tierno llanto.

Música, y baje un ÁNGEL *con una vara de oro.*

ÁNGEL Toma, agustino Moisés,
esta vara, con que saques
agua en la piedra que ves,
con que tanta sed aplaques,
que perennes fuentes des.
Toma, y su rigor cruel
convierte en agua, como él
en el seco Rafidín;
serás otro nuevo Elín,
para que beba Israel.

NICOLÁS Paraninfo soberano,
el que puso sobre el cielo
agua con su eterna mano
hará que este seco suelo
produzca un mar oceano.
La vara tomo y daré
con ella en la piedra dura,
de donde bien claro sé
que ha de engendrarse agua pura

2594 *en tanto*: '[vale] mientras, ínterin o durante algún tiempo intermedio' (*Aut*).

(stage direction before line 2596): Pacheco specifies that angels should appear as though between ten and twenty years of age, 'de hermosos y agraciados rostros, vivos y resplandecientes ojos, aunque a lo varonil, con varios y lustrosos cabellos, rubios y castaños, con gallardos talles y gentil composición de miembros'. The angels' clothing will vary according to their missions, but they will usually appear with wings, 'con alas hermosísimas de varios colores imitadas del natural', as symbols of their supernatural speed and agility (1649, pp. 475-478). Pecheco is adamant that angels should be portrayed not as females but males and Lope seems to agree. The angel Peregrino describes in lines 1406-1411 is clearly male. Similarly, in Lope's St Genesius play, *Lo fingido verdadero*, the angel of the play-within-a-play is to be represented by Fabio, so must have a masculine appearance. Garasa disputes the prevalence of male angels: '[s]e sabe, por acotaciones de manuscritos y por otros testimonios, que casi siempre los ángeles fueron representados por mujeres. En *La buena guarda* hizo de ángel una actriz de nombre Mariana [...]. Sin embargo, algún actor personificó a los arcángeles combativos y munidos de espadas flamígeras' (1960, p. 85), and the angel described by Peregrino certainly falls within her category of 'arcángeles combativos'. Ruano notes that '[l]as vestimentas de ángeles aparecen con frecuencia en los inventarios de los hatos de las compañías', 'convencionalmente los ángeles aparecían vestidos con un traje blanco y capa' (2000, p. 84).

2602-2603 *como él en el seco Rafidín*: see note to lines 2519-2521.

2604 *serás otro nuevo Elín*: on their emancipatory journey out of Egypt the Israelites came to Elim, where there were twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees (Exodus 15. 27).

2606 *paraninfo*: 'comúnmente se toma por el que anuncia alguna felicidad' (*Autoridades* 1780).

2607-2608 *el que puso sobre el cielo agua...*: an allusion to the second day of the Creation: '[a]nd God said: Let there be a firmament made amidst the waters: and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made a firmament, and divided the waters that were under the firmament, *from those that were above the firmament*, and it was so. And God called the firmament, Heaven; and the evening and morning were the second day' (Genesis 1, 6-8, emphasis added).

2610 *oceano*: here (and at line 2670) the word is stressed on the penultimate, rather than the usual antepenultimate syllable, for metrical reasons.

de mi esperanza y mi fe.
Parte a tu eterno Señor
y di que es Dios, y no más,
que es su atributo mayor.

ÁNGEL Pues yo me voy, Nicolás.

*Súbase [*el ÁNGEL*]*.

NICOLÁS Dios te conserve en su amor.
¡Piedra, al Criador ya sabéis
que el respeto obedencial
os toca: si no tenéis
agua, ni os es natural,
sudad, que sudar podéis!
Diréis que os es propio el fuego
por la sequedad; pues luego
dad agua... ¡el agua salió
y la vara floreció!
Oyó su imperio y mi ruego.
¡Oh, cómo corre! Muy bien
el convento va regando,
y irá a la huerta también;
que beba David os mando,
que no hay peligro en Belén.

Sale[n] fray RUPERTO, *el* PRIOR *y fray* GIL.

RUPERTO Digo que es agua y que correr la he visto.
GIL Sin duda es agua, padre.
PRIOR Pues, siguiendo
el claro curso, a su principio vamos.
RUPERTO Ya en el principio, que es la fuente, estamos.
¡Qué hermosa fuente! Arrojaréme en ella.
PRIOR ¿Aquí estás, Nicolás?
NICOLÁS La fuente bella
estoy mirando.
PRIOR Pues, si tú aquí estabas,
¿qué mucho que del cielo se rompiesen

2626-2627 *diréis que os es propio el fuego por la sequedad*: from classical times the elements of fire and earth (here the rock, which Nicolás is addressing) share the property of dryness.

2633 *y irá*: M, S, R, A: *é irá.* Lope (or P's typesetter) is inconsistent in his choice of *y* or *e* before an /i/ sound. See the note to line 1169 for an explanation of normal Golden-Age usage.

2634 *que beba David os mando*: King David longed to drink the water from the well of Bethlehem when that town was in the hands of the enemy Philistines; this, presumably, the 'peligro' to which Lope refers (II Kings 23. 15).

2639 *la fuente*: a play on words by Ruperto, who intends 'fuente', literally, as spring and, figuratively, as source, 'principio'.

2640 *arrojaréme en ella*: judging from Ruperto's words at lines 2660-2661, it seems that Lope does intend the *gracioso* to throw himself enthusiastically into the water.

las cataratas como a nuevo Elías?,
¿qué mucho que saliesen fuentes frías
de las heladas piedras?, y ¿qué mucho
que, habiendo como fuerte nazareno
vencido el filisteo, saques agua
del mismo hueso con que le has vencido?

NICOLÁS Padre, Dios es autor, Dios solo ha sido.

PRIOR Así es verdad, pero tus grandes méritos
alcanzaron de Dios favor tan grande.

NICOLÁS Dadme, padre, esos pies.

PRIOR Nicolás, tente,
y pon los tuyos en mi pecho y frente.

GIL Padre, mire, que importa hacer de forma
que la agua no se pierda y nos anegue.

PRIOR Pues, vamos para hacer que se recoja.

[Vanse el PRIOR *y fray* GIL.*]*

RUPERTO Mi padre Nicolás, Dios se lo pague,
que tal salud ha dado a este convento.
¿No mira? Fresco estoy como un carámbano;
de pechos he bebido como un búzano;
mas, ruégole, por Dios, que en la bodega
haga una fuente de licor más puro,
¡que no le ha de tener a Dios más costa!

NICOLÁS Álcese, fray Ruperto, y déle gracias.

RUPERTO Si dárselas por agua... en él confío...
¡qué le diera por vino, padre mío!

*Vase [*RUPERTO*]*.

NICOLÁS ¡Oh, poderosa mano,
a quien los elementos obedecen!
¡Oh, gran padre oceano,
de quien salen las aguas, por quien crecen
los caudalosos ríos,

2644 *como a nuevo Elías*: after his victory over the Prophets of Baal, Elijah prays for an end to the drought afflicting Israel: '[a]nd while he turned himself this way and that way, behold, the heavens grew dark, with clouds, and wind: and there fell a great rain' (III Kings 18. 45).

2647 *nazareno*: 'el que entre los hebreos observaba cierta especie de religión, separándose del trato y comercio, no comiendo carne, no bebiendo licor que pudiese embriagar, y privándose de otras cosas, que a los demás eran permitidas, dándose a la contemplación' (*Aut*). Men who had taken the Nazarite vow could be recognized by their long hair, like Samson.

2646-2649 *saques agua del mismo hueso con que le has vencido*: Samson, who was a Nazarite, killed one thousand Philistines with the jaw-bone of an ass. Water later sprung from a tooth in that same jaw-bone, when Samson, being thirsty, called upon God for refreshment (Judges 15. 15 & 19). In Lope's *Rimas* sonnet – 'Si el padre universal de cuanto veo' – the name of the 'nazareno hebreo' of line 5 is spelled out in the second tercet: as here, it is 'Sansón el fuerte' (Vega 1983, pp. 120-121).

2661 *búzano*: 'el que se hunde debajo del agua, como hacen los que pescan las perlas y el coral y otras cosas que se caen en la mar' (Covarrubias).

2663 *haga una fuente de licor más puro*: here, as with the miracle of the resuscitated partridge, the *gracioso* makes light of his master's intercessory powers.

volviendo a ti como los ojos míos!
El viento apenas mueve
hoja en el árbol sin que tú lo mandes,
ni a las flores se atreve,
y con tu voluntad los mares grandes
cambia con las serenas
luces del cielo, donde siembra arenas.
La tierra no produce
flor, hoja, rama, tronco, fruto, espiga,
ni el agua, que reduce
a humor su sequedad y la mitiga,
le sirve de alimento,
menos que con tu santo mandamiento.
Por ti, sobre los montes,
pasó cuarenta codos y aquel arca,
por varios horizontes,
llevó, con su familia, el patriarca,
que vio otro mundo nuevo,
el arco de la paz, la luz de Febo.
El fuego no quemara,
actividad ni fuerza no tuviera,
si no le resultara
de tu divino imperio, que en su esfera
elementar le hiciste.

Entre fray PEREGRINO.

PEREGRINO ¡Ah, padre Nicolás!
NICOLÁS ¿Qué es esto? ¡Ay triste!
PEREGRINO No te espantes, mi padre;
fray Peregrino soy.
NICOLÁS Pues, Peregrino,
¿no estabas en la madre
del mundo?
PEREGRINO Al fin de mi camino
Dios me llamó; yo he muerto.
NICOLÁS ¿En Roma has muerto?
PEREGRINO Sí.
NICOLÁS ¿Cierto?
PEREGRINO Sí, cierto.
NICOLÁS ¿Eres, di, por ventura,
ilusión de aquel ángel desdichado
que inquietarme procura?

[2689] *el patriarca*: a reference to Noah. The waters rose fifteen cubits above the mountains while Noah and his family were safe in the ark. When the floodwaters receded, the world Noah saw was a new one, blessed by another kind of 'arco', the rainbow (Genesis 6-9). 'La luz de Febo' is the sun.

[2701] This line is hyposyllabic.

[2704-2705] *eres... ilusión de aquel ángel desdichado*: it was widely appreciated in Golden-Age Spain that the devil could be the cause of supernatural visions intended to tempt the recipient into sin, and long before, St Paul issued the famous warning that 'Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light' (II Corinthians

PEREGRINO No soy sino tu amigo, padre amado.
Difunto estoy, ¿qué dudas?
NICOLÁS ¿Qué quieres? Di.
PEREGRINO Que a mi remedio acudas.
NICOLÁS Según eso, no vives
en el cielo, ni estás en el infierno.
PEREGRINO Tú, mi padre, que escribes
memoriales a Dios, Juez eterno,
con santas oraciones
desata de mi cárcel las prisiones.
NICOLÁS Yo soy hebdomadario;
no puedo esta semana, padre mío;
ya ve que es necesario
acudir con mi oficio.
PEREGRINO Yo confío
que pedirá licencia.
NICOLÁS Padre, ¿ya tú no sabes mi obediencia?
PEREGRINO Dame esa mano.
NICOLÁS Toma.
.....
si has muerto, padre, en Roma.
¿Dónde me llevas?
PEREGRINO Nicolás, conmigo,
donde mis penas veas,
porque te duelas y a tus ojos creas.

---

11. 14). Nicolás's awareness of the dangers of self-deceit and diabolical illusion probably reflect the anxieties of Lope's age rather than St Nicholas's. In book 2 of his 'Subida del Monte Carmelo' St John of the Cross offers a stern warning against giving credence to supernatural visions and locutions: 'el demonio sabe ingerir en el alma satisfación de sí oculta, y a veces harto manifiesta. Y, por eso, él vista figuras de santos y resplandores hermosísimos, y palabras a los oídos harto disimuladas, y olores muy suaves, y dulzuras en la boca, y en el tacto deleite, para que, engolosinándolos por allí, los induzca en muchos males. Por tanto siempre se han de desechar tales representaciones y sentimientos' (1991, p. 319). By ignoring this advice, Paulo makes a fatal mistake in Tirso's *El condenado por desconfiado*.

2710-2711 Nicolás deduces this because, were he in heaven, Peregrino would not need his assistance and, in hell, Peregrino would be beyond redemption. Aquinas's *Summa* confirms that, whilst according to the natural course, the souls of the dead are utterly cut off from communication with the living, nevertheless, if God wills it, they sometimes come forth from their abodes (that is, from heaven, hell and purgatory) and appear to men. In the case of the damned, this may occur for man's instruction and intimidation. In the case of those in purgatory, this will often be to seek the suffrages of the living (Suppl. IIIae, Q. 69, Art.3). This is confirmed in Chapter 20 of Manescal's 'Tratado de las apariciones'. Indeed this is the case with Peregrino: his soul is visiting Nicolás to enlist his prayers, hoping that his purification in purgatory might be hastened thereby. The Council of Trent's 'Decree Concerning Purgatory' asserted that 'the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful and chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar', this challenging the doubts of many Reformers concerning the existence of purgatory and the efficacy of intercessions for the dead (*Canons* 1978, p. 217).

2716 *hebdomadario*: '[e]l sacerdote o monje o monja al que, en una comunidad religiosa o sacerdotal, le toca realizar durante una semana el ministerio de dirigir el Oficio Divino o la misa conventual' (Aldazábal 2002, p. 169). This rather specific excuse was indeed given by the historical Nicholas, according to many of the hagiographies, for example Navarro 1612, fol. 59^{r} and Critana 1612, fol. 11^{r}).

2723 There is a missing hendecasyllabic line here, that should rhyme with the 'conmigo' of line 2725.

O le levante en alto, o le dé vuelta por tramoya; en fin, le lleve; y echando fuego por cuatro partes del teatro, salgan por los escotillones cuatro almas: PADRE *y* MADRE *de san Nicolás,* FLORO *y* URSINO.

PADRE ¿Cuándo será aquel día,
¡oh, patria celestial!, que te gocemos?
MADRE ¡Oh, reino de alegría!,
¿cuándo, tras tantas penas, te veremos?
URSINO ¡Ay, esperanzas santas,
que en este ardor templáis prisiones tantas!
FLORO ¿Cuándo, Señor divino,
tendrá descanso mi abrasado pecho?
URSINO ¿Cuándo, Señor, Ursino
verá este muro de dolor deshecho?
PADRE ¿Cuándo de aqueste fuego
me sacará de Nicolás el ruego?

Fray PEREGRINO *y* NICOLÁS, *por el aire o por tramoya.*

PEREGRINO Por este inculto campo
tiende los ojos, Nicolás.
NICOLÁS Si en fuego
los pies medroso estampo,
que no me acerques a su luz te ruego.
PEREGRINO ¡Aquestas almas mira,
ésta que llora, aquésta que suspira;
mira a tu padre anciano,
tu amada madre mira, y tu sobrino,
a Floro, que tu mano
está esperando, Nicólas divino!
TODOS ¡Piedad, Nicolás santo!
PEREGRINO ¿No te enternece, Nicolás, su llanto?

(stage direction before line 2728): Ruano notes that the word 'teatro', employed in this stage direction, is ambiguous: 'puede designar el tablado de la representación o la fachada del edificio del vestuario, [así que] no podemos estar seguros de dónde estaban los escotillones por donde salían las cuatro almas. Si éstas emergían por el tablado, entonces Fray Peregrino y Nicolás se encontrarían encaramados en un sacabuche para poder dar una vuelta «por tramoya»; si por el contrario, eran descubiertas en el primer corredor y en el «vestuario», se utilizaría una canal con movimiento horizontal' (2000, p. 259). Ruano deduces from the number and complexity of the stage machines required for Lope's *El cardenal de Belén* that that play was 'meant to be staged in an open space and on a large scale platform, probably flanked by carts'. He mentions by way of example the direction requiring that St Jerome be seized by the neck by 'some unspecified stage machine' and carried aloft by an angel, holding him by the hair, to another part of the stage. Ruano continues: '[t]he expense of building such stage machines and "discoveries" would have made the play prohibitively expensive for a regular lessee or "autor". Only the King, the Church or perhaps a grandee would have been able to finance a grand spectacle such as the one required for the staging of *El cardenal de Belén*' (2008, pp. 47-49). The stage direction Ruano details seems similar to Lope's direction here. This may provide us with evidence of the kind of performance Lope envisaged for *San Nicolás de Tolentino*. It may also support the assumption that the Church or some particular religious community commissioned the play.

2740 *inculto campo*: according to the hagiographic tradition, Nicholas accompanied Peregrino to 'un valle y campo llano que estaba a la otra parte del yermo', where he saw this vision of the souls of purgatory (e.g. Navarro 1612, fol. 59^{v}).

PADRE ¡Hijo de mis entrañas,
ten lástima de mí!
MADRE ¡Tu madre triste,
que en penas tan extrañas,
aunque con esperanza ardiente, asiste,
mueva tu tierno pecho!
PADRE ¡Ay, hijo, aunque de piedra fueras hecho…!
NICOLÁS ¡Oh, dulces padres míos,
sabe Dios lo que siento vuestras penas!
Ya son mis ojos ríos
para templarlas con profundas venas.
¡Oh, cómo es diferente
ver con los ojos lo que aquí se siente!
Palabra doy al cielo
de ser devoto de las almas, tanto
que, mientras en el suelo
viviere, haré por ellas todo cuanto
cupiere en un sujeto
tan miserable, débil e imperfeto.
Y si Dios me llevare
a ver su pura luz eternamente,
a quien me encomendare
necesidad tan justa y tan urgente,
daré socorro luego,
con caridad y con humilde ruego.
TODOS ¡Piedad, Nicolás santo!
PEREGRINO Ya has visto, Nicolás, lo que padecen,
y escuchado su llanto.
NICOLÁS En parte, aunque me alegran, me entristecen.
PEREGRINO Dales algún consuelo.
NICOLÁS Esta correa de Agustín, que al cielo
os subirá, que alcanza
desde este mar al soberano puerto,
almas, cuya esperanza
es el consuelo más seguro y cierto;
no pierda el alegría
quien vive en noche de tan dulce día:
el pajarillo ausente,

[2755] *con esperanza ardiente*: Nicolás's mother is in a place of simultaneous agony and hope because, according to Catholic doctrine, the souls of purgatory will inevitably attain heaven once their sins are purged. The Church teaches that '[a]ll who die in God's grace and friendship, but still imperfectly purified, are indeed assured of their eternal salvation [...]. The Church gives the name "purgatory" to this final purification of the elect, which is entirely different from the punishment of the damned'. This doctrine was formulated in particular at the Councils of Florence and Trent (*Catechism* 1999, §1030). The oxymora of lines 2787 and 2794 – that describe purgatory as a 'noche de tan dulce día' and a 'prisión venturosa' – are also explained by this doctrine, as are the mixed emotions the sight of these souls inspires in Nicolás, who comments, at line 2779 that he is at once cheered and saddened.

[2781] *esta correa de Agustín*: the Augustinian belt was a recognizable element of Nicholas's iconography (see note to lines 1145-1150). Nicolás offers it as a ladder up which the souls of his loved ones will climb to heaven.

tal suele, en triste y solitario nido,
mirar el claro oriente,
de pura luz y resplandor vestido.
Haced al cielo salva;
cantad, pues esperáis tan presto el alba.
¡Oh, prisión venturosa,
donde Jerusalén daros espera
patria y ciudad gloriosa,
libertad inmortal y verdadera!
¡Allí, con blancas palmas,
al Agnus cercaréis, sagradas almas!

*[Las almas] se bajen; [*NICOLÁS*] y* PEREGRINO *desaparezcan; y entre el* DEMONIO, *[la* INOBEDIENCIA *y la* IRA*] con otros de diversas figuras, como leones, sierpes y otras así.*

DEMONIO ¡Aquí parad, ejército temido
de Pablos y de Antonios, capitanes
que en la Tebaida y en Egipto hicistes
cosas tan estupendas contra aquellos
que despreciaron la grandeza humana,
retirados del mundo en altas peñas!
¡Aquí parad, que pues ningún remedio
queda para vencer con nuestra industria
al bravo Nicolás de Tolentino,
la venganza será matarle a palos,
a azotes, coces y inquietudes varias,

[2789] *nido*: P, M, S, R, A: *día*. The *lira* requires a word to rhyme with the 'vestido' of line 2791. P's replication of the 'día' of line 2787 is clearly an error. In the context, the only two-syllable word ending *-ido* that makes sense is 'nido', which has been substituted here.

[2792] *haced... la salva*: 'brindar y mover al gusto y alegría' (*Aut*).

[2798-2799] *con blancas palmas, al Agnus cercaréis*: an image of the triumph of the elect in heaven before the throne of Christ, the Lamb. It is derived from Revelation: '[p]ost haec vidi turbam magnam, quam dinumerare nemo poterat ex omnibus gentibus et tribubus, et populis, et linguis: stantes ante thronum, et in conspectu Agni amicti stolis albis, et palmae in manibus eorum', '[a]fter this, I saw a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and in sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands' (7. 9). Lope seems to have transferred the white of the robes to the palms of the elect.

(stage direction before 2800): *diversas figuras...y otras así*: P: *diversas figuras... y otros así*. Pacheco explains that '[l]os demonios no piden determinada forma y traje. Suélense y débense pintar en forma de bestias y animales crueles y sangrientos, impuros y asquerosos, de áspides, de dragones, de basiliscos, de cuervos y de milanos [y] en figura de leones' (1649, p. 478). These animals might symbolize sins and vices, in accordance with the conventional iconography. The roles of animals on the *comedia* stage would usually be performed by human actors 'disfrazados con pieles', though both real animals (especially dogs and birds) and mechanical ones made of *pasta* were sometimes used (Ruano 2000, p. 290, and see the note to line 2147).

[2800-2801] *ejército temido de Pablos y de Antonios*: St Paul of Thebes and St Anthony the Great were hermits who lived in the Egyptian desert, in 'la Tebaida'. St Anthony in particular experienced temptations of the kind often associated with the eremitic life (Farmer 2002, pp. 28-29 & 416). Lope attributes these fearsome temptations to the kind of demons that have just entered on stage.

tomando formas que serán contrarias
a su oración y castidad!

IRA Bien dices.
Ya que ningún engaño solenices
contra su castidad, pureza y fama,
inquiétale, castígale.

INOBEDIENCIA Yo pienso
que, según se castiga, importa nada;
los brazos pone en una piedra helada
cuando de la oración descansar quiere,
piedra que le lastima, hiela y hiere;
y luego con sus bárbaras cadenas
disminuye la sangre de sus venas;
pues ¿qué se le ha de dar de nuestra furia?

DEMONIO No importa; yo sé bien que es diferente;
que el daño ajeno mucho más se siente
que el que un hombre se causa por sus manos;
él viene, retirad los cuerpos vanos.

Sale NICOLÁS.

NICOLÁS Si mientras tuviere vida,
almas que en penas estáis
y de las vuestras purgáis
la Majestad ofendida,
me olvidare del ardor
que os vi entonces padecer,
de mí se olvide el poder
de aquel eterno Señor.
Movido vengo a piedad,
almas de aquel vivo fuego,
y aquí a mi oratorio llego;
cómo os ayudo escuchad.

Descúbrese un oratorio con una lamparita.

NICOLÁS Dulce Jesús, ya que vi…

DEMONIO ¡Dale a la lámpara, dale!

NICOLÁS ¡Jesús! ¿Cuando el nombre sale
de mi boca, y está en mí,
osan estas bestias fieras

2811 *tomando formas*: the demons, then, are able to appear as they wish in the visions they inspire; here, the devil directing that these forms be destracting and lascivious.

2813 *solenices*: *solemnizar*: 'festejar o celebrar solemnemente alguna cosa' (*Aut*).

2817-2819 *los brazos pone en una piedra helada*: this stone elbow rest is mentioned in Navarro's description of how Nicholas would spend hours in prayer in his cell at Tolentino: '[e]n su celda, delante de una imagen devotísima de la piedad de Jesucristo N. S., las rodillas puestas sobre una dura piedra, recostando sus codos desnudos sobre otra cuando, por ser siempre tan larga y tan prolija, de cansado no podía más' (1612, fol. 76r).

2826 *cuerpos vanos*: see the section on the supernatural in the introductory study for a discussion of the implications of this phrase.

cercarme y matar la luz?
Pues, ¡válgame vuestra cruz!
DEMONIO ¿En la oración perseveras?
IRA ¡La lámpara levantó,
hecha pedazos, del suelo,
encendida y sana!
INOBEDIENCIA ¡El cielo
se la juntó y encendió!
¿Aquesto puedes sufrir?
DEMONIO Mas ¿qué? ¿Se pone a rezar
otra vez?
IRA No habrá lugar.
INOBEDIENCIA ¿Cómo?
DEMONIO ¡Porque ha de morir!

Dentro RUPERTO*, el* PRIOR *y fray* GIL.

RUPERTO ¡Padre prior, acuda, que en la celda
del padre Nicolás andan ladrones!
PRIOR Pienso que son los que robar querían
el cielo, fray Ruperto.
RUPERTO Sea quien fuere,
armarme quiero y socorrerle, padre.
PRIOR Ármese, pues, que yo saldré a su lado.
INOBEDIENCIA ¿Por qué consientes que éste rece agora,
favoreciendo aquellas santas almas
que se escaparon de tu infierno? ¡Muera!
DEMONIO ¡Muera, ministros!
NICOLÁS ¡Ay Jesús! ¡María!
¡Que me matan!
DEMONIO ¡Oh, perro! ¿Que te quejas?
NICOLÁS ¡Jesús! ¡Padre Agustín! ¡Agustín santo!
IRA Mátale porque llame valedores.

Salga[n] fray RUPERTO*, armado graciosamente con una escoba en un palo largo, y un tapador de tinaja, el* PRIOR *y fray* GIL.

RUPERTO ¡Aquí, padres, aquí! ¡Mueran los perros!
PRIOR ¡Qué visiones extrañas!

2847 *la lámpara levantó* etc.: this miracle, too, is a matter of hagiographic record. Desperate to interrupt Nicholas's prayers, the devil entered his cell (in the form of a great black bird, according to Navarro) and knocked over the lamp, which was smashed to bits. Unperturbed, Nicholas prays to God for protection and 'tomando los pedazos de la lámpara y juntándolos, luego el vaso fue visto entero y sin alguna señal de haber sido quebrado, y encendido como antes estaba' (1612, fol. 83^{v}-84^{r}). Perhaps this miracle could have been staged in the same way as the similar one in the first part of Tirso's *La santa Juana*. Arellano explains: 'cae sor Juana y se le quiebra un barreño de barro, junta los pedazos, reza arrodillada y *sale un barreño nuevo en lugar del quebrado* (por el escotillón sin duda, por donde echa Juana los pedazos quebrados que ha recogido)' (1999, p. 250).

2852-2853 *mas ¿qué? ¿Se pone a rezar otra vez?*: M, S, R, A attribute this line to Inobediencia. P is clear in attributing it to Demonio.

2858 This line is hypersyllabic, unless the *ea* of 'sea' is pronounced as a diphthong.

RUPERTO ¡Sombras vanas,
Ruperto soy! ¡Figuras antonianas,
dejad mi santo!
DEMONIO ¡Infame! ¿Tú te pones
con nosotros a manos y razones?
RUPERTO ¡Fuera, digo, bellacos!
DEMONIO Pues, infame
zonzorrión, ¿así te atreves?
RUPERTO ¡Bestia!
¡Sal de la celda!
DEMONIO ¡Oh, vil espumaollas!
RUPERTO Hago muy bien; vos espumáis calderas.
¡Llegue, padre prior!
PRIOR Aquí, a este lado,
digo los exorcismos de la Iglesia.
DEMONIO ¡Oh, perro motilón!
RUPERTO ¡Afuera!
DEMONIO ¡Oh, pesia…!

*Anda [*RUPERTO*] pegándoles, y ellos a él, y al irse, uno de ellos le llene la cara de humo.*

RUPERTO ¡Vitoria por Ruperto!
GIL ¿Cómo queda
de esa manera?
RUPERTO Pues, ¿qué tengo, padre?
GIL La cara como un negro de Etiopía.
RUPERTO ¿Qué podían dejar estos bellacos?
PRIOR ¿Qué hay, padre Nicolás?
NICOLÁS Cojo me dejan.
PRIOR Tenga paciencia y ánimo.
NICOLÁS Querría
no dejar los maitines.

2870 *figuras antonianas*: presumably these 'figuras' are described as 'antonianas' because they are of the kind that tempted St Anthony in the desert (see note to lines 2800-2801).

2874 *zonzorrión*: 'el demasiadamente insulso, tardo o simple' (*Aut*).

2876 *vos espumáis calderas*: Ruperto gladly accepts the name that the Demonio intends as an insult. He is an 'espumaollas', ever eager to lap up the froth that bubbles to the top of the stewpot. In this he is like Sancho Panza (and many other *villanos* of Golden-Age fiction): at Camacho's wedding, Sancho gleefully accepts the cook's invitation to help himself to the contents of the bubbling pot: 'espumad una gallina o dos, y buen provecho os hagan' (II, 20; Cervantes 1997a, II, p. 176). The meaning of Ruperto's retort is obscure. Perhaps he is accusing the devil of supping from witches' cauldrons and perhaps that is meant as sexual innuendo, possible if one bears in mind that 'caldo' can signify semen (Cela 1969-1971, I, p. 216) and 'brasero' can stand for the *vas muliebre*, as can 'olla' (*Poesía erótica* 1983, pp. 332 & 344). Alternatively, Ruperto might intend 'caldera' to be understood as hell: *Autoridades* explains that 'caldera de Pero Botero' signifies hell 'vulgar y jocasamente'; perhaps 'caldera' itself could carry this meaning.

2877-2878 *aquí, a este lado, digo los exorcismos*: in contrast to brave, loyal Ruperto, the prior fails to distinguish himself in the fight against these demons, preferring to watch the action from the sidelines. See the note to line 1235: Lope's saint's play priors often antagonize the hero or fail him.

2879 *motilón*: 'el religioso lego. Llamóse así por tener cortado el pelo en redondo' (*Aut*).

2884 *cojo me dejan*: the physical violence done to Nicolás by the devil and the 'allegorical' Inobediencia and Ira seems to problematize an interpretation of these figures as artificial abstractions. See the section of the introductory study on the supernatural for a discussion of this scene.

PRIOR Sea en buen hora.
NICOLÁS Vaya delante, padre.
PRIOR Que me place.
RUPERTO ¿Que estoy muy negro?
GIL Está teñido el rostro
de tizne del infierno.
RUPERTO Lavaréme
y vive Dios.
GIL ¿Qué dice?
RUPERTO Que Dios vive,
que he de desafiar a los bellacos,
y desde aquí los reto de traidores.
GIL Vamos y lavaréle.
RUPERTO Vamos, padre,
a ver si hay algo que almorzar, que quedo
muerto de pelear.
GIL Y yo de miedo.

Vanse [el PRIOR, RUPERTO *y fray* GIL*], y* NICOLÁS *se quede.*

NICOLÁS Gracias, gran Señor, os doy,
que de las locas injurias
me librastes destas furias,
de quien vitorioso estoy.
La pierna me han maltratado,
mas vos me daréis salud.

Dentro una voz, [la MÚSICA*]:*

[MÚSICA] Mucho agrada tu virtud
a Dios, Nicolás amado.
NICOLÁS ¿Cuándo será mi tránsito?
MÚSICA Ya llega.
NICOLÁS Buenas nuevas, espíritus.
MÚSICA Muy buenas.
NICOLÁS ¿Qué le agrada a mi Esposo?
MÚSICA Tus cadenas.
NICOLÁS ¿Entregaréle el corazón?
MÚSICA Entrega.
NICOLÁS ¿Rogaré por mis almas a Dios?
MÚSICA Ruega.

[2886] *maitines*: this fixes the time of the action of this part of Act 3 to the early hours of the morning. According to Covarrubias's definition 'maitines' is the 'hora nocturna de las que canta la Iglesia Católica regularmente de las doce de la noche abajo'.

(stage direction before line 2902): *Música*: as before (see note to stage direction before line 2324), Música is described as 'ángeles' and, here, 'espíritus' too.

[2904] *tránsito*: 'la muerte de las personas santas y justas, o que han dejado buena opinión con su virtuosa vida, porque es un paso de las miserias de ella a la eterna felicidad' (*Aut*).

[2906] *esposo*: God, the Spouse, the Bridegroom of the biblical Song of Songs; the Spouse is promised to the Bride, the Bride symbolizes the human soul seeking union with God.

NICOLÁS ¿Qué perderán por mi oración?
MÚSICA Sus penas.
NICOLÁS ¿Veránse llenas de descanso?
MÚSICA Llenas.
NICOLÁS ¡Gran favor de mi Dios!
MÚSICA Nada te niega.
NICOLÁS Mis panecitos ¿qué darán?
MÚSICA Saludes.
NICOLÁS ¿De qué más librarán?
MÚSICA Del mar y el fuego.
NICOLÁS ¿Tendrán otra virtud?
MÚSICA Dos mil virtudes.
NICOLÁS ¿Saldrán, en fin, mis almas?
MÚSICA Saldrán luego.
NICOLÁS Ángeles, ¿cómo?
MÚSICA Si a rogarlo acudes;
tanto puede con Dios tu humilde ruego.

En lo alto se vea un PEREGRINO *con música.*

[EL] PEREGRINO ¿Conócesme, Nicolás?
NICOLÁS ¿No sois vos, Señor divino,
aquel pobre peregrino,
aunque os vi una vez no más?
[EL] PEREGRINO Yo soy, Nicolás, a quien
diste aquellas cien monedas;
deudor soy.
NICOLÁS ¿Que decir puedas
que debes, inmenso bien?
[EL] PEREGRINO Sí, Nicolás, y más debo.
NICOLÁS ¿Qué, Señor?
[EL] PEREGRINO Tu capa.
NICOLÁS ¿Agora
que en vos al mismo sol dora?
[EL] PEREGRINO Vestirte quiero de nuevo,
como allí lo prometí.
Ponedle el hábito luego.

Vístanle dos ÁNGELES *un hábito de tafetán negro con estrellas de oro.*

NICOLÁS Si a tantos favores llego,
Señor, ¿qué será de mí?

Cantan [los ÁNGELES*] mientras le visten.*

UNOS ÁNGELES *Como viste Nicolás*

[2918] *conócesme*: M, S, R: *conocéisme*. The emendation is misconceived: the pilgrim addresses Nicolás in the 'tú' form. See, for example, lines 2923 and 2927. The forms Nicolás uses to address the pilgrim are inconsistent, perhaps for metrical reasons.

[2930] *como allí lo prometí*: as the pilgrim promised Nicolás in Act 1, lines 335-350.

negro bordado de estrellas,
parece noche con ellas,
y el sol no relumbra más.

Salen RUPERTO *y el* PRIOR *con una linterna.*

RUPERTO Estas voces he sentido.
PRIOR Vaya quedito y con tiento.
RUPERTO Pasos junto al coro siento.
PRIOR No vaya haciendo ruido.
RUPERTO Ay, padre, ¿no ve que pasa
todo bordado de estrellas
Nicolás?
PRIOR Y el sol en ellas,
que en amor de Dios se abrasa.
RUPERTO Alce un poco la linterna.
PRIOR Déjele, padre, pasar.
NICOLÁS [*Al peregrino*] Las gracias te voy a dar,
mi Jesús, bondad eterna.
RUPERTO ¡Oh, padre, llegar quisiera
y echarme a sus pies!
PRIOR ¿Qué dice?
¿No ve que eso contradice
a su humildad?
RUPERTO ¡Quién pudiera
hurtarle alguna estrellica!
Hasta la misma correa
oro divino hermosea
con una hebilla tan rica.
PRIOR Vamos, por nuestro consuelo,
a ver tan santo varón.
RUPERTO Hoy le ha hecho la oración
huevo estrellado en el cielo.

*Vanse [*NICOLÁS, *el* PRIOR *y* RUPERTO*], y dan voces dentro:*

LIDIA ¡Fuego, fuego!
FENISO ¡Que se abrasa
nuestra casa! ¡Fuego, fuego!

2954 *estrellica*: the diminutive forms in this scene, here and at line 2939, suggest the affection that Ruperto and the prior feel for Nicolás.

2960-2961 *le ha hecho la oración huevo estrellado en el cielo*: again, as at lines 1807-1809, Ruperto must intend some pun based on the polyvalency of the word 'estrellado'. Dressed in a new habit decorated with stars, Nicolás is 'estrellado' in a literal sense and, approaching death, he will soon become a starry denizen of the heavens, 'el cielo'. His mind fixed on food, though, Ruperto immediately associates the word 'estrellado' with eggs, and, perhaps, he confuses 'la oración' with the phonetically similar 'la ración': the *gracioso*'s subliminal thought process transforms his friend into a portion of fried eggs. As with the miracle of the partridge, where Ruperto greedily chased after the resuscitated bird, and as with the miracle of the water, when the *gracioso* asked for alcohol instead, Nicolás's approaching apotheosis fails to distract Ruperto's attention completely away from his grumbling stomach.

*Salgan [*LIDIA, FENISO, AURELIO *y* ROSELA*]*.

[LIDIA] ¡Agua, por Dios! ¡Agua luego,
que se arde toda la casa!
FENISO Parece que no hay remedio
contra las voraces llamas.
AURELIO Si un mar, Feniso, derramas,
hay un elemento en medio.
LIDIA Aurelio, ¿qué hemos de hacer?
ROSELA Acudid presto, señores,
que tan extraños ardores
de infierno deben de ser.
Ya se emprende por mi casa;
¡venid al socorro os ruego!
AURELIO Con el aire crece el fuego,
y de una en otra se pasa.
Llamad en San Agustín;
vengan padres del convento.

Salen el PRIOR *y fray* RUPERTO, *alzados los hábitos en la correa, con un cántaro.*

PRIOR ¡Corra, padre!
RUPERTO En un momento
verá de la llama el fin.
PRIOR ¡Arroje presto!
RUPERTO Ya arrojo.
PRIOR ¡Qué poca maña se ha dado!
RUPERTO ¿Piensa que es nuestro pescado,
que le echamos en remojo?
LIDIA ¡Ay, padres! ¡Sean bienvenidos!
PRIOR Dios la consuele.
RUPERTO Mi padre,
no habrá remedio que cuadre;
aire y fuego están unidos.
¿No se probaría aquí
un panecito de aquellos
de Nicolás?
PRIOR ¿Tiene dellos?
RUPERTO Nunca se apartan de mí,
ni sé cuál hombre cristiano
uno deja de traer.
PRIOR ¡Fuego, en virtud del poder
de Dios, tu rey soberano,

2969 *hay un elemento en medio*: the water will not extinguish the flames because a third element, the wind, is fanning them, as confirmed below at line 2976.

2984-2985 *nuestro pescado que le echamos en remojo*: the prior is surprised that the bucket of water failed to extinguish the blazing inferno. Ruperto, annoyed by the prior's deflating disappointment, sarcastically suggests that a little more water and effort will be required here than that needed to soak the community's salt cod.

2988 *cuadrar*: 'agradar o convenir una cosa con el intento o deseo' (*Autoridades* 1817).

y la gracia concedida
a su santo, Nicolás,
ni quemes, ni crezcas más!

RUPERTO ¡Templó la llama encendida
luego que en ella cayó!

AURELIO ¡Milagro!

RUPERTO ¿Fue buen consejo?

PRIOR ¡Oh, claro, o divino espejo
de santidad!

RUPERTO Siempre yo
tuve con él esta fe.

FENISO Padre, ¿cómo le veremos
para que gracias le demos?

PRIOR Hermano, a Dios se las dé;
que el humilde Nicolás
no quiere glorias del suelo,
y más tan cerca del cielo,
que es donde se humilla más.

ROSELA ¿Cómo, padre?

PRIOR Porque llega
de una grave enfermedad
a lo extremo.

ROSELA ¿Su humildad
besarle los pies nos niega,
y agradecerle este pan
tan milagroso y divino?

RUPERTO Vamos, padre, que imagino
que allá con cuidado están.

PRIOR Vamos, que habrá que llorar
por nuestro padre bendito.

RUPERTO Con aqueste panecito,
no hay fuerza en agua ni en mar.

Vanse [todos] y salga NICOLÁS *con un báculo, y fray* ÁNGEL.

ÁNGEL Padre, esfuércese.

NICOLÁS Querría,
pero ya el tiempo ha llegado
en que no importan las fuerzas.

ÁNGEL Siéntese.

NICOLÁS ¡Ay, Dios, qué desmayo!,
pero pienso que es de amor.
Mi vida, por vos me abraso;

3001-3002 *¡templó la llama encendida luego que en ella cayo!*: records of the miracles attributed to Nicholas in Spain testify to his *panecitos*' power to extinguish fires (see the section of the introductory study concerning the veneration of St Nicholas of Tolentino in Golden-Age Spain).

3029 *¡ay, Dios, qué desmayo!*: this line implies that an ailing Nicolás should fall into his chair, his strength sapped by his state of rapture.

estoy por pediros flores;
déme esa cruz en las manos.
Digamos, padre, él y yo,
juntos o a versos, un salmo.
ÁNGEL Descanse primero un poco.
NICOLÁS Hablando a mi bien descanso.

Salen el PRIOR, RUPERTO *y fray* GIL.

PRIOR ¿Que nuestro padre se muere?
GIL Yo pienso que está expirando.
PRIOR Hoy perderá Tolentino
su luz, su ejemplo, su amparo.
Padre Nicolás, ¿qué es esto?
RUPERTO ¿Qué es esto, mi padre amado?
¿Así deja a su Ruperto?
NICOLÁS ¡Oh, padres, denme los brazos!
PRIOR Sin lágrimas, yo no puedo.
¿Quiere algo? Díganos algo.
RUPERTO ¡Ah, padre! ¿Quiere comer?
No carne, que lo ha jurado,
y ya sé que las perdices
se levantan sobre el plato,
pero otra cosa que sea
de consuelo.
GIL Está elevado;
ya le deben de esperar
del impíreo soberano
los espíritus.
ÁNGEL ¡Ah, padre!
¡Ah, padre querido!
NICOLÁS *In manus*
tuas, Domine, commendo
spiritum meum.

[3032] *pediros flores*: Nicolás has in mind the Old Testament Song of Songs: '[f]ulcite me floribus, | [s]tipate me malis, | [q]uia amore langueo' (2. 5), '[s]tay me up with flowers, | compass me about with apples: | because I languish with love'. This line inspired Chapter 7 of St Teresa's 'Meditaciones sobre los Cantares' (published in 1611), where she explains how God's 'suavidad' can be so extreme 'que deshace el alma de manera que no parece ya que la hay para vivir, y *pedís flores*' (emphasis added). As Teresa explains, the Esposa, the soul calling for these 'flores' desires not death, but the strength to live on to serve the beloved, and the flowers are a metaphor for this new gift the soul desires from God. 'De otro olor son esas flores que las que acá olemos. Entiendo yo aquí que pide hacer grandes obras en servicio de nuestro Señor y del prójimo [...]. [C]uando las obras activas salen de esta raíz [...] son admirables y olorosísimas flores' (1997, pp. 464-465). Nicolás's rapture, his 'desmayo', is so extreme, then, that, if his soul is to resist the irresistible pull towards God, with whom only death can unite it, it needs a special gift of strength from God.

[3034] *él*: see the note to line 1252.

[3055] This line is hypersyllabic, unless the *eo* of 'impíreo' is pronounced as a diphthong.

[3055b] *impíreo*: *empíreo*: '[e]l cielo, supremo asiento y lugar de la divinidad, morada de los santos, superior a los demás cielos y el que abraza en sí y dentro de su ámbito al primer móvil' (*Aut*). M, S, R, A: *imperio*.

[3057-3059] *in manus tuas* etc.: the words Jesus addressed to the Father immediately before he died (quoting Psalm 30 (31). 6): '[e]t clamans voce magna Iesus ait: Pater, *in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum*. Et haec

PRIOR Dando
tal alma a Dios, dice bien.
RUPERTO Como un ángel ha quedado.
ÁNGEL Echemos esa cortina.

Dentro:

[TODOS] ¡Santo! ¡Santo! ¡Santo! ¡Santo!
¡Déjennos ver nuestro padre,
nuestro Nicolás amado!
RUPERTO Todo Tolentino rompe
las puertas.
PRIOR Vaya, fray Ángelo,
y detenga su furor.
ÁNGEL Venga, fray Ruperto.
RUPERTO Vamos,
que bien será menester
según en vida le amaron.

*Vanse [*RUPERTO*, fray* ÁNGEL *y fray* GIL*], y quede el* PRIOR *solo.*

PRIOR Bien le debe Tolentino
ese amor, ese cuidado,
y toda Italia, y el mundo,
pues con milagros tan raros
en todas las partes dél
conocen su nombre santo.
¿Qué cautivos no han salido
de prisión de muchos años?
¿Qué naves no han visto el puerto?
¿Qué fuego no se ha templado?
¿Qué ciego no cobró vista?
¿Qué enfermo…? Mas ¿qué me canso
en contar al mar la arena
y al sol los átomos claros?
Quiero en oración ponerme,
por mi consuelo, entretanto
que le ponen en las andas,
porque, si lugar no damos
a Tolentino que vea

---

dicens, expiravit', '[a]nd Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit. And saying this he gave up the ghost' (Luke 23. 46, emphasis added). Antonio de Alvarado's *Arte de bien morir* (first published in 1611) states that these words are 'muy a propósito para la muerte', obviously because a good death meant imitating Christ as far as possible (1615, p. 285). Navarro confirms that Nicholas died with his hands held up to heaven, his eyes fixed on a cross, and his lips uttering the words of Psalm 30 (31) (1612, fol. 140ᵛ). Critana has Nicholas say the same words, but in Spanish (1612, fol. 30ᵛ). This line of Lope's play does not fit the á-o assonance of this section of *romance.*

[3059] This line is hyposyllabic.

[3062] *echemos esa cortina*: this direction suggests that Nicolás's deathbed is in the discovery space.

[3067] *Ángelo*: see the note to line 2120.

[3083] *¿qué me canso?*: 'qué' is used here as an interrogative adverb equivalent to *por qué.*

su padre y glorioso amparo,
han de rompernos las puertas.
Mas ¿qué es esto, cielo santo?
¿Qué luz es ésta que veo
bajar por los aires claros?
¡Nicolás parece! ¡Él es,
con el hábito estrellado!
¿Si es aquél el purgatorio?
¡Bravo fuego! ¡Ay, Dios, qué espanto!

San NICOLÁS *baje con el hábito estrellado y en llegando al suelo, donde esté un peñasco, salgan dos almas, y tomándolas de las manos, vayan subiendo los tres al cielo, con música.*

¡Nicolás! ¡Ah, padre mío!
Pues te favorece tanto
quien te da tal privilegio
—que con tus divinas manos
saques las almas por quien
ruegas con celo tan santo—
¡acuérdate de la mía!
Y aquí se acaba, senado,
la vida de Nicolás,
el santo de los milagros.

(stage direction before line 3100): *salgan dos almas...vayan subiendo... con música*: 'la música sirve no sólo para anunciar sino también para resaltar la importancia de una escena y contribuir a la creación de una atmósfera de devoción, admiración y solemnidad'. Where, as here, a group of actors was to be raised or lowered, *canales dobles* could be used. A single one could take no more than two people (Ruano 2000, pp. 118 & 257). (See the note to the stage direction before line 2057 for a description of the *canal* device.)

LIST OF VARIANTS

Line	Variant(s)*
5	¿Por la oveja vuelve el lobo?] ¿Por qué la oveja vuelve al lobo? A
6	nobles] noble A
20	esa] esta M, S, R, A
39	se] fe M, S, R, A
53	la] lo A
60	esa] esta M, S, R, A
83	y por estar elevado] se prueban los sentimientos A
84	se prueban los sentimientos] y por estar elevado A
98	razón] sazón A
119	perdonen tus devociones] pues eres mozo y discreto P, M, S, R, A
120	pues eres mozo y discreto] perdonen tus devociones P, M, S, R, A
132	suele] puele M; puede S, R, A
149	ea] en P
150	pasa] casa M, S, R
156	fruncen] frunce R
185	toma] tome P, M, S, R, A
185	esa] esta M, S, R, A
214	máscara] máscaras A
241	impedir] impidir P
244	Ursino Gentil] Ursino gentil M, S, R, A
246	he] ha P
253	hallara] hallarà P
276	entre] entra M, S, R, A
282	alábese] alabase M, S, R, A
295	haré] hará A
297	de] que A
300	qué dar] que dar S
313	van] va M, S, R, A
316	¿Pues no] — R
368	el sol] al sol P, M, S, R, A
372	mas] más A
379	qué queda] que quede P, M, S, R, A
388	Aora] Ahora M, S, R, A

* This list does not include variants that are: (a) obvious typographical errors; (b) merely a question of capitalization (included only where sense is affected); (c) the result of the modern editors' imposition of learned consonant clusters; or (d) the result of different approaches to the fusion of prepositions and articles/pronouns. Also excluded are: differences in punctuation (these are extensive and important, but their inclusion would make the variants list unwieldy); the *dramatis personae* lists (differences between P and the present edition are dealt with in the footnotes on the appropriate page); and, finally, stage directions (this edition uses square brackets to show how the *acotaciones* and speakers' names differ from P). Where an editorial decision merits discussion, a footnote has been included on the relevant page. This list has been prepared in the style recommended in Arellano 2007.

391 sucediere] sucediera M, S, R, A
400 quito] quitó A
411 este cruel] éste cruel M, S
432 en el cielo, en la tierra] en el cielo, la tierra P
460 esa] esta M, S, R, A
464 he] líe A
470 virtudes y oraciones] virtudes oraciones S, A
475 el papel y si no fuera espíritu] el papel; si espíritu no fuera M, S, R, A
482 mi] mí A
491 en efeto] en ef to P
498 tú] tu A
500 un] en A
525 Tú] Tu A
532 quieren] quieran S, A
545 advierte] advierta P
564 comienza] comienzo M, S, A
592 delante] adelante S, A
593 Él es] Este es M, S, R, A
640 dad] das M, S, R, A
652 unos y otras] unos y otros P, M, R
681 iniquitatem] iniquitantem A
700 declararla] declarar la P, M, S, R, A
708 desnudan] demudan M, S, R, A
709 viva] vivan A
736 le] lo M, S, R, A
772Aloc ROSELA] ROGERIO M, S, R, A
772B grande] gran R
774Bloc [AURELIO]] *Ant.* P, M, S, R, A
822 lo] le M, S, R, A
828 Una alma] Un alma M, S, R, A
830 Ya] Ya, ya A
835 tú] tu A
847 yo] ya A
852 esas] estas M, S, R, A
882 escuché] escuche A
901 la razón y la esperanza] la razón es y la esperanza P
920 ya] yo A
951 quiere] quiera M, S, R, A
984 conformes] conforme A
994 Aora] Ahora M, S, R, A
1002 Mira] Mire P
1009 tornau, tornau] Tornad, tornad M, S, R, A
1012 dio] diera S, A
1022 Mas] Más A

1035 ésta] està P
1045 se] es A
1072 le] lo M, S, R, A
1073 voz] vos A
1077 nos] no A
1079 alguna] alguno S
1101 pellico] pelliço/pellizo P, M, S, R, A
1111 impíreo] empíreo A
1112 es] en A
1132 su] la A
1164 le mudó] mudóse M, S, R, A
1169 y hijos] é hijos M, S, R, A
1200 Miralle provoca a amor] Miralle provoca amor M, R; Miradle provoca amor S, A
1202 *Deo gratias*] Deo gracias M, S, R, A
1230 trujese] trajese M, S, R, A
1242 [RUTILIO]] *Rup.* P, M, S, R, A
1251 sirve] sirva A
1260A rosarios] rosario M, S, R, A
1261 récenlos] récenlo M, S, R, A
1268 da] dé M, S, R, A
1269 vayan] vaya R
1272 See footnote for description of A's re-ordering of the text beginning here.[540]
1277 esa] esta M, S, R, A
1318 pureza] pereza M, S, R, A
1339 eso] esto M, S, R, A
1384 y, como si] Y si como P
1395 al] el S, A
1411 murrión] morrión M, S, R, A
1428 cocodrilo] cocodrillo P
1435 Laocón] Leocón P, M, S, R, A
1472 zafir] zafiro M, S, R, A
1477 púrpura] pórpora A
1503 trujo] Trajo M, S, R, A
1526 truje] traje M, S, R, A
1551 fuere] fuera M, S, R, A
1564 Traza tú, Ruperto, hermano] Traza tú, hermano M, S, R, A
1589 lo] la P, M, S, R, A
1592 Quisiéralos] Quisierale P, M, S, R, A

[540] A breaks off after line 1272. Our line 1272 is followed in A by lines 1365-1479 of our text, after which come our lines 1273-1275. Only then does A place the scene of Nicolás's temptation (our lines 1276-1334), then lines 1335-1364. Rather than the start of Peregrino's account of his vision of hell, which is meant to come here, A skips nonsensically to a point part way through the account – ll. 1480-1558. After this, A follows our order. It is very difficult to see why A re-orders the text in this way. It seems most likely that this resulted from a twentieth-century printer's error.

1596 Mas] Más A
1622A *Deo gratias*] Deo gracias M, S, R, A
1646B De mujer] — A
1647-50loc RUPERTO] CELIA
1651 le] te P
1678A altos] años M, S, R, A
1705B A Dios] Adiós M, S, R, A
1716 Si me la ve, la ha de dar] Si me la ve, ha de dar A
1757 por qué] porque P, M, S, R, A
1765 el] Al M, S, R, A
1774 Apocalipsi] Apocalipsis M, S, R, A
1800 Eso] Esto M, S, R, A
1812 Aora] Ahora M, S, R, A
1823 trujo] trajo M, S, R, A
1835 que yo soy] que soy yo A
1842 Mayolo] Mayoro P; Mayoto M, S, R, A
1857 y Jerónimo, Ruperto] y Jerómino y Ruperto P, M, S, R, A
1858 madre] medra A
1866 ha] a R
1899B suspendan] suspende P
1904A *Deo gratias*] Deo gracias M, S, R, A
1915 y su] y en su M, S, R, A
1925 su] tu P, M, S, R, A
1932 demos] damos A
1933 el] él M, S, R, A
1947 yo] ya A
1949 ésa] esta M, R, A; ésta S
1954 ésa] esta M, R, A; ésta S
1960 esas] estas M, S, R, A
1971 olvidare] olvidase M, S, R, A
2017 de Margarita enviada] Que Margarita enviaba P, M, S, R, A
2020 espetándola] Esperándola M, S, R, A
2024B él] ello P
2041 tengo de] tengo que M, S, R, A
2045 las] los M, S, R, A
2056 del] el A
2079 quiere mi Hijo que el pan] — A
2091 tú] tu A
2131 esa] esta M, S, R, A
2144 tu] tú A
2156 alabara] alabaré M, S, R, A
2169loc [NICOLÁS]] *P.* P; PRIOR M, S, R, A
2178 misterios] misterio M, S, R, A
2186 culchuchú] cuichuchú A

2190 que siete] que a siete M, S, R, A
2203A del cardenal] el Cardenal M, S, R, A
2210 de consuelo] desconsuelo M, S, R, A
2218 Cuénteme] Cuentame P
2246 al] el M, S, R, A
2259 los] las A
2260 mas] más A
2285 aquesta] aquella A
2298 le] les A
2317 Aora] Ahora M, S, R, A
2340 lazo] lado P, M, S, R, A
2341 sólo] solo A
2361 sólo] solo A
2381 que se era] que fuera M, S, R, A
2384 gocemos] queremos M, S, R, A
2435 quebrantó] quebró A
2461 la ley y los profetas] la Ley, á los Profetas M, S, R, A
2469 aun] aún M, S, R, A
2479 cumpliendo] cumplimiento A
2481 y un ángel] un ángel A
2488 de] en S, A
2509 paro] paso M, S, R, A
2531 qué] que M, S, R, a
2539 le] lo S, A
2540 Qué] Que P
2541 ocupadas] ocupados M, S, A
2541 con] en A
2548 yo] ya A
2552 sabed] saber A
2557 ingenioso] ingenio P
2561 fuerte] suerte M, S, R, A
2564 Ved cuál estoy, pues este pobre paño] — A
2569 integridad] inteligencia M, S, R, A
2571 vos] voz A
2573 los] les A
2591 ya me conoces] ya no me conoces A
2608 su] tu M, S, R, A
2633 y irá] É irá M, S, R, A
2636 correr] corre A
2637A Sin duda es agua, padre] — A
2648 el] al M, S, R, A
2655 mire] mío M, S, R, A
2662 mas] más A
2667 qué] que A

2722A esa] esta M, S, R, A
2741 tiende] Tiene M, S, R; tienes A
2755 ardiente] abierta A
2756 mueva] muevan M, S, R
2757 piedra] piedras A
2771 a ver su pura] a ver pura A
2789 nido] día P, M, S, R, A
2802 hicistes] hicisteis M, S, R; incisteis A
2808 al bravo Nicolás de Tolentino] — A
2810 y] é M, S, R, A
2831 olvidare] olvidaré S, A
2852loc DEMONIO] INOBEDENCIA M, S, R, A
2881A esa] esta M, S, R, A
2895 Y yo de miedo] Y yo quedo de miedo A
2913B y el fuego] y fuego M, S, R, A
2918 Conócesme] Conocéisme M, S, R, A
2952 eso] esto M, S, R, A
2964loc [LIDIA]] — P, M, R; AUR. S, A
2971loc ROSELA] REFITOLERO M, S, R, A
3014Aloc ROSELA] REFITOLERO M, S, R, A
3016Bloc ROSELA] REFITOLERO M, S, R, A
3021 allá] allí M, S, R, A
3033 esa] esta M, S, R, A
3055 impíreo] Imperio M, S, R, A
3062 esa] esta M, S, R, A
3073 ese amor, ese cuidado] ese amor y cuidado A
3081 ha] han A
3085 al] el A

LIST OF NOTES

Aaron, 1449
Abel (and/or Cain), 321-322, 1449, 2484
Abiram, 1449
Abraham, 2421-2422
Absalon, 1409
Adam and/or Eve, 1-18, 26-27, 38, 73-82, 483, 1425, 1755-1756
adonde, 482
Adonijah, 452-453
Agrippa, Cornelius, 1-18
Albertus Magnus
- *De animalibus*, 1436-1437
Alciatus
- *Emblemata*, 804-807
Alexander IV, pope, 1145-1150
Allecto, 1014
alto, en lo, 596
altos, de tres, 1678
angels, 483, 1016-1017, 1481, 2324sd, 2345, 2405, 2596sd, 2902sd
animals, 2147, 2800sd
Anselm, St
- *Cur Deus homo?*, 1733
Anthony the Great, St, 1486-1489, 1708, 2800-2801, 2870
anti-Semitism, 1699, 1993-2030
Antonino de Florencia
- *Crónica*, 1096
Aquinas, St Thomas
- *Sacris solemniis*, 1134-1135
- *Summa*, 2710-2711, 2826, 2870
- *De forma absolutionis*, 1738
Argus, 395-397
Aristotle
- *Historia animalium*, 1436-1437
- *Physiognomica*, 2540
assimilation, 138
Augustine, St, 73-82, 173, 401-403, 483, 618-628, 1084, 1745-1751, 1792, 2050sd, 2556-2557
Augustinian Order, 173, 342, 1145-1150, 2008, 2525-2526, 2781
autorhyme, 73 & 76, 532-533, 1565-1566
Baltasar de Vitoria, Fray
- *Teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad*, 2045
Basil the Great, St, 1851-1852, 2045
Bathsheba, 452-453

Bernard of Clairvaux, St, 1852-1853
Bridget, St, 456
búzano, 2661
Cain (and/or Abel), 321-322, 1449, 2484
caldeo, 1613
caldera, 2876
Calderón de la Barca, Pedro
- *El divino Jasón*, 2045
- *El mágico prodigioso*, 400
- *El médico de su honra*, 1316
- *El purgatorio de san Patricio*, 400
calonjía, 113
canelón, 261, 506, 1397, 1526
capigorrón, sd1
capón, 1574
carne de honestidad, 1578
Caro, Ana
- *El conde Partinuplés*, 2147
Castro de Santángel (Sant'Angelo in Pontano), 1086
Catechism, 1034-1035
catedrático de prima, 2464
Cato, 157-163
Celestina, 398
Cervantes, Miguel de
- *Don Quijote*, 222, 553, 1186, 2876
- 'Rinconete y Cortadillo', 1264
Charles V, Emperor, 1993-2030
Christ, 73-82, 321-322, 480, 1477, 2045, 2068, 2219, 2257, 2297sd, 2421-2422, 2461, 2464, 2476, 2494-2495, 2496-2497
Church, 73-82
Chrysologus, St Peter, 685-686
Chrysostom, St John, 634-637, 1855-1856
claustro, 2450
coco, 2457
cocodrilo, 1428
colación, 260
color, 2045
compas, 130
Commodus, Emperor, 1439
concierto, 3
conditional use of *–ara* verbs, 253, 1168, 1234
confession, 763
Corinthians, Letter to the
- I 11. 3, 42

- II 11. 14, 2705-2706
Correas, Gonzalo
- *Vocabulario de refranes*, 558, 1073-1074
cortina, 2068
Creed, 2344-2351
Creon, 1451
cuadrar, 2988
Dante, 1030, 1423
Dathan, 1449
David, King, 452-453, 1395, 1409, 1770-1772, 2546, 2634
demons, 2800sd, 2811, 2826, 2870, 2884
demudan, 708
derramar, 2223
deslenguarse, 364
desprecio del mundo, 1157
Devil, 233-234, 408, 460-463, 473-477, 480, 494-495, 1014, 1016-1017, 1429, 1481, 1484, 1486-1489, 2300, 2370, 2373, 2405, 2412-2422, 2433-2435, 2469-2470, 2539, 2568, 2705-2706, 2811, 2826, 2847, 2876, 2884
dreams, 518-519
e (conjunction), 1169, 2633
ea, 149
Ecclesiasticus, Book of
- 24. 18, 1487-1503
Edom, 1477
ejercicio, 1374
él (personal pronoun), 1252
Elijah, 1419, 2075-2076, 2644
Elim, 2604
encarecer, 1887
encogimiento, 149
Enoch, 1419
en tanto, 2594
entender, 1687
Ephesians, Letter to the
- 4. 26, 2568
escena múltiple, 526-579
esmaltar, 1149
estampas, 1264
Esther, Book of, 456
Eucharist, 1134-1135, 2050, 2067, 2068
Evangelists, 2480-2481
Eve and/or Adam, 1-18, 26-27, 38, 73-82, 483, 1425, 1755-1756
Exodus, Book of
- 15. 27, 2604

- 17, 2519-2521
Ezechiel, Book of
- 1. 10, 2480-2481
fasting, 1851-1852, 1852-1853, 1855-1856, 1858
Fermo, 1030, 1165
forma, 2067
Frishlin, Nicodemus, 1-18
fuente, 2639
Furies, 1014
fusion, 39
future subjunctive, 4, 1971
Gabriel, Archangel, 483
Galatians, Letter to
- 3. 16, 2421-2422
Genesis
- 1. 6-8, 2607-2608
- 2. 17, 1755-1756, 2394
- 2. 21, 38
- 2. 23, 26-27
- 3. 14, 1234
- 3. 15, 460-463
- 4. 1-16, 2484
- 5. 24, 1419
- 6-9, 2689
- 9. 13, 2045
- 11. 1-9, 1447
- 22. 18, 2421-2422
- 28. 12, 233-234
- 31. 19, 494-501
gorrón, 1000
goshawk, 1436-1437
graciosos, 848-850, 1206, 1209, 1573ff., 1596, 1609, 1613, 1645, 1662, 1685, 1699, 1705, 1807-1809, 1993-2030, 2183, 2640, 2663, 2691, 2876, 2954, 2984-2985
Gregory X, pope, 199
Guelphs and Ghibellines, 199, 1030, 1160
haber, 2374
hacimiento, 1712
heaven, 2710-2711, 2798-2799
hebdomadario, 2715
Hebrews, Letter to the
- 12. 24, 321-322
hell, 2710-2711
Henry of Luxembourg, Holy Roman Emperor, 1030, 1249
Herod, 494-501, 1448, 2457

higa, 1702
Historia de cómo fue hallada la imagen del santo crucifijo (1554), 398
Holofernes, 1453
Holy Innocents, 494-501, 2457
huevos estrellados, 1807-1809
Icarus, 392-393
impíreo, 3055b
indio, 1384
Io, 395-397
Isaiah, Book of
- 14. 3-20, 494-495
- 14, 12-15, 233-234
Jacob, 494-501
Jacob's ladder, 233-234
Jeremiah, Book of
- 2. 13, 2572
- 17. 13, 2572
- 31.30, 1766-1767
Jerome, St, 145, 1858
Jews, 1699, 1993-2030
Job, Book of, 408
- 6. 12, 1002-1003
John the Baptist, St, 1145-1150
John, Gospel of
- 1. 12, 625, 634-637
- 1. 14, 628
- 6.51, 1034-1035
- 11. 38-44, 1922
- 12. 1-2, 1922
- 12. 6, 2494-2495
- 13. 29, 2490-2491
- 19. 26, 455-456
John, Letter of
- I 1. 7, 321-322
- I 2. 15, 1157
John of the Cross, St
- *Cántico espiritual*, 2906
- *Subida del monte Carmelo*, 2705-2706
Joseph, St, 480
Juan de Ávila
- *Epistolario espiritual*, 3083
Juana Inés de la Cruz, Sor
- *La Respuesta*, 1395
Judas Iscariot, 317-320, 1456, 2490-2491, 2494-2495, 2496-2497

Judges, Book of
- 15. 15 & 19, 2464-2469
Juno, 395-397, 1014
Jupiter, 395-397, 1435
Keniston, Hayward
- *The Syntax of Castilian Prose: the Sixteenth Century*, 482, 2190, 2202-2203, 2539, 3083
Kings, Book of
- I 16. 14-23, 1395
- II 11, 452-453
- II 14. 26, 1409
- II 23. 15, 2634
- III 1. 11-31, 452-453
- III 2. 19, 452-453
- III 17. 4, 2075-2076
- III 18. 45, 2644
- III 19. 5-6, 2075-2076
- IV 2. 11, 1419
Laban, 494-501
Laocón, 1435
Lazarillo de Tormes, 2457, 2539
Lazarus, 1922, 2494
le (object pronoun), 1066
llano, 18
Lotti, Cosimo, 411
Lucrecia de León, 1145-1150
Luis de Granada
- *Guía de pecadores*, 401-403
Luis de León
- *Nombres de Cristo*, 3
Luke, Gospel of
- 1. 28, 483, 2440-2441
- 2. 42-50, 2461, 2476
- 3. 23, 2476
- 10. 38-42, 1922
- 15. 10, 767
- 15. 11-12, 606, 639-641
- 15. 17-19, 668-681
- 23. 46, 3057-3058
luz de Febo, 2689
Macerata, 1086, 1160
maitines, 2886
Majolus, St, 1842
Manescal, Honofre de
- 'Tratado de las apariencias' (1611), 518-519

Marca de Ancona, 176
Martha, 1922, 2494
Mary, sister of Martha and Lazarus, 1922, 2494
Mary, the Virgin, 449, 455-456, 460-463, 483, 494-501, 753, 1487-1503, 2050sd, 2101-2102
Matthew, Gospel of, 2421-2422
- 2. 16-23, 1448, 2457
- 5. 17, 2461
- 8. 26, 3038
- 23. 35, 321-322
- 26.15, 317-320, 1456, 2496-2497
- 27. 28, 1477
menudo, 1690
Mercury, 395-397
Michael, Archangel, 1016-1017, 1481, 2405
Midas, 1454
Milo of Croton, 1453
miracles, 1186, 1206, 1863, 1876-1885, 1932, 2057sd, 2057-2104, 2147, 2183, 2230, 2519-2521, 2663, 2740, 2847, 3001
Monterubbiano, Pietro da
- *Vita*, 1096, 1186, 1876-1885
Moses, 2519-2521, 2602-2603
motilón, 2879
muerte, 400
murrión, 1411
music, 2324sd, 2902sd, 3100sd
Nathan, the Prophet, 452-453
Navarro, Antonio
- *Abecedario virginal*, 1487-1503
Navarro, Bernardo
- *La vida y milagros de san Nicolás de Tolentino*, 401-403, 902-906, 1096, 1157, 1186, 1206, 1876-1885, 2008, 2057-2104, 2165-2166, 2297sd, 2716, 2740, 2817-2819, 2847, 3057-3059
nazareno, 2647
Nebrija, Antonio de
- *Vocabuliarium*, 558
Nero, 157-153, 1439
Nicholas of Bari, St, 902-906, 1096, 1693,
Nicholas of Tolentino, St, 401-403, 902-906, 1096, 1157, 1186, 1206, 1145-1150, 1876-1885, 2008, 2050sd, 2057-2104, 2147, 2165-2166, 2219, 2297sd, 2300, 2519-2521, 2525-2526, 2571, 2716, 2740, 2781, 2817-2819, 2847, 2884, 3029, 3057-3059
Nimrod, 1447
Noah, 2689
novicio, 1569
Numbers, Book of

- 16, 1449
obispillos, 1693
Ocasión, 804-807
olla, 2876
orejón, 1573
Ovid
- *Metamorphoses*, 395-397, 1435, 1454
Pacheco, Francisco
- *Arte de la pintura*, 1423, 1484, 2596sd, 2800sd
panecitos, 2057-2014
paraninfo, 2606
parte, 644
partridge, 2147, 2663
Paul of Thebes, St, 1708, 2800-2801
peacock, 395-397
pellico, 1101
penance, 261, 264, 2847
Penny, Ralph
- *A History of the Spanish Language*, 4, 138, 155, 253, 444, 1066, 1168, 1169, 1971, 2045
Pepin, Guillaume, 449
Pereira, Benito
- *Prior Tomus Commentariorum et Disputationum in Genesim*, 1733
perlado, 1110
personal *a*, 155
Peter, St, 136, 1152
Philip III, King, 1439
pigs, 1486-1489, 1698
Pliny
- *Historia naturalis*, 1436-1437
pontífice, 145
popes, 199, 1152
por momentos, 1869
porque, 2539
prayer, 848-850
preaching, 594, 604
prelado, 1110
presto, 1036
pretendiente, 154
preterite, 2278
priors, 1235, 2877-2878 , 2954, 2984-2985
Processus, 1096
Proverbs, Book of
- 24. 16, 1792
Psalms

- 41 (42), 2571
- 48 (49), 1770-1772
- 62 (63), 2571
- 77 (78), 1134-1135
- 118 (119), 1792
Ptolomaic universe, 342
pueblos en Francia, 558
puesto que, 222, 402
purgatory, 2710-2711, 2740, 2755, 3100sd
purple, 1477
qué (as equivalent for *por qué*), 3083
Quevedo, Francisco de
- 'El alguacil endemoniado', 1678
- 'En el ardor de una siesta', 1573
- 'Sueno del Infierno', 2297sd
- 'Sueño del Juicio Final', 408
repentance, 401-403
Rachel, 494-501
rainbow, 2045
rebelión, 1326
recipe, 2027
reloj, 1537
Rephadim, 1449, 2519-2521, 2602-2603
Resende, André de
- *Sententiarum Memorabilium*, 1858
Revelation, Book of
- 4. 7, 2480-2481
- 7. 9, 2798-2799
- 12, 460-463, 2101-2102, 2433-2435
- 12. 3-12, 233-234
- 12. 7-8. 1016-1017, 1481
- 14. 13, 1256 & 1258
- 19. 20, 1773-1775
- 20. 10, 1773-1775
- 20. 14-15, 1773-1775
- 21. 8, 1773-1775
Ribadeneira, Pedro de
- *Flos sanctorum*, 1096
Ripa, Cesare de
- *Iconologia*, 411, 804-807, 1299-1300, 2540sd
Romans, Letter to the
- 5. 12-21, 73-82
Roman Missal, 321-322
Rosal, Francisco de

- *Origen de vocablos*, 558
Ruperto, 848-850, 1206, 1209, 1573ff., 1596, 1609, 1613, 1645, 1662, 1685, 1699, 1705, 1807-1809, 1993-2030, 2183, 2640, 2663, 2691, 2876, 2954, 2984-2985
sacraments, 721-723
Sallust
- *Bellum Catalinae*, 157-163
salva, hacer la, 2792
Samson, 2646-2649, 2647
Sant'Angelo in Pontano (Castro de Santángel), 1086
Saul, King, 1395
sayón, 1487
scholastic disputation, 8, 1733b
sentir, 2032
serafín, 1981
servicios, 1570
sheep, 5, 1770-1772
solemnizar, 2813
Solomon, King, 452-453, 1395, 1762-1765
Song of Songs, 760, 2906
songs, 193-206, 2322
souls, 2710-2711, 2728sd, 2740, 2744, 3100sd
sparrowhawk, 1436-1437
Spaulding, Robert K.
- *How Spanish Grew*, 138, 1252
staging, 596, 1308, 2057sd, 2147, 2242sd, 2728sd, 2800sd, 3062, 3100sd
sudario, 2205
supernatural, 1299-1300, 2705-2706, 2710-2711, 2884
terciana, 860
Textor, Ravisius
- *Epitome epithetorum*, 157-163
Tirso de Molina
- *El condenado por desconfiado*, 401-403
tránsito, 2904
Trent, Council of, 460-463, 763, 1932, 2710-2711, 2755
Trinity, 2045, 2322, 2340, 2344-2351
Troy, 533
Uriah the Hittite, 452-453
Wisdom, Book of
- 16.14, 1762-1765
Vega, Lope de
- *El cardenal de Belén*, 145, 2728
- *El cerco de Santa Fe*, 553
- *La devoción del rosario*, 848-850
- *Diego de Alcalá*, 2300

- *El divino africano*, 2556-2557
- *Los embustes de Fabia*, 1326
- *La Filomena*, 1002-1003
- *Lo fingido verdadero*, 2596sd
- *Fuenteovejuna*, 1009
- *La hermosa Ester*, 1447
- *La hermosura de Angélica*, 2826
- *Juan de Dios y Antón Martín*, 848-850, 1264
- knowledge of Church Fathers, 618-628
- knowledge of classical literature and mythology, 395-397, 1014, 1435, 1453, 1454
- knowledge of Italian literature, 1423
- knowledge of Latin, 8
- *La limpieza no manchada*, 456, 460-463
- *El marqués de Mantua*, 1439
- *El niño inocente de La Guardia*, 1993-2030, 2216
- *El peregrino en su patria*, 1030
- priest, 321-322
- *Púsoseme el sol, salióme la luna*, 815-816
- *La Santa Liga*, 1439
- *El santo negro Rosambuco de la ciudad de Palermo*, 815-816
- 'Si el padre universal de cuanto veo', 2646-2649
- *Soliloquios amorosos*, 1477
- *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco*, 157-163, 233-234

Villegas, Alonso de
- *Flos sanctorum*, 1096

Virgil
- *Aeneid*, 1014

visions, 518-519, 2705-2706, 2870

Voragine, Jacob
- *Legenda Aurea*, 473-477

voz de Dios, 1073-1074

y (conjunction), 1169, 2633

women, 1-18, 42, 2398

zonzorrión, 2874

APPENDIX 1

List of sources consulted in the preparation of this edition

Author	Abbreviated Title	Language	Edition
The Church	*Processus canonizationis sancti Nicolai a Tholentino*	Latin	1325[541] [1984]
Monterubbiano	*Historia beati Nicolai de Tolentino*	Latin	1326 [1480]
Antonino of Florence	*Chronicon: Historialis domini Antonini Archiepiscopi Florentini*	Latin	Nuremberg, 1491
Orozco	*Crónica de san Agustín y de los santos y beatos y doctores de su orden*	Castilian	Seville, 1551 [2001]
Augustinian Friars of Burgos	*Historia de cómo fue hallada la imagen del santo crucifijo*	Castilian	Burgos, 1554
Vega	*La vida de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo y de su santísima madre y de los otros santos*	Castilian	Zaragoza, 1554
Román	*Crónica de la orden de los ermitaños del glorioso padre san Agustín*	Castilian	Salamanca, 1569
Millán	*Flos sanctorum, la vida de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo y de su santísima madre y de los otros santos*	Castilian	Seville, 1572
Villegas	*Flos sanctorum:historia general de la vida y hechos de Jesucristo y de todos los santos de que reza la iglesia católica*	Castilian	Toledo, 1578
Román	*Vida y milagros del bienaventurado san Nicolás de Tolentino, sacada de la primera parte de la Historia de san Agustín*	Castilian	Valencia, 1590
Frigerio [ed. by Giacomo Alberici]	*Vita gloriosissima e miracoli eccelsi del beato confessore Nicola di Tolentino*	Italian	Milan, 1603

[541] The Church's record of the canonization process, begun on 23 May, 1325, the date of the papal bull 'Pater luminum et misericordiarum'.

Ortiz	*Flos sanctorum y vida de Jesucristo, Dios y Señor nuestro y de todos los santos de que reza y hace fiesta la iglesia católica*	Castilian	Madrid, 1605
Ledesma	'Pareces trasfigurado' in *Tercera parte de los conceptos espirituales y morales*	Castilian	Madrid, 1612
González de Critana	*Epitome historica vitae monasticae magni antistitis Augustini*	Latin	Antwerp, 1612
González de Critana	*Vida y milagros del glorioso confesor san Nicolás de Tolentino*	Castilian	Madrid, 1612
Navarro	*Vida y milagros de san Nicolás de Tolentino, religioso del orden de nuestro padre san Agustín*	Castilian	Barcelona, 1612
Cairasco y Figueroa	*Templo militante, flos santorum, y triumphos de sus virtudes [...] primera y segunda parte*	Castilian	Lisbon, 1613
	Templo militante, flos santorum, y triumphos de sus virtudes [...] quarta parte	Castilian	Lisbon, 1614
Ribadeneira	*Flos sanctorum o libro de las vidas de los santos*	Castilian	Madrid, 1616
Cairasco y Figueroa	*Terceta parte del templo militante, flos santorum, y triumpho de sus virtudes*	Castilian	Lisbon, 1618
Ledesma	'Soys qual linterna encendida' and 'Pintose un cielo' in *Epigramas y hieroglíficos a la Vida de Christo*	Castilian	Madrid, 1625

APPENDIX 2

Table of factual details present in *San Nicolás* also present in hagiographies[542]

		Monterubbiano (1326)	A. of Florence (1491)	Orozco (1551)	Burgos *Historia* (1554)	Millán (1572)	Villegas (1578)	Román (1590)	González de Critana (1612)	Navarro (1612)	Ribadeneira (1616)
1	Nicholas had a relative called Gentil Ursino	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
2	Nicholas has a colleague called Peregrino	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
3	Nicholas has a *capigorrón* called Ruperto										
4	They all celebrate the election of a new pope, *Gregorio santo*										
5	Nicholas was made canon of a local church	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
6	Ursino is killed	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
7	The devil is involved in his death										
8	Ursino's lover is called Laurencia										
9	Ursino avoids damnation thanks to Nicholas's virtues and prayers	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
10	Nicholas takes Peregrino and Ruperto to a Discalced Augustinian priory										
11	A supernatural pilgrim – Christ – asks Nicholas for alms										

[542] The *Processus* is not analysed here since Radi states it would have been unavailable outside Italy before 1704 (see section of introduction on sources). Works listed in Appendix 1 and not considered here have been excluded from consideration because they do not appear to contain substantial accounts of the life and miracles of the St Nicholas of Tolentino in which we are interested.

12	Nicholas gives the pilgrim 100 *monedas* (his income as canon) and his cloak										
13	Rosela and Feniso have a lovers' tiff										
14	Heraclio and Fabricio discuss business										
15	Lidia and Aurelio have a lovers' tiff										
16	*Agustino* preaches a sermon	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
17	Friar is called Rogerio										
18	The sermon is based on the parable of the Prodigal Son										
19	The sermon persuades Nicholas to become an Augustinian friar	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
20	Nicholas's parents support his decision to leave the world	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
21	The maid to Nicholas's parents is called Celia										
22	Nicholas's parents asked God for a child, through St Nicholas of Bari/Myra	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
23	Ruperto enters the monastery with Nicolás										
24	Takes place during Guelph-Ghibelline conflicts										
25	Set during a time of famine							●			
The Labrador's biography:											
26	Nicholas was born in Castro de Santangel	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
27	Nicholas's parents wanted an heir			●	●	●				●	
28	They went to Bari	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
29	Bari is the site of the the tomb of St Nicholas of Bari	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
30	Nicholas of Bari appeared to them	●	●				●	●	●	●	●
31	He told them that God had heard their prayer	●	●				●	●	●	●	
32	Nicholas's mother was called Amada	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
33	The child Nicholas fasted three days a week	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
34	Many times he gave his own belongings to the poor			●	●	●		●	●		
35	Many times whilst hearing mass he saw the face of the Christ child in the Host	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●
36	The Augustinian friar preached about *desprecio del mundo*	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
37	The *labrador* sustains an injury when cutting wood	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	
38	The *labrador* injures his leg (rather than his foot)							●	●		
End of the labrador's biography											
39	Nicholas gives bread to poor which turns into flowers when the prior challenges								●	●	
40	Nicholas is encouraged to lessen his self-mortification	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
41	It is the devil who tempts him to do this	●	●					●	●	●	

Fray Peregrino tells the prior about his dream:											
42	The angel shows Peregrino hell										
43	Then he sees the scene of his Last Judgement										
44	The doctor who treats Nicholas is Jewish										
45	The doctor prescribes that he eat meat	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
46	Nicholas has taken a vow not to eat meat	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
47	The superior orders him to eat the meat as an obedience	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
48	Nicholas prays to God for guidance faced with the choice			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
49	The Virgin Mary and St Augustine appear to Nicholas	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
50	The BVM tells Nicholas to ask for bread and to eat it dipped in water as a cure	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
51	The bird brought for him to eat was a *perdiz*							●	●	●	
52	It flies away (even though it was already roasted and carved)			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
53	The *panecillo* cures Nicholas	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
54	Peregrino goes to Rome on priory business										
55	The devil torments Nicholas whilst he is mending his habit, his *túnica*	●		●	●	●		●	●	●	
56	While Nicholas sews he tells his *túnica* stories from the Bible										
57	The devil takes the *paño* to try to provoke Nicholas to anger	●		●	●	●			●	●	
58	Nicholas prays for water for the monastery								●	●	
59	Nicholas uses a *caña* and finds water like Moses								●	●	
Fray Peregrino's soul visits Nicholas											
60	Peregrino dies and his spirit appears to Nicholas	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
61	His soul is in purgatory and he asks for Nicholas's aid	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
62	Nicholas says he cannot because he is the *hebdomadario* that week	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	
63	Word *hebdomadario* used	●	●					●	●	●	
64	Nicholas is taken to see the suffering of the souls of purgatory	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
65	The souls include those of Nicholas's mother, father and Floro										
66	Nicholas is beaten by the devil and other demons	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
67	They smash a *lámpara,* which is miraculously restored			●	●	●		●	●	●	●
68	Ruperto saves him by fighting off the devil and all his demons										
69	Nicholas's leg is injured by the fight and he remains lame for the rest of his life			●	●	●		●	●	●	●
70	Nicholas hears from angels telling him that he will soon die	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●
71	Nicholas is given a black habit decorated with stars							●	●		

72	A *panecillo* is used to put out a fire that has engulfed a house			●	●	●		●	●	●	
73	Nicholas dies with a crucifix in his hands	●	●				●	●	●	●	●
74	His last words are *In manus tuas Domine commendo spritum meum*	●	●					●	●	●	●
75	He is seen rescuing two souls by the 'hand' from purgatory										
	CONVERGENCE PERCENTAGE[543]	73	65	75	75	75	46	90	96	92	42

[543] This figure shows the percentage of the historical facts selected present in Lope's play also found in the hagiographies. In producing these calculations, I have excluded the details not found in any hagiography (shown hatched in the table), making the tentative assumption that these are invented by Lope.

APPENDIX 3

ACT 1

Macrosecuencia	***Microsecuencia***	**Lines**	**Verse Form**	**Time and location of action**	**Action**	**Characters and extras**	**Empty stage**	***Cuadro***
I	a	1-192	Redondillas	Night, a city of the Marca de Ancona	Scholastic debate and anticipation of *fiestas.*	Ruperto, Nicolás, Ursino, Peregrino, four unnamed speakers		I
		193-206	Canción		Song in praise of Church and pope.	*Máscaras, músicos*		
		207-350	Redondillas		Devil lures away Ursino; Nicolás brings friends to safety and is visited by Christ.	Máscara, Nicolás, Ursino, Peregrino, Ruperto, Pilgrim	l. 350	
	b	351-404	Versos sueltos	Night; alleyway	Devil leads Ursino to death.	Ursino, Devil		II
	c	404-477		God's Tribunal	Ursino's soul tried before God.	Devil, Juez divino, Misericordia, Justicia, Virgen María		
		478-504	Octavas reales		Devil vows to pursue Nicolás.	Devil	l.504	
	d	505-525		Night; street	Ursino's corpse discovered; Peregrino vows to reform his life.	Nicolás, Peregrino, Ruperto	l.525	III
II	a	526-605	Décimas	City square	Prelude to the sermon.	Rosela, *escudero*, Feniso, Heraclio, Fabricio, Lidia, Aurelio, Fray Rogerio, Antonio, Nicolás, Ruperto		IV

		606-781	Romance é-a		Sermon followed by brief reactions.	Fray Rogerio, Rosela, Feniso, Lidia, Aurelio, Heraclio, Fabricio, Nicolás, Ruperto	l. 1009	
	b	782-873	Redondillas	From square to Nicolás's home	Nicolás confirms vocation and persuades Ruperto to join him.	Nicolás, Fray Rogerio, Antonio, Ruperto		
	c	874-1009	Romance á-a	Nicolás's home	Nicolás and Ruperto bid farewell to loved ones.	Nicolás, father and mother, Ruperto, Celia		

ACT 2

Macrosecuencia	*Microsecuencia*	**Lines**	**Verse Form**	**Time and location of action**	**Action**	**Characters and extras**	**Empty stage**	*Cuadro*
I	a	1010-1081	Redondillas	Near priory at Firmo	Poor and infirm gather for alms.	Fisberto, Rutilio, Fabia *con niño*, Labrador		I
		1082-1199	Romance í-o		Labrador tells story of Nicolás's childhood.	Labrador, Fisberto, Rutilio, Fabia, child		
	b	1200-1275	Redondillas		Nicolás provides alms; miracles: bread transformed into *hierbas* and cures Fisberto.	Fabia, Nicolás, Ruperto, prior, Fisberto, Rutilio, Labrador		
		1276-1289	Soneto		Nicolás prays to share Christ's suffering.	Nicolás		
II	a	1290-1334	Redondillas	Priory	Devil and Carne try to tempt Nicolás to mitigate penance.	Demonio, Carne, Nicolás		
	b	1335-1377			Peregrino remembers Nicolás's good influence.	Nicolás, Peregrino, then prior		
		1378-1551	Romance ó-Ø		Peregrino recalls vision of hell and conversion.	Peregrino, prior		
		1552-1558	Redondillas		Prior responds to Peregrino's account.	Prior, Peregrino, Ruperto		
III	a	1559-1615			Ruperto's comic monologue on food.	Ruperto, prior, Peregrino		
	b	1616-1721			Celia's tries to tempt Ruperto with *carne.*	Gil, Ruperto, Celia		
	c	1721-1731		Priory's orchard	Nicolás and Floro discuss sin and Ruperto's basket given away.	Ruperto, Nicolas, Floro		
		1732-1875	Romance é-o					

	d	1876-1936	Tercetos		Margarita's son resuscitated; priory's famine averted thanks to Nicolás.	Ruperto, prior, Gil, Peregrino	l. 1936	
IV	a	1937-1986	Décimas	Priory	Nicolás declares God meaning of his life.	Nicolás		II
	b	1987-2040	Redondillas		Nicolás forces to choose between obedience and vegetarian vow.	Nicolás, Ruperto, prior, Peregrino, Jewish doctor		
	c	2040-2042			Nicolás prays for guidance.	Nicolás		
		2043-2056	Soneto		Nicolás prays for a cure and to avoid eating meat.			
		2057-2104	Romance é-o		Mary and Augustine appear to Nicolás and give him *panecito*.	Nicolás, María, Agustín		
	d	2105-2186			Patridge resuscitated and Nicolás cured by *panecito.*	Nicolás, Ruperto, prior, Peregrino, Gil	l. 2186	

ACT 3

Macrosecuencia	*Microsecuencia*	Lines	Verse Form	Time and location of action	Action	Characters and extras	Empty stage	*Cuadro*
I	a	2187-2296	Quintillas	Rome	Peregrino sees the Turin Shroud and ails.	Peregrino, Secretario, Fabia, Laurencia, Teodoro, Ludovico, two cardinals, two students	l. 2296	I
II	a	2297-2321		Priory at Tolentino	Nicolás mends his tunic and talks to it about religion.	Nicolás		II
		2322-2333	Canción		Song on Trinity.			
		2334-2363	Irregular 8s		Continuation *microsecuencia* a.			
		2364-2369	Canción		The same song.			
		2370-2503	Romance é-a		Continuation microsecuencia a, with devil's interjections.	Nicolás, Demonio		
	b	2504-2523	Redondillas		Priory suffering drought.	Nicolás, Ruperto, Devil		
	c	2524-2595	Octavas reales		Devil and demons try to tempt Nicolás to anger by theft of *paño*.	Demonio, Inobediencia, Carne, Ira, Nicolás		
III	a	2596-2635	Quintillas	Priory grounds	Nicolás gets water from stone.	Nicolás, angel		
	b	2636-2667	Versos sueltos		Friars recognize miracle.	Nicolás, Ruperto, Gil, prior		
	c	2668-2696	Liras (six lines)		Nicolás thanks God for miracle.	Nicolás		
IV	a	2697-2799		From priory to purgatory and back	Peregrino's spirit takes Nicolás to purgatory; Nicolás promises to help the suffering souls.	Peregrino, Nicolás, souls.	l. 2799	

V	a	2800-2826	Versos sueltos	Night, Nicolás's cell	Devil resolves to kill Nicolás.	Demonio, Ira, Inobediencia, and other demons		III
	b	2827-2854	Redondillas		Miracle of the lamp.	As above (hiding), plus Nicolás		
	c	2855-2895	Versos sueltos		Demons attack Nicolás, who is saved by Ruperto.	As above, plus Ruperto and prior		
VI	a	2896-2903	Redondillas		Nicolás thanks God for saving him	Nicolás and the voice, 'Música'		
		2904-2917	Soneto		Angel informs Nicolás of fate.	As above		
	b	2918-2961	Redondillas		Pilgrim and angels reward Nicolás with starry habit.	Nicolás, Christ, two angels, then Ruperto, prior	l. 2961	
VII	a	2962-3025		Burning house	Fire quenched by *panecito.*	Lidia, Feniso, Aurelio, Rosela, Ruperto, prior	l. 3025	IV
VIII	a	3026-3109	Romance á-o	Priory	Nicolás's death and rise up to heaven.	Fray Angel, Nicolás,prior, Gil, Ruperto, then two souls	l. 3109	V

APPENDIX 4

Synopsis of versification

ACT 1

Lines	*Verse form*	*Number of lines*	*Notes*
1-192	Redondillas	192	Line 137 is missing. Where there is evidence of a missing line, this is indicated by a row of dots in the text. Missing lines are given line numbers to facilitate reference to them. They are also included in the tally of lines in this synopsis of versification.
193-206	Song	14	
207-350	Redondillas	144	
351-477	Versos sueltos	127	69% *pareados*: lines 352-355; 357-372; 375-378; 383-392; 394-395; 397-398; 402-405; 407-414; 418-419; 421-424; 428-433; 435-436; 438-439; 444-447; 449-450; 453-454; 457-458; 460-469; and 471-472.
478-525	Octavas reales	48	
526-605	Décimas	80	
606-781	Romance (é-a)	176	This section includes four lines of Latin. Two (ll. 628 & 681) are octosyllabic and fit the *romance* assonance pattern. Two (ll. 606-625) are hypersyllabic and interrupt the assonantal rhyme. All four lines are included in the line count to facilitate reference to them.
782-873	Redondillas	92	
874-1009	Romance (á-a)	136	

ACT 2

Lines	*Verse form*	*Number of lines*	*Notes*
1010-1081	Redondillas	72	
1082-1199	Romance (í-o)	118	
1200-1275	Redondillas	76	
1276-1289	Sonnet	14	
1290-1377	Redondillas	88	Line 1366 is missing.
1378-1551	Romance (ó)	174	Line 1379 is missing.
1552-1731	Redondillas	180	Line 1722 is missing.
1732-1875	Romance (é-o)	144	The Latin of lines 1733, 1749 & 1766 fits the octosyllabic line length and the é-o assonance. Lines 1751 & 1767 are octosyllabic but have assonance in é-u.
1876-1936	Tercetos	61	Line 1895 is missing.
1937-1986	Décimas	50	
1987-2042	Redondillas	56	
2043-2056	Sonnet	14	
2057-2186	Romance (é-o)	130	

ACT 3

Lines	*Verse form*	*Number of lines*	*Notes*
2187-2321	Quintillas	135	
2322-2333	Song	12	
2334-2363	Irregular 8s	30	This section is made up of three strophes. Each begins as a *décima* (i.e. *abbaaccd...*), but then, rather than ending with the expected *dc* rhyme, the *estribillo* of the preceding song is added, with the rhyme *dd* (to give *abbaaccddd*). Also, the penultimate line of each strophe is clearly hyposyllabic and ll. 2343 and 2363 are hypersyllabic.
2364-2369	Song (reprise)	6	
2370-2503	Romance (é-a)	134	The Latin of line 2495 fits the *romance* line length and assonance.
2504-2523	Redondillas	20	
2524-2595	Octavas reales	72	Line 2547 is missing.
2596-2635	Quintillas	40	
2636- 2667	Versos sueltos	32	44% *pareados*: lines 2638-2641; 2644-2645; 2649-2650; 2653-2654; 2660-2661; and 2666-2667.
2668-2799	Liras (six-line variety)	132	Line 2723 is missing.
2800-2826	Versos sueltos	27	52% *pareados*: lines 2810-2813; 2816-2821; and 2823-2826.
2827-2854	Redondillas	28	
2855-2895	Versos sueltos	41	20% *pareados:* lines 2869-2872; 2878-2879; and 2894-2895.
2896-2903	Redondillas	8	
2904-2917	Sonnet	14	
2918-3025	Redondillas	108	
3026-3109	Romance (á-o)	84	The Latin of lines 3057-3059 fits the *romance* line length but the assonance is á-u.

VERSE TOTALS

	Lines (no. of passages)	Percentage of lines rounded to one decimal place
Romance	1096 (8)	35.3%
Redondillas	1064 (12)	34.2%
Versos sueltos	227 (4)	7.3%
Quintillas	175 (2)	5.6%
Liras	132 (1)	4.2%
Décimas	130 (2)	4.2%
Octavas reales	120 (2)	3.9%
Tercetos	61 (1)	2%
Sonnets	42 (3)	1.4%
Songs	32 (3)	1%
Irregular 8s	30 (1)	1%
Total	3109 (39)	

APPENDIX 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albertus Magnus. 1651. *De animalibus libri XXVI* (Lyon)

Alciato, Andrea. 1975. *Emblemas*, prologue by Manuel Montero Vallejo (Madrid: Nacional)

Aldazábal, José. 2002. *Vocabulario básico de liturgia* (Barcelona: Centre de Pastoral Litúrgica)

Alín, José María, and María Begoña Barrio Alonso. 1997. *Cancionero teatral de Lope de Vega*, Colección Támesis, Serie A: Monografías, 167 (London: Tamesis)

Alonso, Carlos. [n.d.] 'Saggio Bibliografico di San Nicola da Tolentino', <http://www.cassiciaco.it/navigazione/monachesimo/agiografia/santi/nicola/bibliografia.html> [accessed 17 September 2012]

Alvarado, Antonio de. 1615. *Arte de bien morir y guía del camino de la muerte* (Irache, Navarre: Nicolás de Assiayn)

Amezúa y Mayo, Agustín G. de. 1935-1943. *Epistolario de Lope de Vega Carpio*, 4 vols (Madrid: Artes Gráficas Aldus)

Anchor Bible Dictionary. 1992. Ed. by David Noel Freedman and ors, 6 vols (New York: Doubleday)

Anibal, Claude E. 1943. Review of S. G. Morley and C. Bruerton: *The Chronology of Lope's de Vega's 'comedias'*, *Hispanic Review*, 11: 338-353

Anselm of Canterbury, Saint. [1886]. *Cur Deus homo? Why God Became Man?*, trans. by Edward S. Prout, Christian Classics Series, 1 (London: Religious Tract Society)

Antoninus of Florence, Saint. 1491. *Chronicon: Historialis domini Antonini Archiepiscopi Florentini* (Nuremberg)

Antonucci, Fausta. 2007a. 'Introducción: para un estado de la cuestión', in *Métrica y estructura dramática en el teatro de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Fausta Antonucci, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Estudios de Literatura, 103 (Kassel: Reichenberger), pp. 1-30

——. 2007b. 'Polimetría, tiempo y espacio teatral en algunas obras de tema caballeresco del primer Lope', in *Métrica y estructura dramática en el teatro de Lope de Vega,* ed. by Fausta Antonucci, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Estudios de Literatura, 103 (Kassel: Reichenberger), pp. 31-82

Aparicio Maydeu, Javier. 1999. *Calderón y la máquina barroca: escenografía, religión y cultura en 'El José de las mujeres'* (Amsterdam; Atlanda, GA: Rodopi)

——. 1989. 'Juntar la tierra con el cielo: la recepción crítica de la comedia de santos como conflicto entre emoción y devoción', in *Diálogos hispánicos de Amsterdam: el teatro español a fines del siglo XVII. Historia, cultura y teatro en la España de Carlos II*, ed. by Javier Huerta Calvo, Harm den Boer and Fermín Sierra Martínez, 2 vols (Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi), II, pp. 323-332

——. 1994. 'Notas sobre magia y herejía en *El José de las mujeres*. Calderón tienta al Demonio', *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 42, No. 2: 587-596

Aquinas, Saint Thomas. 1968. *De forma absolutionis*, on-line version at <http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/osf.html> [accessed 15 August 2013]

——. 1920. *Summa Theologica*, on-line version at <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/index.html> [accessed on multiple occasions]

Aragone Terni, Elisa. 1971. *Studio sulle 'comedias de santos' di Lope de Vega* (Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze–Casa Editrice d'Anna)

Aragüés Aldaz, José. 2011. ‘Lope de Vega y la tradición hagiográfica sobre san Nicolás de Tolentino’, *Anuario Lope de Vega*, 17: 1-43

Araujo-Costa, Luis. 1952. *Hombres y cosas de la Puerta del Sol* (Madrid: Nacional)

Arellano, Ignacio. 1999. *Convención y recepción: estudios sobre el teatro del Siglo de Oro*, Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, II: Estudios y Ensayos, 143 (Madrid: Gredos)

——. 2000a. *Diccionario de los autos sacramentales de Calderón*, Autos Sacramentales Completos, 28 (Kassel: Reichenberger; Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra)

——. 2007. *Editar a Calderón: hacia una edición crítica de las comedias completas*, Biblioteca Áurea Hispánica, 49: Comedias Completas de Calderón, 5 (Madrid: Iberoamericana; Frankfurt-am-Main: Vervuert)

——. 2000b, ‘El vestuario en los autos sacramentales (el ejemplo de Calderón)’, in *El vestuario en el teatro español del siglo de oro*, ed. by M. de los Reyes Peña, Cuadernos de Teatro Clásico, 13-14 (Madrid: Teatro Clásico), pp. 85-108

Arjona, J. H. 1953. ‘The use of autoryhmes in the XVIIth century *comedia*’, *Hispanic Review*, 21, No. 4: 273-301

Augustine of Hippo, Saint. 1849. *Homilies on the Gospel According to St. John, and his First Epistle*, trans. by Rev. Henry Browne, 2 vols (Oxford: John Henry Parker)

——. 1844-1855. *Opera omnia*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 16 vols, Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina, 32-47 of 221 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique)

Baños Vallejo, Fernando. 2003. *Las vidas de santos en la literatura medieval española* (Madrid: Laberinto)

Barrera y Leirado, Cayetano Alberto de la. 1968. *Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español desde sus orígenes hasta mediados del siglo XVIII*, Colección Tamesis, Serie D: Reproducciones en facsímil, I (London: Tamesis)

Barrios Rozúa, Juan Manuel. 2001. ‘El convento de agustinos descalzos de Granada: patrimonio histórico y desamortización’, in *Los agustinos recoletos en Andalucía y su proyección en América: Actas del I congreso histórico*, ed. by Juan Aranda Doncel and Ángel Martínez Cuesta (Granada: Agustinos Recoletos), pp. 151-166

Basil the Great, Saint. 1857-1866. *Opera omnia quae exstant*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 4 vols, Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca, 29-32 of 161 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique)

——. 1967. ‘A Sermon of S. Basil on Fasting’, trans. by Cardinal Reginald Pole, in *A Treatie on Iustification* (Louvain: Ioannem Foulerum)

Benítez Sánchez, Jesús Miguel. 2008. ‘Un ejemplo del influjo de la piedad popular en la traza del espacio sagrado: la capilla de san Nicolás de Tolentino en la iglesia de Ntra. Sra. del Socorro de Palma de Mallorca’, in *El culto a los santos: cofradías, devoción, fiestas y arte* (San Lorenzo de El Escorial: Escurialenses – Real Centro Universitario Escorcial-María Cristina), pp. 877-900

Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint. 1844-1855. *Opera omnia*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 4 vols, Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina, 182-185 of 221 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique)

——. 1954. *Saint Bernard on the Christian Year: Selections from his Sermons* (London: Mowbray)

Bershas, Henry N. 1966. ‘Pueblos en Francia’, *Hispanic Review* 34, No. 2 (1966): 143-149

Beusterien, John. 2004. ‘Lope de Vega’s *Auto sacramental de la circuncisión y sangría de Cristo*: A Focal Point of Anti-Semitism in Seventeenth-Century Spain’, *Hispanic Review*, 72, No. 3: 35-374

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam Clementinam. 2005. Ed. by Alberto Colunga and Lorenzo Turrado, 12th edn (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos)

Book of Saints: A Dictionary of Servants of God Canonized by the Catholic Church: Extracted from the Roman & Other Martyrologies, Compiled by the Benedictine Monks of St. Augustine’s Abbey, Ramsgate. 1931. (London: A & C Black, 1931)

Bouterwek, Friedrich. 1801-1850. *Geschichte der Künste und Wissenschaften seit der Wiederherstellung derselben bis an das Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 12 vols (Göttingen: Johann Friedrich Römer)

Bowsky, William M. 1960. *Henry VII in Italy: The Conflict of Empire and City-State, 1310-1313* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press)

Brecht, Bertolt. 1998. ‘A Short Organum for the Theatre’, in *Modern Theories of Drama: A Selection of Writings on Drama and Theatre 1850-1990*, ed. by George W. Brandt (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Brill’s Encyclopedia of the Ancient World - New Pauly: Antiquity. 2004. Ed. by Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider and (English edition) Christine F. Salazar, 15 vols plus index (Leiden; Boston: Brill)

Brumble, David H. 1998. *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings* (London; Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn)

Busto, Cristóbal de. 1604. *Compendio de algunos milagros que Dios ha obrado en Córdoba por intercesión de san Nicolás de Tolentino*, re-printed in *Vida y milagros de san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Barcelona: Sebastián Matheuad, 1612)

Butler, Alban. [1949]. *The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Principal Saints*, ed. by Bernard Kelly, 5 vols (London: Virtue)

Cairasco de Figueroa, Bartolomé. 1613. *Templo militante, flos santorum y triunfos de sus virtudes [...] primera y segunda parte* (Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck)

——. 1614. *Templo militante, flos santorum, y triumphos de sus virtudes [...] quarta parte* (Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck)

——. 1618. *Terceta parte del templo militante, flos santorum, y triumpho de sus virtudes* (Lisbon: Pedro Crasbeeck)

Calamari, Barbara and Sandra Di Pasqua. 2004. *Holy Cards* (New York: Harry N. Abrams)

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. 2005. *El gran teatro del mundo – El gran mercado del mundo*, Letras Hispánicas, 15 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1996. *El mágico prodigioso*, ed. by Bruce W. Wardropper, Letras Hispánicas, 217 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1981. *El médico de su honra*, ed. by Don Cruickshank, Clásicos Castalia, 112 (Madrid: Castalia)

——. 1988. *El purgatorio de san Patricio*, ed. J. M. Ruano de la Haza (Liverpool: Liverpool UP)

Camargo y Salgado, Fernando. 1628. *El santo milagroso agustiniano san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Madrid: Imprenta Real)

Canning, Elaine M. 2004. *Lope de Vega's comedias de tema religioso*, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 204 (Woodbridge: Tamesis)

——. 2008. 'Sacred Souls and Sinners: Abstinence and Adaptation in Lope's Religious Drama', in *A Companion to Lope de Vega*, ed. by Alexander Samson and Jonathan Thacker, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 260 (Woodbridge: Tamesis), pp. 147-58

Canonica, Elvezio. 2005. 'Usos y funciones del latín eclesiástico en la obra dramática de Lope de Vega', *Anuario Lope de Vega*, 11 (2005): 41-62

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, The. 1978. Trans. by Rev. H. J. Schroeder (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books)

Carmona Moreno, Félix. 2005. 'San Nicolás de Tolentino. VII Centenario. Devoción y patronazgo en algunos pueblos de España', *La ciudad de Dios*, 218, No. 3: 603-639

Caro Baroja, Julio. 1985. *Las formas complejas de la vida religiosa: religión, sociedad y carácter en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII* (Madrid: Sarpe)

Case, Thomas E. 1999. 'Understanding Lope de Vega's *comedia de santos*', *Hispanófila*, 125: 11-22

Castro, Américo. 1918. 'Datos para la vida de Lope de Vega: I. Una justa poética en Toledo', *Revista de Filología Española*, 5: 398-403

Castro, Américo, and Hugo A. Rennert. 1968. *Vida de Lope de Vega* (Salamanca: Anaya)

Catechism of the Catholic Church. 1999. Revised Edn (London: Burns & Oates)

Catecismo Romano promulgado por el Concilio de Trento. 1926. Ed. by Alfonso María Gubianas (Barcelona: Litúrgica Española)

Catholic Encyclopedia, The. 1907-1912. Ed. by Charles G. Herbermann and ors, 15 vols (New York: Robert Appleton)

Cela, Camilo José. 1969-1971. *Diccionario secreto*, 3 vols (Madrid: Alianza-Alfaguara)

Cervantes, Miguel de. 1997a. *Don Quijote de La Mancha*, ed. by John J. Allen, 2 vols, Letras Hispánicas, 100 & 101 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 2010. *Don Quijote de La Mancha*, ed. by Francisco Rico (Madrid: Punto de Lectura)

——. 1997b. *Novelas ejemplares*, ed. by Harry Sieber, 2 vols, Letras Hispánicas, 105 & 106 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1997c. *El rufián dichoso*, ed. by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo, Clásicos Castalia, 234 (Madrid: Castalia)

Chrysologus, Saint Peter and ors. 1953. *Saint Peter Chrysologus: Selected Sermons and Saint Valerian: Homilies*, trans. by George E. Gauss, The Fathers of the Church (New York: Fathers of the Church)

Chrysostom, Saint John. 1986. *The Fathers of the Church: St John Chrysostom – Homilies on Genesis 1-17*, trans. by Robert C. Hill (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press of America)

——. 1848. *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. John: Part I – Homilies I-XLI*, Library of the Fathers, 28 (Oxford: John Henry Parker)

Cicero. 1990. *Laelius, On Friendship, and The Dream of Scipio*, trans. by J. G. F. Powell (Warminster: Aris & Phillips)

Classical Literary Criticism. 2000. Trans. by Penelope Murray and T. S. Dorsch, with intro. by Penelope Murray (London: Penguin)

Correas, Gonzalo. 2000. *Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales*, ed. by Louis Combet, revised by Robert Jammes and Maïté Mir-Andreu (Madrid: Castalia)

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. 1997. *Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España*, facsimile ed., intro. by J. L. Suárez García (Granada: Universidad de Granada)

Couderc, Christophe. 2008. 'Sobre el género y la intriga secundaria en algunas comedias de santos de Lope de Vega', in *La comedia de santos: coloquio internacional, Almagro, 1, 2 y 3 de diciembre de 2006*, ed. by F. B. Pedraza Jiménez and A. García González (Almagro: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha), pp. 65-84

Covarrubias Horozco, Sebastián de. 2006. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*, ed. by Ignacio Arellano and Rafael Zafra, Biblioteca Áurea Hispánica, 21 (Madrid: Iberoamericana)

Covos y Moxica, Antonio de los. [*c.* 1750]. *Narración verdadera del funesto suceso que en la más triste noche del más alegre día del señor san Nicolás de Tolentino acaeció en el pueblo y provincia de Iguala, en la actualidad de las fiestas que, celebrado anuales, le comenzaba a hacer en este año de 1744, el día diez de septiembre al dicho santo* [Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MSS 12968/30]

Cruz, San Juan de la. 1991. *Obras completas*, ed. by Lucinio Ruano de la Iglesia, 2nd edn, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 15 (Madrid: BAC)

Cruz, Sor Juana Inés de la. 1994. *The Answer/La Respuesta*, ed. and trans. by Electa Arenal and Amanda Powell (New York: Feminist Press at the City University of New York)

Cull, John. 1992. 'Emblematics in Calderón's *El médico de su honra*', *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 44 (1992): 113-31

Dante Alighieri. 1939a. *The Divine Comedy: 1. Inferno*, with trans. by John D. Sinclair (New York: OUP)

——. 1939b. *The Divine Comedy: 2. Purgatorio*, with trans. by John D. Sinclair (New York: OUP)

Dassbach, Elma. 1997. *La comedia hagiográfica del Siglo de Oro español*, Ibérica 22 (New York: Peter Lang)

Díaz, Simón. 1972. *Impresos del siglo XVII: bibliografía selectiva por materias de 3500 ediciones príncipes en lengua castellana* (Madrid: CSIC)

Díaz Moreno, Félix, and Concepción Lopezosa Aparicio. 1999. 'Nuevas aportaciones sobre el desaparecido convento de Agustinos Recoletos de Madrid', *Anales de Historia del Arte*, 9: 181-206

Diccionario de autoridades de la Real Academia Española. 1726-1737. <http://buscon.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUILoginNtlle> [accessed on multiple dates]

Dixon, Victor (ed.). 1981. *'El perro del hortelano': A Critical Edition, With Introduction and Notes* (London: Tamesis)

——. 1985. 'The Uses of Polymetry: An Approach to Editing the *comedia* as Verse Drama', in *Editing the 'comedia'*, *Michigan Romance Studies*, 5 (1985): 104-125

——. 2008. 'Lope's Knowledge', in *A Companion to Lope de Vega*, ed. Alexander Samson and Jonathan Thacker, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 260 (Woodbridge: Tamesis), pp. 15-28

Dunn, Peter N. 1957. 'Some Uses of Sonnets in the Plays of Lope de Vega', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 34, 4: 213-222

Ellis, Havelock. 1926. *The Soul of Spain* (London: Constable)

Enciclopedia Italiana. 1929-1937. 36 vols (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana)

Escudero, Lara and Rafael Zafra. 2003. *Memorias de apariencias y otros documentos sobre los autos de Calderón de la Barca*, Autos Sacramentales de Calderón, 41 (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra; Kassel: Reichenberger)

Farmer, David H. 2003. *Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford: OUP)

Fernández Rodríguez, Natalia. 2013. 'Comicidad y devoción: la risa festiva en la comedia hagiográfica de Lope de Vega', *Hipogrifo*, 1.1: 185-199

Ferrer Valls, Teresa. 1991. *La práctica escénica cortesana: de la época del emperador a la de Felipe III* (London: Tamesis)

——. 1986. 'Producción municipal, fiestas y comedia de santos: la canonización de san Luis Bertrán en Valencia (1608)', in *Teatro y prácticas escénicas, II: La comedia*, ed. by J. Oleza and J. L. Canet (London: Tamesis), pp. 156-186

Frigerio, Ambrogio. 1603. *Vita gloriosissima e miracoli eccelsi del beato confessore Nicola di Tolentino*, ed. by Giacomo Alberici (Milan: Pacifico Pontio and Battista Piccaglia)

Fuertes y Biota, Antonio. 1652. *Carta del doctor don Antonio de Fuertes y Biota escrita al reverendo padre maestro fray Nicolás Rosel y Valcárcel, difinidor de Canaria en que la vuelve una relación del milagro de S. Nicolás de Tolentino sucedido en la ciudad de Venecia, traducida de italiano en español* (Brussels: Francisco Vivien)

Garasa, Delfín Leocadio. 1960. *Santos en escena: estudio sobre el teatro hagiográfico de Lope de Vega* (Bahía Blanca, Argentina: Cuadernos del Sur–Universidad Nacional del Sur)

García Reidy, Alejandro. 2009. 'Lope de Vega frente a su escritura: el nacimiento de una conciencia profesional' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universitat de València)

Gavela García, Delia. 2007. 'Clientelismo y estructura dramática en las obras de Lope de Vega: *El premio de la hermosura*', in *Métrica y estructura dramática en el teatro de Lope de Vega*. ed. by Fausta Antonucci, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Estudios de Literatura, 103 (Kassel: Reichenberger), pp. 83-108

Gibbon, Edward. 1910. *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 6 vols, Everyman's Library (London: Dent)

González de Critana, Juan. 1612a. *Epitome historica vitae monasticae magni antistitis Augustini, institutionis sacrae eremitarum familiae, antiquitatis & continuationis eiusdem* (Antwerp: Hieronyum Verdussen)

——. 1603. *Libro de la Archicofradía de la Cinta de S. Agustín y Santa Mónica y de las indulgencias y privilegios que gozan los cofrades de ella y de su fundación y bulas, con un compendio historial de cómo N. P. san Agustín vivió vida monástica y fundó la Orden de los Frailes Ermitaños* (Valladolid: Luis Sánchez)

——. 1612b. *Vida y milagros del glorioso confesor san Nicolás de Tolentino de la orden de san Agustín llamado 'El Milagroso' por el papa Eugenio IV* (Madrid: Alonso Martín)

González Fernández, Luis. 1611. 'Honofre Manescal y su *Miscellánea de tres tratados* (1611)', <http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00309692>

Gozos a san Nicolás de Tolentino. 1816. (Palma de Mallorca: Imprenta de Villalonga)

Granada, Fray Luis de. 1986. *Guía de pecadores*, ed. by José María Balcells, Clásicos Universales Planeta, 119 (Barcelona: Planeta)

Grañén Porrúa, María Isabel. 2010. *Los grabados en la obra de Juan Pablos, primer impresor de la Nueva España, 1539-1560* (Mexico City: Apoyo al Desarrollo de Archivos y Bibliotecas de México, A.C.- Fondo de Cultura Económica)

Gregorio, Michael Di. 2004. *Saint Nicholas of Tolentino: Patron of the Holy Souls* (Staten Island, NY: Society of St Paul)

Grimalt i Vidal, Josep. 2005. *Sant Nicolau de Tolentí: patró de Cas Concos des Cavaller* (Cas Concos des Cavaller: Col.lecció Coses Nostres)

Gualtieri, Teresa Flora Lucia. 2005. 'Birds of Prey and the Sport of Falconry in Italian Literature through the Fourteenth Century: From Serving Love to Served for Dinner' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison), <http://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/dokumente/a/a151439.pdf>

Güell, Mónica. 2007. 'Usos dramáticos y estéticos de la versificación en *El perro del hortelano*', in *Métrica y estructura dramática en el teatro de Lope de Vega*. ed. by Fausta Antonucci, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Estudios de Literatura, 103 (Kassel: Reichenberger), pp. 109-132

Gutiérrez, David. 1979. *The Augustinians from the Protestant Reformation to the Peace of Westphalia, 1518-1648*, trans. by John J. Kelly (Villanova, PA: Augustinian Historical Institute, Villanova University)

——. 1984. *The Augustinians in the Middle Ages, 1256-1356*, trans. by Arthur J. Ennis (Villanova, PA: Augustinian Historical Institute, Villanova University)

Haliczer, Stephen. 2002. *Between Exhaltation and Infamy: Female Mystics in the Golden Age of Spain* (Oxford: OUP)

Hall, J. B. 1985. *Lope de Vega: Fuenteovejuna*, Critical Guides to Spanish Texts, 42 (London: Grant & Cutler)

Harrington, Daniel J. 1991. *The Gospel of Matthew*, Sacra Pagina Series, 1 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press)

Heiple, Daniel L. 1994. 'Political Posturing on the Jewish Question by Lope de Vega and Faria e Sousa', *Hispanic Review*, 62, No. 2: 217-234

Herskovits, Andrew. 2005. *The Positive Image of the Jew in the 'comedia'* (Bern: Peter Lang)

Herzig, Carine. 2008. 'Crítica a las comedias de santos y problemática de la recepción en el «Buen celo» (1683) del padre jesuita Pedro Fomperosa y Quintana', in *La comedia de santos: coloquio internacional, Almagro, 1, 2 y 3 de diciembre de 2006*, ed. by F. B. Pedraza Jiménez and A. García González (Almagro: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha), pp. 53-64

Historia de cómo fue hallada la imagen del santo crucifijo que está en el monasterio de san Agustín de Burgos con alguno de sus milagros. Síguese la vida, canonización y milagros del bienaventurado san Nicolás de Tolentino. 1554. (Burgos: Juan de Junta)

Holy Bible: Douay Version Translated From the Latin Vulgate (Douay, A.D. 1609: Rheims, A.D. 1582). 1956. (London: Catholic Truth Society)

Huarte de San Juan. 1989. *Examen de ingenios*, ed. by Guillermo Serés, Letras Hispánicas, 311 (Madrid: Cátedra)

Iannone, John C. 2010. *The Three Cloths of Christ: The Emerging Treasures of Christianity* (Kissimmee, FL: NorthStar Production Studios and Lulu Press)

Iturbe Sáiz, Antonio. 2006. 'Aspetti figurativi e tradizioni della devozione a san Nicola da Tolentino in Spagna', trans. by Pablo Viola, in *San Nicola da Tolentino nell'arte: Corpus iconografico*, ed. by Roberto Tollo, 2 vols (Florence: Nerbini), II: *Dal Concilio di Trento alla fine del seicento*, pp. 117-135

Jameson, A. K. 1937. 'The Sources of Lope de Vega's Erudition', *Hispanic Review*, 5, No. 2: 124-139

Jerome, Saint. 1933. *Select Letters of St. Jerome*, ed. by F.A. Wright (London; Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press).

Kagan, Richard L. 1990. *Lucrecia's Dreams: Politics and Prophecy in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press)

Keitt, A. W. 2005. *Inventing the Sacred: Imposture, Inquisition, and the Boundaries of the Supernatural in Golden Age Spain* (Leiden: Brill)

——. 2013. 'The devil in the Old World: anti-superstition literature, medical humanism and preternatural philosophy in early modern Spain', in *Angels, Demons and the New World*, ed. by Fernando Cervantes and Andrew Redden (Cambridge: CUP), pp. 15-39

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. 2006. *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge: CUP)

Kelly, J. N. D. 2006. *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: OUP)

Keniston, Hayward. 1937. *The Syntax of Castilian Prose: The Sixteenth Century* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press)

Ledesma, Alonso de. 1969. *Conceptos espirituales y morales*, ed. by Eduardo Juliá Martínez (Madrid: CSIC)

——. 1625. *Epigramas y jeroglíficos a la vida de Cristo* (Madrid: Juan González)

Ley, Charles David. 1954. *El gracioso en el teatro de la península: siglos XVI-XVII* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente)

Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. 1973. 'Lope de Vega y los judíos', *Bulletin Hispanique*, 75: 73-113

Link, Luther. 1995. *The Devil: The Archfiend in Art from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Century* (London: Reaktion)

López Remón, Benito. 1629. *Relación de las fiestas que el Orden Real y Militar de Nuestra Señõra de la Merced, Redención de Cautivos, hizo a su [...] padre y patriarca san Pedro de Nolasco en [...] su convento de Madrid (Madrid: Juan González)*

López Prisuelos, Felipe. 1845. *Triduo sagrado en honor de las tres virtudes que caracterizan al glorioso san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Madrid: Imprenta de Alejandro Gómez Fuentenebro)

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 2004. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London: Penguin)

MacDonald, Michael. 1981. *Mystic Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: CUP)

Maclean, Ian. 1980. *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: CUP)

——. 1977. *Woman Triumphant: Feminism in French Literature 1610-1652* (Oxford: OUP)

Manescal, Honofre de. 1611. 'Tratado de las apariciones', in *Miscellánea de tres tratados, de las apariencias de los espíritus el uno, donde se trata como Dios habla a los hombres y*

si las almas del purgatorio vuelven, de Anticristo el segundo, y de sermones predicados en lugares señalados el tercero (Barcelona: Sebastián Matheuad)

Marín, Diego. 1962. *Uso y función de la versificación dramática en Lope de Vega* (Valencia: Castalia)

Martín González, Juan José. 1978. 'Tres cuadros madrileños del seiscientos', *Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología*, 44: 490-494, *<dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/2691325.pdf>*

Martínez Cuesta, Ángel. 1995. *Historia de los Agustinos Recoletos*, Vol. 1: Desde los orígenes hasta el siglo XIX (Madrid: Augustinus)

McClelland, I. L. 1948. *Tirso de Molina: Studies in Dramatic Realism* (Liverpool: Institute of Hispanic Studies)

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino. 1890-1913. 'Observaciones preliminares', in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: RAE), IV (1894), pp. xcii-c

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. 1952. *Manual de gramática histórica española*, 9th edn (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe)

Micozzi, Patrizia. 1996. 'Hacia una edición crítica de *San Nicolás de Tolentino*', *Anuario Lope de Vega*, 2: 103-110

Moloney, Francis J. 1998. *The Gospel of John*, Sacra Pagina Series, 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press)

Monterubbiano, Pietro da. [1326]. *Historia beati Nicolai de Tolentino ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini composita a fratre Petro de Monte Rubiano lectore anno MCCCXXVI tempore domini Iohannis papae XXII*, ed. by Mombrizio, <http://acta.chadwyck.co.uk/> [accessed 20 October 2011]

Morán Turina, Miguel and Javier Portús Pérez. 1997. *El arte de mirar: la pintura y su público en la España de Velázquez* (Madrid: ISTMO)

Morley, S. Griswold. 1930. 'Lope de Vega's "Peregrino" Lists', *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, 14, No. 5: 345-366

Morley, S. Griswold, and Courtney Bruerton. 1940. *Chronology of Lope de Vega's 'comedias', The* (London: OUP)

——. 1968. *Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega*, trans. by María Rosa Cartes (Madrid: Gredos)

Morrison, Robert R. 1990. '*Graciosos con breviarios*: The Comic Element in the *Comedia de Santos* of Lope de Vega', *Crítica Hispánica*, 12: 33-45

——. 2000. *Lope de Vega and the 'comedia de santos'*, Ibérica, 33 (New York: Peter Lang)

Mujica, Barbara. 2008. 'Performing Sanctity: Lope's Use of Teresian Iconography in *Santa Teresa de Jesús*', in *A Companion to Lope de Vega*, ed. by Alexander Samson and Jonathan Thacker, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 260 (Woodbridge: Tamesis), pp. 183-198

Navarro, Antonio. 1604. *Abecedario virginal de excelencias del santísimo nombre de María* (Madrid: Pedro Madrigal)

Navarro, Bernardo. 1612. *Vida y milagros de san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Barcelona: Sebastián Matheuad)

Navarro Tomás, Tomás. 1972. *Métrica española: reseña histórica y descriptiva*, 3rd edn (Madrid: Guadarrama)

Norton, Roy. 2012. 'In Praise of Folly: Re-Considering the Functions of Lope de Vega's Saint's Play *graciosos*', *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 64, No. 1: 19-34

——. 2011. 'Performing Political Theory: Juan de Mariana's Ideal Polity and Lope's *La vida de san Pedro Nolasco*', in *On Wolves and Sheep*, ed. by Aaron Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing), pp. 93-112

Novena del milagroso S. Nicolás de Tolentino y modo de hacerla para alcanzar de Dios por su intercesión los favores que desean, traducida del español al Ilocano por don Adriano Encarnación con superior permiso. 1884. (Manila: C. Valdezco)

Orozco, Alonso de. 2001. *Crónica de san Agustín y de los santos y beatos y doctores de su orden* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española–Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca)

Ortiz, Francisco. 1605. *Flos sanctorum y vida de Jesucristo, Dios y Señor nuestro y de todos los santos de que reza y hace fiesta la iglesia católica* (Madrid: Miguel Serrano de Vargas)

Ovid. 1986. *Metamorphoses*, trans. by A. D. Melville (Oxford: OUP)

——. 1992. *Metamorphoses I*, ed. by A. G. Lee (London: Bristol Classical Press)

Oxford Classical Dictionary. 1999. Ed. by Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth, 3rd edn (Oxford: OUP)

Oxford Dictionary of Quotations. 2009. Ed. by Elizabeth Knowles, 7th edn (Oxford: OUP)

Pacheco, Francisco. 1649. *Arte de la pintura, su antigüedad y grandezas* (Seville: Simón Fajardo)

Panedas Galindo, Pablo. 2004. *Nicolás de Tolentino: el primogénito de la familia agustiniana* (Marcilla, Navarra: Agustinos Recoletos)

——. 2005. *El santo de la estrella: san Nicolás de Tolentino* (Madrid: Agustinos Recoletos–Provincia de san Nicolás de Tolentino)

Parker, A. A. 1958. *The Theology of the Devil in the Drama of Calderón* (London: Aquinas Society of London and Blackfriars Publications)

Paxson, James J. 1994. *The Poetics of Personification* (Cambridge: CUP)

Penny, Ralph. 2002. *A History of the Spanish Language*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: CUP)

Pereira, Benito. 1594. *Prior tomus commentariorum et disputationum in Genesim* (Lyon)

Pérez de Moya, Juan. 1995. *Philosofía secreta de la gentilidad*, ed. Carlos Clavería, Letras Hispánicas, 404 (Madrid: Cátedra)

Pfandl, Ludwig. 1929. *Cultura y costumbres del pueblo español de los siglos XVI y XVII* (Barcelona: Avalense)

Piccaluga, Giulia. 1968. *Lykaon: un tema mitico* (Rome: Ateneo)

Piedrafita y Albis, Juan Antonio. 1667. *In processu executorum ultimi testamenti Ioannes Falcon et Mariae Artazos de Bergara coniugum* (Zaragoza: Colegio de san Nicolás de Tolentino de Agustinos Descalzos, 1667)

Pinelo, León. 2003. *Anales de Madrid: Reinado de Felipe III – Años 1598 a 1621*, ed. by Ricardo Martorell Téllez-Girón (Valladolid: Maxtor)

Poesía erótica del Siglo de Oro. 2000. Ed. by Pierre Alzieu, Robert Jammes and Yvan Lissorgues, 2nd edn (Barcelona: Crítica)

Poppenberg, Gerhard. 2009. *Psique y alegoría: estudios del auto sacramental español desde sus comienzos hasta Calderón*, trans. by Elvira Gómez Hernández, Autos

Sacramentales Completos de Calderón, 66 (Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra; Kassel: Reichenberger)

Proceso per la canonizzazione di S. Nicola da Tolentino, Il. 1984. Ed. by N. Occhini (Rome: Padri Agostiniani di Tolentino-École Française de Rome)

Profeti, María Grazia. 1988. *La collezione »Diferentes autores«* (Kassel: Edition Reichenberger)

——. 2008. 'La comedia de santos entre encargos, teatro comercial, texto literario', in *La comedia de santos: coloquio internacional, Almagro, 1, 2 y 3 de diciembre de 2006*, ed. by Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez and Almudena García González (Almagro: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha), pp. 233-253

Quevedo Villegas, Francisco de. 1993. *Sueños y discursos*, ed. by James O. Crosby, Clásicos Castalia, 199 (Madrid: Castalia)

Radi, Luciano. 2004. *San Nicola da Tolentino* (Milan: San Paolo)

Rees, Margaret. 1991. 'Tirso de Molina's *El condenado por desconfiado*: Individual Piety and Salvation Panic in the Golden Age', in *Golden Age Spanish Literature: Studies in Honour of John Varey by his Colleagues and Pupils*, ed. by Charles Davis and Alan Deyermond (London: Westfield College), pp. 167-178

Relación de las fiestas que la Universidad de Salamanca celebró desde el 27 al 31 de octubre del año de 1618, al juramento del nuevo estatuto, hecho el 2 de mayo del dicho año, de que todos los graduados defenderán la pura y limpia Concepción de la Virgen Nuestra Señora, concebida sin mancha de pecado original. 1618. (Salamanca: Antonia Ramírez)

Rennert, Hugo Albert. 1915. 'Bibliography of the dramatic works of Lope de Vega Carpio based upon the catalogue of John Rutter Chorley', in *Revue Hispanique*, 33: 238

——. 1904. *The Life of Lope de Vega (1562-1635)* (Glasgow: Gowans and Gray)

Ribadeneira, Pedro de. 1616. *Flos sanctorum o libro de las vidas de los santos, primera parte* (Madrid: Luis Sánchez)

Riley, E. C. 1971. 'The *pensamientos escondidos* and *figuras morales* of Cervantes', in *Homenaje a William L. Fichter: estudios sobre el teatro antiguo hispánico y otros ensayos*, ed. by A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid: Castalia), pp. 623-631

Ripa, Cesare. 1976. *Iconologia* (New York; London: Garland)

——. 1779. *Iconology*, ed. George Richardson, 2 vols (London: G. Scott)

Rodríguez G. de Ceballos, Alfonso. 1991. 'Teatro y espacio sacro en el Barroco', in *Espacios teatrales del Barroco español: XIII Jornadas de teatro clásico*, directed by José María Díez Borque (Kassel: Reichenberger), pp. 101-120

Rodríguez Marín, Francisco. 1926. *Más de 21.000 refranes castellanos* (Madrid: Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos)

——. 1930. *12.600 refranes más* (Madrid: Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos)

——. 1934. *Los 6.666 refranes* (Madrid: Santísima Trinidad)

——. 1941. *Todavía 10.700 refranes más* (Madrid: Prensa Española)

Rogers, Daniel (ed.). 1974. *El condenado por desconfiado*, by Tirso de Molina (Oxford: Pergamon)

Rojas, Fernando de. 1991. *La Celestina: comedia o tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. by Peter E. Russell, Clásicos Castalia, 191 (Madrid: Castalia)

Román, Jerónimo. 1569. *Crónica de la orden de los ermitaños del glorioso padre san Agustín* (Salamanca: Joan Baptista de Terra Nova)

——. 1590. *Vida y milagros del bienaventurado san Nicolás de Tolentino, sacada de la primera parte de la Historia de san Agustín* (Valencia: Herederos de Juan Navarro)

Ruano de la Haza, José María. 2000. *La puesta en escena en los teatros comerciales del Siglo de Oro*, Literatura y Sociedad, 67, (Madrid: Castalia)

——. 2008. 'Lope and the Theatre in Madrid', in *A Companion to Lope de Vega*, ed. Alexander Samson and Jonathan Thacker, Colección Tamesis, Serie A: Monografías, 260 (Woodbridge: Tamesis), pp. 29-50

Rubio, Luciano. 1986. 'Introducción', in *El monasterio de la Encarnación de Madrid: un modelo de vida religiosa en el siglo XVII*, by María Leticia Sánchez Hernández (San Lorenzo de El Escorial: Escurialenses), pp. 17-35

Sagrada septenario y ejercicio devoto en favor de los vivos y eficacísimo sufragio para las ánimas de los difuntos, revelado al gran protector de la católica iglesia san Nicolás de Tolentino, del orden de san Agustín, con el modo y regimen de hacerle por siete viernes, compuesto en italiano por los padres recoletos de san Agustín de Nápoles y traducido en castellano por un devoto del santo. [1736] ([Zaragoza]: Bernardo Lucio)

Sainz de Robles, Federico Carlos (ed.). 1946-1955. *Obras escogidas de Lope Félix de Vega Carpio*, 3 vols (Madrid: Aguilar)

Sallust. 2007. *Bellum Catilinae,* ed. by J. T. Ramsey, 2nd edn (Oxford: OUP)

Salvá, Joseph. 1735. *Universal patrocinio del glorioso padre san Nicolás de Tolentino del Orden de nuestro gran padre san Agustín* (Palma de Majorca: viuda de Frau)

Samson, Alexander. 2002. 'Anti-Semitism, Class, and Lope de Vega's *El Niño Inocente de La Guardia*', *Hispanic Research Journal*, 3, No. 2: 107-122

Sánchez Hernández, María Leticia. 1986. *El monasterio de la Encarnación de Madrid: un modelo de vida religiosa en el siglo XVII* (San Lorenzo de El Escorial: Escurialenses)

San Nicolás de Tolentino: co-patrono de la Villa de Pontedeume. 1997. (La Coruña: Fundación Caixa Galicia)

San Nicolás de Tolentino: séptimo centenario – Almonacid de la Sierra 1305-2005. 2005. Ed. by Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Almonacid de la Sierra (Zaragoza: Imprenta Provincial de Zaragoza)

San Román, Francisco de Borja. 1935. *Lope de Vega: los cómicos toledanos y el poeta sastre: Serie de documentos inéditos de los años de 1590 a 1615* (Madrid: Imprenta Góngora)

Shepherd, Simon, and Mick Wallis. 2004. *Drama/Theatre/Performance*, The New Critical Idiom (London: Routledge)

Sicardo, José. 1701. *Vida y milagros del glorioso san Nicolás de Tolentino, religioso del Orden de los Ermitaños de nuestro padre san Agustín, con una devota novena al santo* (Madrid: Manuel Ruiz de Murga)

Silvestre, Francisco. 1693. *Relación verdadera del singular prodigio que la Majestad de Dios ha obrado en la milagrosa imagen de su glorioso siervo san Nicolás de Tolentino que se venera en la Iglesia del convento de señor san Agustín de la villa de Cazalla de la*

Sierra para favorizar la devoción de los fieles a tan milagroso santo (Seville: Tomás López de Haro)

Sinouet, Anna. 2005. 'Representación del trabajo manual en tres piezas de Lope de Vega: *Barlán y Josafá, San Nicolás de Tolentino*, y *San Diego de Alcalá*', *Les Cahiers de Framespa*, 1 <http://framespa.revues.org/389> [accessed 17 August 2011]

Sirera, Josep Lluís. 1991. 'Los santos en sus comedias: hacia una tipología de los protagonistas del teatro hagiográfico', in *Comedias y comediantes: estudios sobre el teatro clásico español*, ed. by Manuel V. Diago and Teresa Ferrer (Valencia: Universitat de València), pp. 55-76

Smith, Hilary Dansey. 1978. *Preaching in the Spanish Golden Age: A Study of Some Preachers of the Reign of Philip III* (Oxford: OUP)

Sophocles. 1986. *Sophocles Plays: One*, trans. by Don Taylor (London: Methuen)

Spaulding, Robert K. 1943. *How Spanish Grew* (Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles, CA; London: University of California Press)

Stoichita, Victor I. 1995. *Visionary Experience in the Golden Age of Spanish Art* (London: Reaktion)

Teresa de Jesús, Santa. 1997. *Obras completas*, ed. by Efrén de la Madre de Dios and Otger Steggink, 9th edn, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 212 (Madrid: BAC)

Teske, Roland. 2001. 'Augustine's Theory of the Soul', in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. by Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann (Cambridge: CUP), pp. 116-123

Teulade, Anne. 2008. 'Santidad y teatralidad: el santo como paradoja estética', in *La comedia de santos: coloquio internacional, Almagro, 1, 2 y 3 de diciembre de 2006*, ed. by F. B. Pedraza Jiménez and A. García González (Almagro: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha), pp. 85-99

Textor, R. J. (Jean Tixier de Ravisi). 1613. *Epitome epithetorum* (Douay: Baltazar Belleri)

Thacker, Jonathan. 2007. *A Companion to Golden Age Theatre* (Woodbridge: Tamesis)

Thompson, Colin. 2009. 'Seeing the Unseen: The Representation of Visions in Golden Age Painting and Writing', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 86: 797-809

——. 2002. *St John of the Cross: Songs in the Night* (London: SPCK)

Tirso de Molina. 1997. *El burlador de Sevilla*, ed. by Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez, Letras Hispánicas, 58 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1992. *El condenado por desconfiado*, ed. by Ciriaco Morón, Letras Hispánicas, 11 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1974. *Marta la piadosa – El burlador de Sevilla*, ed. Antonio Prieto, Colección Novelas y Cuentos, 146 (Madrid: Magisterio Español)

——. 1984. *La mujer que manda en casa*, ed. Dawn L. Smith (London: Tamesis)

Tollo, Roberto. 2005. 'Confezione dell'iconografia nicoliana: codificazione, diffusione, tradizione, variazione', in *San Nicola da Tolentino nell'arte: Corpus iconografico, Vol. 1: dalle origine al Concilio di Trento* (Milan: Federico Motta)

Umpierre, Gustavo. 1975. *Songs in the Plays of Lope de Vega: A Study of their Dramatic Function* (London: Tamesis)

Varey, J. E., and Charles Davis. 1992. *Los libros de cuentas de los corrales de comedias de Madrid: 1706-1719: Estudio y documentos*, Fuentes para la Historia del Teatro en España (London: Tamesis)

Vázquez, Luis. 1988. 'Escritores célebres del Siglo de Oro en el «Proceso de vida y milagros» del beato Orozco y el cardenal Cisneros (Documentos)', *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 68, Cuaderno 243: 99-168

Vega y Carpio, Lope Félix de. 2006. *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*, ed. by E. García Santo-Tomás, Letras Hispánicas, 585 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1890-1913a. *El capellán de la Virgen, san Ildefonso*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: RAE), IV (1894), pp. 467-504

——. 1890-1913b. *El cardenal de Belén*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: RAE), IV (1894), pp. 155-186

——. 1993-1996a. *El cerco de Santa Fe y ilustres hazañas de Garcilaso de la Vega*, in *Obras completas de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Jesús Gómez and Paloma Cuenca, 12 vols, Biblioteca Castro (Madrid: Turner Libros), Comedias V (1993), pp. 101-170

——. 2008a. *¿De cuándo acá nos vino?*, ed. by Delia Gavela García, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Ediciones Críticas, 156 (Kassel: Reichenberger)

——. 1963. *La dama boba*, in *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña y La dama boba*, ed. by Alonso Zamora Vicente (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe)

——. 1916-1930a. *La devoción del rosario*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. Cotarelo y Mori, 13 vols (Madrid: RAE), II (1916), pp. 90-124

——. 1987. *La Dorotea*, ed. by Edwin S. Morby, Clásicos Castalia, 102 (Madrid: Castalia)

——. 1993-1996b. *Los embustes de Fabia*, in *Obras completas de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Jesús Gómez and Paloma Cuenca, 12 vols, Biblioteca Castro (Madrid: Turner Libros), Comedias I (1993), pp. 815-910

——. 1621. *La Filomena, con otras diversas rimas, prosas y versos* (Madrid: viuda de Alonso Martín)

——. [1992]. *Lo fingido verdadero*, ed. by Maria Teresa Cattaneo (Rome: Bulzoni)

——. 1955a. *La hermosa Ester*, in *Obras escogidas de Lope Félix de Vega Carpio*, ed. by Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles, 3 vols (Madrid: Aguilar), III, pp. 101-131

——. 2005. *La hermosura de Angélica*, ed. by Marcella Trambaioli, Biblioteca Áurea Hispánica, 32 (Madrid: Iberoamericana; Frankfurt-am-Main: Vervuert)

——. 1955b. *Juan de Dios y Antón Martín*, in *Obras escogidas de Lope Félix de Vega Carpio*, ed. by Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles, 3 vols (Madrid: Aguilar), III, pp. 415-453

——. 1972. *La limpieza no manchada* (Salamanca: Librería Cervantes)

——. 1890-1913c. *Los locos por el cielo*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: RAE), IV (1894), pp. 83-118

——. 1993-1996c. *El marqués de Mantua*, in *Obras completas de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Jesús Gómez and Paloma Cuenca, 12 vols, Biblioteca Castro (Madrid: Turner Libros), Comedias V (1993), pp. 269-360

——. 1997. *El mejor alcalde, el rey*, ed. Frank P. Casa and Berislav Primorac, Letras Hispánicas, 368 (Madrid: Cátedra)

——. 1985. *El niño inocente de La Guardia*, ed. by Anthony J. Farrell, Colección Támesis, Serie B: Textos, 27 (London: Tamesis)

——. 1983. *Obras poéticas*, ed. by José Manuel Blecua (Barcelona: Planeta)
——. 1973. *El peregrino en su patria*, ed. by Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce, Clásicos Castalia, 55 (Madrid: Castalia)
——. 1981. *'El perro del hortelano': A Critical Edition, With Introduction and Notes*, ed. by Victor Dixon (London: Tamesis)
——. 1916-1930b. *Púsoseme el sol, salióme la luna*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, Nueva edición, ed. by E. Cotarelo y Mori, 13 vols, (Madrid: RAE), IX (1930), pp. 1-38
——. 1622. *Relación de las fiestas que la insigne villa de Madrid hizo en la canonización de san Isidro* (Madrid: viuda de A. Martín)
——. 2004. *Rimas humanas y divinas del licenciado Tomé de Burguillos*, ed. by Juan Manuel Rozas and Jesús Cañas Murillo, Clásicos Castalia, 280 (Madrid: Castalia)
——. 1890-1913d. *El rústico del cielo*, in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, 15 vols (Madrid: RAE), V (1895), pp. 155-186
——. 1988. *San Diego de Alcalá*, ed. Thomas E. Case, Teatro del Siglo de Oro: Ediciones Críticas, 14 (Kassel: Reichenberger)
——. 1993-1996d. *La Santa Liga*, in *Obras completas de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Jesús Gómez and Paloma Cuenca, 12 vols, Biblioteca Castro (Madrid: Turner Libros), X (1994), pp. 475-565
——. 1999. *El santo negro Rosambuco de la ciudad de Palermo*, in *Comedias de Lope de Vega*, Vol. III, ed. PROLOPE (Barcelona: PROLOPE), pp. 397-501
——. 2008b. *Soliloquios amorosos de un alma a Dios*, ed. by Hugo Lezcano Tosca, Colección Alfar Universidad, 155 (Seville: Alfar)
——. 1890-1913e. *La vida de San Pedro Nolasco* in *Obras de Lope de Vega*, ed. by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo (Madrid: RAE), IV (1894), pp. ix-xii and 3-31
——. 1637. *La vega del Parnaso* (Madrid: Imprenta del Reino)
Vega Carpio, Lope Félix de, and Cristóbal de Monroy. 1985. *Fuente Ovejuna (Dos comedias)*, ed. by Francisco López Estrada, Clásicos Castalia, 10 (Madrid, Castalia)
Vega, Pedro de la. 1554. *La vida de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo y de su santísima madre y de los otros santos* (Zaragoza: Bartolomé de Nagera)
Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes, La. 2011. Ed. by Alberto Blecua, Clásicos Castalia, 58 (Madrid: Castalia)
Villegas, Alonso de. 1578. *Flos santorum: historia general de la vida y hechos de Jesucristo y de todos los santos de que reza la iglesia católica* (Toledo: Diego de Ayala)
Virgil. 1999. *Aeneid I-VI*, trans. by H. R. Fairclough, revised by G. P. Goold, Loeb Classical Library, 63 (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard UP)
——. 2000. *Aeneid VII-XII and Appendix Vergiliana*, trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough, revised by G. P. Goold, Loeb Classical Library, 64 (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard UP)
Vosters, Simon A. 1977. *Lope de Vega y la tradición occidental*, 2 vols (Madrid: Castalia)
Warner, Marina. 1985. *Alone of All her Sex: The Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Picador)
Warr, Cordelia. 2007. 'Hermits, Habits and History: The Dress of the Augustinian Hermits', in *Art and the Augustinian Order in Early Renaissance Italy*, ed. by Louise Bourdua and Anne Dunlop (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 17-28

Weinstein, Donald, and Rudolph M. Bell. 1982. *Saints & Society: The Two Worlds of Western Christendom, 1000-1700* (London: University of Chicago Press)

Williams, Thomas. 2001. 'Biblical Interpretation', in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. by Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann (Cambridge: CUP), pp. 59-70

Zamora Vicente, Alonso. 1961. *Lope de Vega: su vida y su obra*, Biblioteca Románica Hispánica, 7 (Madrid: Gredos)