

SHADOW OF THE KING: *PRIVANZA* AND PERCEPTIONS OF ROYAL POWER IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SPANISH THEATER

by

CARL AUSTIN WISE

(Under the Direction of Elizabeth R. Wright)

ABSTRACT

Privanza, a political institution in which the monarch relinquishes his authority to a favorite, brings the concept of subjectivity to the forefront in seventeenth-century Spain by introducing questions of manipulation, control, and self-representation. Using theater as means of exploring political favoritism, seventeenth-century playwrights Lope de Vega and Antonio Mira de Amescua present *privanza* as a test against a king's ability to maintain his autonomy against an institution which, it was thought, owed its very existence to a courtier's ability to manipulate the monarch into submission. Lope and Mira internalize this struggle and offer scenarios in which the kings voluntarily hand themselves over to bondage. By presenting a series of weak kings who allow their *voluntades* to become enslaved, the playwrights suggest that the monarch's true power emanates from his ability to recognize and to control his internal self. *Privanza*, however, proves to be a constant danger to a king's efforts to realize this potential, and offers example after example of kings who fail to enforce their own autonomy.

INDEX WORDS: Privanza, Privado, Royal Favorite, Antonio Mira de Amescua, Spanish Drama, Comedia nueva, Golden Age Spanish Theater, Bernardo de Cabrera, Carvajal Brothers, Alvaro de Luna, Rodrigo Calderón, Lope de Vega, Seventeenth-Century Spanish Theater

SHADOW OF THE KING: *PRIVANZA* AND PERCEPTIONS OF ROYAL POWER IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SPANISH THEATER

by

CARL AUSTIN WISE

B.A., Birmingham-Southern College, 2003

M.A., The University of Georgia, 2005

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

© 2011

Carl Austin Wise

All Rights Reserved

SHADOW OF THE KING: *PRIVANZA* AND PERCEPTIONS OF ROYAL POWER IN
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SPANISH THEATER

by

CARL AUSTIN WISE

Major Professor: Elizabeth R. Wright

Committee: Dana Bultman
Nicolas Lucero

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I could not have asked for a better advisor, and I thank Elizabeth Wright for her constant dedication to my growth as a scholar. I am also very grateful to Dana Bultman and Nicolas Lucero for offering guidance and invaluable advice throughout all stages of this project. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Catherine Jones for helping me with award applications, and for constantly insuring that I met all of UGA's graduate requirements. I want to also thank all of my professors in the Romance Languages department for their friendship and their kindness in sharing their expertise through my many graduate seminars. To Teresa Perez-Gamboa, thank you for always insuring I had an ideal teaching schedule. Equally important, Tom Bavis, Maryanna Axson, Sharon Yen, and Amy Duran provided constant technical and administrative support that made working in Gilbert Hall a pleasure. To my undergraduate professors Barbara Domcekova and Janie Spencer at Birmingham-Southern, thank you for introducing me to the richness of Spanish and Hispanic studies. I still follow your examples when I teach my own students. I also am grateful to my colleagues from the doctoral program, Mitch McCoy, Karen Pollard, Celia Peris-Peris, Aurora Thorgerson, Julia Barnes, Joey Warner, Diego del Pozo, and Amy Hernandez, who were and continue to be a constant source of encouragement and advice.

Much of my dissertation depended on consulting archival manuscripts that are not easily available, and I am indebted to the University of Georgia's Graduate School for their generosity in funding my research. The Dean's Award allowed me to collect valuable manuscripts at the Hispanic Society of America in New York City, and the Dissertation Completion Award

provided me ample time to dedicate to this study. I also am very grateful to the University of Georgia Library's Interlibrary Loan department for quickly processing my many requests to locate obscure publications, and to Fred Olive at the University of Alabama at Birmingham's Sterne Library for generously allowing me access to their collections.

Last but not least, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to my parents for their steadfast support and encouragement, and to my brother Chase, whose friendship I have valued for my entire life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CHAPTER	
1 THE EXHALTED IMAGE	1
Introduction.....	1
<i>Sombra del rey</i>	11
<i>Privanza</i> and Theater	21
2 LEGENDARY INJUSTICE: MAD KINGS AND MURDERED PRIVADOS IN LOPE DE VEGA'S <i>LA INOCENTE SANGRE</i>	26
Legend as Source Material	28
Pillars of Justice: The Christian Prince.....	36
<i>La inocente sangre</i>	43
La Peña de Martos	55
3 ECLIPSED AUTONOMY IN ANTONIO MIRA DE AMESCUA'S ALVARO DE LUNA PLAYS.....	63
Ensnaring the Monarch.....	70
Celestial cycles	74
<i>La próspera fortuna</i>	81
<i>La adversa fortuna</i>	88

4	BAROQUE PERCEPTIONS: PRIVANZA AND MACHIAVELLIAN FAILURES IN ANTONIO MIRA DE AMESCUA’S BERNARDO DE CABRERA PLAYS	99
	El arte de mover voluntades.....	101
	Perceptions of Power	104
	<i>Próspera fortuna</i>	109
	<i>Adversa fortuna</i>	122
5	CONCLUSION.....	134
	REFERENCES	138

CHAPTER 1

THE EXHALTED IMAGE

Introduction

After the death of Queen Margaret of Austria in 1611, witnesses at her funeral describe the grief-stricken Philip III as the center of attention, and yet, no one actually saw him. Measures were taken to draw everyone's gaze toward the monarch – lavish curtains draped his box and candles surrounded the space where he was believed to be watching the mass, and yet he was also conspicuously invisible. One attendee describes how Philip remained completely hidden from view:

... y tiene una ventana al Altar mayor, a la parte de la Epístola, donde su Magestad oyó la Vigilia y Missa de las Honras, por auerse ansimismo determinado, no avia de baxar, ni estar en la yglesia en publico, sino retirado en la ventana dicha, la qual se cubrió de cortinas de demasco negro, por las quales su Magestat vio, y no fue visto ni juzgado de la yglesia. (Gomez de Mora 75)

Finally, a line of grandees began emerging from the king's covered box and marched toward the tomb. The somber ceremony was dramatically choreographed, and like a bride on her wedding day, the processional was designed to build suspense and anticipation when everyone would finally get a glimpse of the king.

When Philip at last stepped into the dark nave of the St. Geronimo Royal Convent, no less than eighty-two ushers lit candles at the door where he emerged, and, according to witnesses, he dramatically appeared amidst a spectacular display of candlelight. Despite the fact

that every eye in the church was now gazing on his royal person, Philip still maintained an aura of invisibility, donning a large hat with a black veil so no one could actually see his face:

alli [su Magestad] estuvo con sus hijos, y su Magestad tenía una loba de bayeta y montera, y assi como se sentó se baxaron todos los grandes assentarse a la iglesia en los vancos que estavan alrededor del tumbulo todos cubiertos las cabeças.

(Gomez de Mora 79)

The monarch was a ghostly, faceless image that was rendered an untouchable apparition through careful theatrics and special lighting effects. While black drapes and veils hid the king from the crowd, however, attendee Gomez de Mora reports that Lerma, the king's *privado*, or favorite minister, was sitting in plain view in an *aposeno* in the “crucero de la yglesia” (77). No other comment is made about the duke of Lerma apart from his seat being in a physically conspicuous and elevated area, yet such a scene became standard during the reign of Philip III, and later that of his son and successor, Philip IV. In a truly baroque production of misdirection, the funeral's seeming focal point, the king, is rendered a spectacle as he passes under the gaze of Lerma who towers above the entire room from his elevated box seat.

Indeed, the interplay between Lerma and the invisible Philip III at Margaret's 1611 funeral is not unlike Diego Velazquez's *Las meninas*. The visual focal point of the scene, the princess, is merely a background bystander to the painting's true subject, Philip IV and his wife. Strangely, the monarchs are nowhere to be seen save a blurry hint of a reflection in the very back of the room. Even though the monarchs are the focus of everyone's gaze and everyone's awe, they are kept from the spectators' view. The entire painting hints at something that is out of reach. As Michel Foucault explains in his analysis of Velázquez's masterpiece, “all of these elements intended to provide representations, while impeding them, hiding them, concealing

them...of all the representations represented in the picture this [mirror] is the only one visible; but no one is looking at it” (*The Order of Things* 6,7). The projection of the majesty of Philip IV in *Las meninas*, like his father’s awe-inspiring appearance – or rather his awe-inspiring lack of appearance – at Margaret’s funeral depends precisely on the inability to fully perceive the monarch. As the true object of everyone’s attention is obstructed from view, background figures become the visual focal points of the scene. Like Velazquez’s princess, Lerma placed himself to be perceived, at least on the surface, merely as a spectator of the funeral mass, and yet because the king is hidden with black veils, it is Lerma who became the visual focal point of the entire ceremony. It is a baroque image which seems to be, as Antonio Maravall has put it, “el mundo al revés” (313).

It is my aim to explore this baroque perception of monarchy and *privanza* as it translates to theatrical representations in seventeenth-century Spain. While there are dozens of political treatises that strive to define these roles in an increasingly modern state, they often limit themselves to abstraction, relying heavily on theoretical works like Tomas Aquinas’s *De Regimine Principium* and other medieval notions of monarchy. Theater, on the other hand, invites spectators to contemplate how abstract and exalted definitions of *privanza* hold up against real life situations. Indeed, based on the new and unprecedented levels of power attained by Lerma and Olivares, combined with dramatic current events such as the 1621 public execution of Rodrigo Calderón, privado of Philip III and Lerma’s favorite secretary, it is clear that Spaniards in the early seventeenth century struggled to find adequate language for describing the monarchy’s relationship with *privanza*.

Until very recently, many scholars considered the representation of royal power in seventeenth-century Spain as conforming to Antonio Maravall’s notion of Baroque artistic

expression as a form of cultural control. Maravall assumes that there is an intrinsic conflict between the Spanish court and the general public. Attempting to maintain control over a population that did not share their values, society's elite utilized baroque aesthetic in various media, both literary and visual, in order to indoctrinate the masses into accepting their own visions of religious morality and absolute monarchy. He writes that "la cultura del Barroco es un instrumento operativo ... cuyo objeto es actuar sobre unos hombres de los cuales se posee una visión determinada (a la que aquella debe acondicionarse), a fin de hacerlos comportarse, entre sí y respecto a la sociedad que forman y al poder..." (132). This "cultura dirigida," as Maravall describes it, is necessarily one of "autoritarianismo" (160) in which the ruling class perceives the mass population as antithetical to social morals. The role of commissioned art, architecture, and literature, therefore, was designed to "dirigir" the Spanish public into conforming to acceptable values, most notably accepting an authoritarian state. Indeed, many *comedias* introduce a monarch or other court official to the stage in the third act as a *deus ex machina* plot device which completely resolves the conflict and restores order. For Maravall, the implications are obvious as time and time again, the monarch is portrayed on stage as the primary source of social justice and harmony.

Building on Maravall's "cultura dirigida" model, Antonio Cascardi's work over the last decade adds an important theoretical approach to Baroque aesthetics and subjectivity, providing a valuable framework in which to study representations of the monarch-*privado* relationship. Modifying Maravall's idea's on cultural control, Cascardi maintains that conflicts arising from modernizing social change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are primarily the result of transitioning between a medieval caste system and a more capitalist society based on class. The *comedia*, then, must negotiate between these two opposing versions of social hierarchy,

especially when its characters are pulled from the pages of Spanish history. According to Cascardi, early modern theater offered “a vision of history that looked either to the past or to the future as a way of suturing together the various contradictions that in their contemporary world could be attributed to the conflicting value-system of caste and class” (2). In other words, the *comedia* offers its spectators and readers versions of history which neutralize the turbulent social conflicts present in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At the same time, the *comedia* invites its audiences to participate in this new “sanitized” nostalgic version of a glorious Spanish past.

Whereas Maravall described baroque culture as a propaganda campaign designed to control behavior, Cascardi views this nostalgic use of history by playwrights as a subjective process in which social constraints are internalized on an individualized level. This process, argues Cascardi, “allows subjugation to appear as if it is desired or willed by the subjects themselves” (37). The baroque aesthetic, paradoxically, promotes the notion of self-autonomy as a means of social control. Applying Foucault’s theories of authority to early modern notions of self autonomy, Cascardi writes:

...the customary description of early modern Spain in terms of the power of its reactionary position with respect to modernizing institutions and ideas underestimates the relationship between subjectivity, the mechanisms of subjugation through which it was produced, and the psychology of the will that came to the fore during this period. Indeed, the thesis of a fully autonomous subject-self (whether sacred or secular, masculine or feminine), wholly free from control and empowered by an autonomous will, must be recognized as an ‘ideological’ construct of the early modern world, belief in which leads at best to

a systematic denial of the individual's political position as *subject to* an external authority or rule. (Cascardi 121)

Given Cascardi's theory, we can see how the pageantry and decorum involved in propagating the mystique of the invisible monarch during Philip III's reign introduces new notions of subjectivity into kingship. As Philip's rehearsed appearance at Margaret's 1611 funeral illustrates, the king's absence from view invites guests to project their own grandiose ideas of monarchy onto Philip's elusive and candle-lit image. To some extent, the monarch himself becomes subjected to the gazes of the audience, and his grandeur becomes a product of the viewers' reaction to his presence.

For Alban Forcione, this choreographed and artificial vision of monarchy contradicts emerging early modern notions of self and individual autonomy. On one hand, he writes, the king is stripped of his personhood when he is thought to embody idealized visions of power:

...if with the state's monopoly of power the official body of the king was expanded and mythified as never before, by the same token the king could become, for thoughtful observers ..., paradigmatic for the loss of the self in the new dominant spaces of public performance... (Forcione 21)

To combat the "loss of the self," Forcione argues, playwrights often allowed their theatrical kings to "disrobe" and show their humanity, reminding audiences that the king is both the embodiment of power as well as a flesh-and-blood person who is vulnerable to the same human weaknesses as anyone else. In Forcione's view, Lope de Vega and others often show this vulnerable side of the monarch in order to underline his supreme virtues. The king is exposed to the same temptations and frailties as the rest of humanity, yet his superior qualities allow him to overcome weakness, thereby achieving virtue and strength of character. The king, therefore,

serves as an ideal example of autonomy, or as Forcione writes, “a mirror, a model on which his subjects should look to find an ideal they could emulate in their individual lives” (40). In this view, the king shows that everyone can resist human vulnerabilities.

However, there are cases where the monarch’s humanity is not interpreted as strength. While Cascardi and Forcione argue that such audience participation in the royal image would enhance their desire to submit to royal authority, McKendrick views this same process as subversive, especially in the *comedia*. She has criticized Maravall’s claims that the Spanish public shared a common “mass” culture and would inherently oppose the ruling class and its aesthetic if given the opportunity, and dismisses claims that theater served as an outlet for state propaganda and the playwrights mere minions of the court. In fact, McKendrick accuses Maravall of dismissing playwrights, and especially Lope de Vega, as being a mere “lackey of the system, a jobbing genius who tamely sold his soul to his political masters, uncritically swallowing all the ideological platitudes of the day” (12). Instead, she argues that placing a king on stage in and of itself was a potentially subversive act. After all, when the court aesthetic of the day held that the king must be elusive and mysterious, exposing a monarch in a crowded *corral* was to strip him of the illusion of majesty (McKendrick 26). She writes that “there are two parallel discourses of monarchy in the play – an ideal and a real, a rhetorical discourse and an enacted discourse – and it is the explicit dislocation between the two that constitutes the play’s critique of kingship” (111). In other words, any representation of a king on stage, while seemingly glorified, betrays the illusion of grandeur. It is precisely for this reason that Philip III maintained invisibility at Margaret’s funeral – by depriving the attendees of the chance to actually see him, they are left only with an idealized and mystified version of his person. King

plays, therefore, give spectators a chance not only to see a “king” up close, but also to scrutinize his behavior against their idealized notions of a monarch.

While McKendrick’s argument opens important new avenues into studying monarchy and theater, she also limits her study only to the representation of kings, and does not comment on *privanza* in any real depth. However, given the heights of power attained by Lerma and Olivares and the prevalence of political theories attempting to define their positions, it is apparent that *privanza* cannot be divorced from the seventeenth century’s notion of kingship. To consider the monarch in any way is to necessarily grapple with the proper role of the minister to whom the monarch has relinquished his power. At the same time, Carreño-Rodríguez offers the possibility that *comedia* goes beyond the Maravall and McKendrick debate and engages each audience member directly: “el significado de la comedia va más allá de la propaganda y de las intenciones de un autor. Representa un sujeto que participa y está familiarizado con los códigos socioculturales, discursivos teatrales, de su tiempo” (Carreño-Rodríguez 27). In other words, regardless of the political motives that are certainly embedded in all of the plays analyzed in the following chapters, the *comedia*’s reception also relies on the reactions, mood, and participation of the audience which, according to Cascardi, shows an emerging concept of autonomy.

Comedias de privanza offer us a unique perspective when contemplating McKendrick’s view of *comedia* as subversive as well as Cascardi and Forcioni’s notions of autonomy. While Cascardi’s concern primarily lies with tensions between the Spanish public and the ruling courts, his approach to early modern subjectivity as a means of control provides us with a useful framework in which to consider *privanza*. If autonomy is born from self-control and the ability to resist influence, *comedias de privanza* suggest that the king too is subjected to the same processes. Of course, this is not a new idea, and Foucault reminds us that as early as Plato, the

ultimate virtue of a ruler is that “the sovereign must be a master of himself” (Foucault, *The Government of Self* 270). As we shall see, however, many *privanza* plays show precisely the opposite. In fact, most monarchs in *privado* plays lose this emerging notion of autonomy, for example through losing control of their senses in *Inocente sangre*, losing their identities altogether in *Adversa fortuna de Alvaro de Luna*, or deliberately misrepresenting themselves in Machiavellian games of deception in *Adversa fortuna de Bernardo de Cabrera*.

In the following chapters, I analyze five *comedias* in which the king’s ability to maintain his self-autonomy is tested against *privanza*. I have limited my study to plays by Lope de Vega and Antonio Mira de Amescua written or published between 1621 and 1624 during the transition between the reigns of Philip III and Philip IV. The duke of Lerma’s public fall from power in 1618, followed by the 1621 public execution of Rodrigo Calderón, his favorite secretary, provided a new catalyst for literary production contemplating the role of the *privado* in government, and indeed, the proper role of the monarch. In order to frame their debates, Lope and Mira resurrect *privados* from Spain’s medieval past in order to explore their effects on the king’s ability to maintain his will against *privados*, who, by their very nature, were often suspected of manipulating or controlling the monarch’s *voluntad*.

To this end, the present chapter introduces the study by briefly reviewing the historical reasons for which *privanza* emerged to such a prominent political institution in seventeenth-century Spain and how *representations* of kingship and favorites created conceptual problems for early modern writers when they tried to define the office. Paradoxically, language employed to exalt the king’s power also rendered him a static, and often invisible icon. Theater, therefore, offers an ideal site in which to test grandiose ideas about kingship against real, historical scenarios.

The second chapter looks at how Lope de Vega utilizes popular knowledge of the medieval Castilian King Fernando IV's notorious cruelty towards his *privados* Juan and Alonso Carvajal. The Carvajal brothers' terrible fate spawned a long oral tradition that branded Fernando a vicious *privado*-murderer. Using the public's familiarity of the story to his advantage, Lope dramatizes how Fernando is slowly driven into madness by excessive dependence on his favorite *privado*, Gómez de Benavides. When Benavides is suddenly murdered, Fernando cannot tolerate his absence and allows rage to overtake him completely, thereby conforming to the medieval and classical definitions a tyrant.

Chapter 3 analyzes Antonio Mira de Amescua's two part *Próspera fortuna de don Alvaro de Luna* and *Adversa fortuna de don Alvaro de Luna*. Together, these two plays trace the rise and fall of Alvaro de Luna, Spain's most iconic *privado* who was historically regarded as a usurping magician who controlled king Juan II by witchcraft. Mira ignores Luna's negative reputation, and instead he frames his poetics in an extended eclipse analogy that dramatizes Juan's slow surrender of his *voluntad* and autonomy to his *privado*.

Chapter 4 looks at how Mira de Amescua uses dramatic asides and internal monologues in *Próspera fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera* and *Adversa fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera* to reveal a disconnect between the characters internal selves and their external representations. Throughout the play, characters routinely interrupt the normal dialogues with extended asides and reveal to the audience that their internal motives and desires actually contradict what they are saying to the other characters. Following a Machiavellian model for self-representation, characters deliberately manipulate their spoken words in order to control how other people perceive them. Mira de Amescua, however, tests this political theory against

privanza and concludes that divorcing the self from its representation can have dire consequences.

Sombra del rey

Given the awe-struck reactions of the attendees at Margaret's funeral when Philip III emerged from the darkness glimmering in candlelight, it is no surprise that strategic and choreographed appearances, as well as absences, were used to enhance the king's image of power. Philip III and Philip IV's courts, as the above example indicates, held that the monarch's majesty depends on the inability to actually see them. Indeed, learned seventeenth-century politicians and authors were very aware that viewing an actual flesh-and-blood king, whether real or fictitious, can be quite disappointing. Having a monarch appear in full view of a crowded corral, writes McKendrick, "removes the kings from their palaces and shows them to be not merely men but much of the time to be men as others are" (26). Lope de Vega captures this disillusionment in *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña* (1608) when the villagers glimpse Enrique III as he presides over a street festival. When they see the king himself watching the celebrations, they become confused as to why Enrique does not resemble his magnificent image displayed in the cathedral of Toledo. One of the villagers, Casilda, is shocked that the king is a man of "carne y hueso" and not an immortalized icon made of "demasco o terciopelo" (Vega, *Peribáñez* I. 987-89). At least in this scene of the play, the monarch is deprived of his splendor when spectators are forced to compare his glorified version hanging on the wall of the Toledo Cathedral with a rather unremarkable man who appears to be no different from them.

Indeed, Philip II seemed to have been aware that representations of himself in public, especially by lowly actors, could damage his position as an austere and pious relic. Lope

comments in *Arte Nuevo de hacer comedias* (1609), for example, that Philip II detested seeing kings cast as dramatic characters, explaining:

Felipe, rey de España y señor nuestro,
 en viendo un rey en ellos se enfadaba,
 o fuese al ver el arte contradice,
 o que la autoridad no debe
 andar fingiendo entre la humilde plebe. ("Arte Nuevo De Hacer Comedias" 140)

Enrique García Santo-Thomas tells us in his edition of the work that Lope is actually exaggerating in this passage and that Philip II only prohibited theatrical representations of himself (140). Still, representing a current or recent monarch was seen as taboo and nearly all kings or queens used as dramatic characters were historical, foreign, or biblical-- far removed from the recent memories of the audience.

To be certain, the king's remoteness was exalted and mystified long before Lerma began deliberately staging court ceremonies to reflect Philip III's inaccessibility. While historians argue over the exact circumstances that gave rise to this trend, they all agree that the Hapsburg tendency toward elusiveness emerged during the reign of Philip II. Prior to his ascension, the Spanish rulers practiced a direct-rule style of monarchy that relied on the king's mobility throughout the various kingdoms. Philip II's father Charles V, like Isabel and Ferdinand before him, did not commit his courts to one particular site. Instead, he and his entourage traveled continuously from city to city while he was in Spain. As the various Spanish kingdoms still remained highly factionalized, Elliott explains that this gave each region the sense that they had access to the monarch and could rely on him to address their concerns while the court was visiting their particular area (*Imperial Spain, 1469-1716* 254). This, of course, all changed when

Philip II established a permanent seat in Madrid in 1551. While Madrid, the geographic center of Spain, seems to have been chosen as the capital in order to foster unity among the provinces, Elliott argues that in reality it had the complete opposite effect and created the sense that the king was now remote and inaccessible (*Imperial Spain, 1469-1716* 257).

Philip II's hermetic personality also exacerbated his reputation for being aloof. Río Barredo writes that he was always shy, but a series of personal disasters, including the death of both his son Charles and his wife Isabel Valois in 1568, pushed him into almost complete isolation (45). In addition, regions outside of Castile began feeling excluded from the king as his visits became less and less frequent, and began participating in anti-Castilian and *Leyenda negra* propaganda. This proved personally devastating for Philip, who withdrew into his palaces and dramatically reduced his public appearances after 1568 (Río Barredo and Burke 45).

Whether by design or by personal preference, remoteness became ingrained in how the Spanish public perceived Philip II. Indeed, Antonio Feros writes:

During Philip II's reign, the inaccessibility and invisibility of the king came to be viewed as key elements in the practice of kingship, and Philip II's supporters began to defend the idea that the king's invisibility was essential for the promotion of obedience and reverence among the king's subjects. (*Kingship and Favoritism* 84)

While Philip II's isolation seems to have been an accident of personality and geography, however, his son fully integrated the practice as a matter of court decorum. The lavish ceremonial protocol initiated during the reign of Philip III sought to enhance his remoteness from spectators, and even from his own nobles at court. For example, Feros tells us that Lerma redesigned the palace specifically to isolate the king deep within a secluded chamber that was

only accessible after passing through a series of passageways, each door guarded by a servant chosen by Lerma (93).

The effect of the new palace design would have been dramatic and immediate. Even very high-ranking nobles had to first petition Lerma for permission to see the king, and when granted an audience, the visit would have occurred in the king's private chamber supervised by Lerma or a royal attendee chosen by Lerma. After reviewing reported experiences from many different sources who were allowed an audience with Philip III, many of whom were foreign dignitaries, Elliott concludes that the same protocol was always followed (*Spain and Its World* 150). The visitors were made to pass through several layers of chambers and guards, and after this intimidating spectacle, they were ushered into the king's most private sanctum. When finally escorted into the king's presence, Elliott writes that "[Philip IV] would raise his hat as they came in, and then stand motionless throughout the audience" (150). In a dramatic departure from his grandfather's direct-rule approach, the king had become a stationary icon.

Even further enhancing the invisible king model was the Spanish tendency to regard the monarch's body as power incarnate. Other European monarchies, Elliott explains, often held that the power of their state rested in objects (*Spain and its World* 167). In England, for example, the monarch to some extent held divine and regal power, but his or her authority truly emanated from the crown, and especially from the throne on which every English monarch since the fourteenth century had been crowned. This was not so in Spain. In fact, Elliott reminds us that the typical images of state authority were noticeably absent in Spain: "there had been no coronation ceremony in Castile since 1379 [...] and at the end of the sixteenth-century the kings of Spain apparently had no official throne, no sceptre, no crown" (*Spain and Its World* 167). The glory of the monarchy, then, was not represented by external symbols but rather in the very body

of the king. Elliott continues that, “in Hapsburg Spain, the supremacy of the king is taken for granted, [therefore] political imagery can be studiously understated, and there is no need to deck out the ruler with elaborate allegorical trappings” (*Spain and Its World* 167). As the king’s very body represented the glory of the state, it became important that he be considered different from other men, and this meant keeping him invisible.

Because new court protocols required the monarch to be detached from courtiers, it fell on his favorite minister, or *privado*, to assume the king’s practical duties. At the same time the king’s image became more and more aggrandized and historians have described the increasingly elaborate court ceremony as having contributed to the rise of the *privados* into seventeenth-century Spanish politics. After the pious and simply dressed Philip II died in 1598, the duke of Lerma, at the time known as the Marquee of Denia, ordered lavish celebrations to be held honoring the deceased king’s memory and inaugurating the newly crowned Philip III. It is at these festivities in 1599, Patrick Williams argues, that Lerma began controlling the king’s public appearances in order to heighten the majesty of the crown, and therefore his own position (175). Williams maintains that the 1599 celebration at Denia spawned both *privanza* as public institution during the reign of Philip III and a new court aesthetic which would require that the king’s every move be carefully choreographed (175). He writes, “el valimiento coincidió con el nacimiento de la corte barroca y fue la más alta expresión del control que Denia mantuvo sobre las más importantes ceremonias regias y fiestas de la corte” (175-76). If the king remains hidden and never speaks in public, then it is left to his *privado*, or favorite minister, to serve as the visible head of the state. In the midst of such extravagant court pageantry designed to enhance the king’s glory, the function of the *privado* seemed a kind of paradox, as Margaret’s funeral illustrates. Lerma made this point very clear by placing himself in the physical center of the

funeral, thereby both flaunting his command over the entire ceremony, yet at the same time implying that he was merely a bystander to the king's procession. Such contradictory imagery naturally confused Spaniards, who generally believed the king should rule directly, and at the same time witnessed the *privados* publicly wielding king-like powers.

Political theorists may have struggled to define the new institution, but the duke of Lerma was quick to initiate a propaganda campaign to brand himself not only as king's favorite minister and *privado*, but his actual double. While Philip III and later Philip IV were cloistered away in their private chambers, Lerma and Olivares emerged as a kind of visible manifestation of the king. Antonio Feros, as well as other historians, have discussed the perception of the favorite as the "twin soul," "double," or "alter ego" of the monarch ("Images of Evil" 231). Olivares's private chaplain, Mateo Renzi, goes so far as to write in 1622 that "el privado es en todo el concepto voz, mano y sombra del príncipe" (Renzi 35). Laura Bass writes that this was a deliberate strategy instituted by Lerma himself. The king's absence is highlighted in a strategic fashion in order to portray the *privado* as his representative or manifestation and not as a usurper (Bass 90).

This was not merely a symbolic gesture. In 1612, Philip III mandated that Lerma's utterances and written instructions carried, as James Boyden writes, "binding force utterly equivalent to [the king's] own royal signature or pronouncements" (64) In one of the most visually striking examples of this vision, to which Feros and Bass both refer, is Juan Pantoja de la Cruz's 1602 portrait of Lerma and subsequent rendering of Philip III in exactly the same position (Bass 90; Feros, *Kingship* 104). If the intended message were not obvious enough, Pantoja even has them wearing the same decorated armor. This visual representation of Lerma as

another Philip III illuminates Mateo Renzi's "sombra" analogy. The favorite becomes not just the king's representative, but also his copy.

Given the Hapsburg monarchs' retreat from public view and the rise of the *privado* as a new and powerful figure in Spanish politics, representing the king and his favorite became exceedingly problematic. Philip II, of course, had employed numerous ministers throughout his reign to help govern, most notably Ruy Gomez de Silva, but even so, the councilors were not publicly exalted until Lerma began his visible campaign to brand himself the king's *privado* (Feros, *Images* 211). Because the practice of publicly relinquishing royal power had not occurred in Spain in recent memory, political theorists and writers struggled to explain the new political office. Although most theorists maintained that the monarch should take advice, they also accepted the dangers of such a situation that could lead to a counselor being, as Cauvin states, "so powerful as to mold the behavior of the monarch, making decisions for him even in personal matters" (Cauvin 24). Any conclusion as to the proper role of the *privado*, therefore, was always made hesitantly. Charles Oriel underlines the difficulty in conceptualizing the *privado*:

The *privado* is thereby defined in a very problematic way, that is, by his special and unfixable status outside of the traditional conceptualization of social space, and institutional authority. His authority is sanctioned by the powers that be, but only obliquely, that is, by virtue of his *privanza* with the monarch (Oriel 44)

The favorite's status, in this sense, relies completely on the monarch's disposition and thus can only be maintained by constantly perusing the monarch's favor. This position, then, was seen as inherently unstable being that the *privado* achieved an unnatural height that depended solely on the whims of the monarch.

The precarious nature of the king's favorite minister is especially evident in the numerous *privanza* treatises that abound throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. Barely two months after Calderón's execution, Mateo Renzi sent Olivares, the newly elevated favorite to Philip IV, a letter detailing the proper behavior of a *privado*. The letter, entitled *El privado perfecto*, insists that the count tread carefully in the presence of the new king because "con los príncipes tienen más peligro los grandes que los humildes"(Renzi 3). While Renzi's letter was probably in direct response to Calderón and Lerma's fall, this was hardly a new gesture to a newly ascended favorite. Lerma's personal confessor, Pedro Maldonado, had also written him instructions on being a *Privado perfecto* in 1609 and warns, "de las mayores subidas hemos visto las más lamentables caídas" (27). In fact, so many *privanza* treatises were circulating in the early seventeenth century that Antonio Pérez commented in a letter to Lerma that "la material de privados es como la peste, y enfermedad de piedra, o de muelas, que por más remedios que uno sepa, se huelga cualquiera pasajero, aunque sea un charlatán" (Pérez 2).¹ Such a statement testifies to the profound preoccupation with the ministers' proper behavior, and implies that advice to *privados* had become a thriving genre.

Despite the abundance of material discussing *privanza*, however, there was no real consensus on what a *privado* should be. Among the numerous reasons why it proved difficult for Spaniards to perceive Lerma's new role, historians have offered us several important factors that

¹ A minister to Philip II, Antonio Pérez himself was the object of intense court intrigue. Feros tells us that it was widely whispered that he secretly supported Dutch enemies of Spain and sold state secrets for profit (*Kingship* 266, 67). Like Rodrigo Calderón, Pérez had several people murdered to keep his own scandalous dealings quiet, but was eventually arrested for his crimes, although he later managed to escaped into France.

prevented a clear conception of the *privado*. First, Thompson attributes *privanza*'s resistance to definition because it was outside the Spanish legal system, and therefore was never a real institution which could be defined and regulated (19). He writes:

the force (and the weakness) of the *validimiento* lay precisely in the fact that (unlike kingship) it was not an office, and was therefore extra-legal, not regulated by rules and ordinances, but driven by a guiding principal which was not distributive justice, but reason of state. The *valido* was the political persona of the 'Christian Prince,' the negative identity of a king who could do no wrong; he was a buffer, a lightning conductor, or at worst a burning-glass interposed between king and people at a time when a moral conscious for government policy could not be relied upon. (Thompson 19)

As Thompson accurately observes, the *privado* did not exist as a valid office protected by council consent, but rather could be made and unmade at the whims of the monarch. This instability of the position, combined with some notoriously disastrous *privados* in Spain's distant past, added an air of intrigue and suspicion.

Second, contemporary political theorists approached defining *privanza* by scouring through historical chronicles looking for examples of past favoritism instead of accepting it as a new institution unique to Philip III and Lerma's situation. Despite the numerous treatises on *privanza* circulating in the first part of the seventeenth-century, most merely glossed medieval theories on kingship and then listed ancient and medieval examples of kings taking a favorite. The works that attempted to comment at all on the current situation at court tended to explain the virtuous characteristics that an ideal *privado* would possess, but they were forced to relinquish the fact that history so far had yet to produce a "perfect privado." Indeed, in nearly every

example of past king-favorite relationships scrutinized by historians and theorists, the minister is either overwhelmed by temptation to seize power, or else he is victimized and murdered by an ungrateful monarch.

Third, John Lynch argues that failure to adequately understand and define *privanza* was due in part to the resistance of seventeenth-century political philosophy to consider the possibility of evolving beyond the medieval notion of monarchy (18). Even as the government grew increasingly more modern, instituting bureaucracies and *arbitrista* committees to deal with civil concerns, the majority of the Spanish public still believed that the king should directly rule his realm in all aspects (Lynch 18). Describing the political theorists of the day, Lynch writes:

[they] took for granted that the perfect form of government was personal monarchy; they did not question that sovereignty should be absolute; and it never occurred to them to consider the role of representative institutions. They were looking, indeed, not for the origins and nature of power but for the ideal Christian Prince. (18)

Given that this concept of “personal” and “absolute” monarchy was so thoroughly ingrained into the Spanish consciousness, it proved difficult to negotiate these convictions against an increasingly disconnected reality that suggested that the king did not actually govern.

Apart from political and legal theory, one of the most important reasons that *privanza* was such a difficult concept for seventeenth-century Spaniards is that almost every example they could think of in which a *valido* assumed some kind of royal responsibility ended disastrously. As critics have noted, *privanza* for most Spaniards in the first few decades of the seventeenth century was synonymous with Alvaro de Luna. Elliott captures the notion when he writes:

The *valido* or *privado* was a man who had succeeded in capturing the favor of the king, usually –it was assumed—by sinister means. In the popular imagination Don Alvaro de Luna, the fifteenth-century favorite of John II of Castile, was the very image of the *privado*, and the spectacular downfall and execution and execution of Don Alvaro in 1453 was seen as a salutary warning to those who rose above their stations and usurped royal authority. (*The Count-Duke of Olivares : The Statesman in an Age of Decline* 169)

Given his image as a usurper, Alvaro de Luna was universally cited in favoritism treatises as an example of a *privado* who could not resist the temptations of power, and *privanza*'s reemergence in the seventeenth century naturally worried writers that the new *privados* would follow Luna's footsteps.

Privanza and theater

With the duke of Lerma controlling the Spanish courts from 1598-1618 and the count-duke of Olivares from 1621-1640, *privanza* became a major component of seventeenth-century notions of political power and monarchy. However, given the widespread affects of *privanza* on political discourse, the body of *comedias de privanza* is surprisingly small. *Comedias de enredo* and honor plays can claim hundreds of representative works, but scholars have only identified about 65 *privanza* plays. When only accounting for the most prolific and major Golden Age playwrights such as Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, Mira de Amescua, Pérez de Montalban, and Calderón de la Barca, the number shrinks to less than 30 works (Peale 149-51).

Teresa Ferrer Valls identifies *comedias de privanza* as urban comedies which frequently take place in “las cortes peninsulares hispanas” (31), contrary to most court-based plays which

stage their settings in Italy. Their conflicts and arguments may vary, but Ferrer Valls writes that all *comedias de privanza* follow the same formula:

...nos encontramos con protagonistas que, partiendo de un origen hidalgo humilde (*La fortuna merecida*) o de una posición elevada, más o menos cercana al poder (todos los demás), inician un proceso de ascenso en el ‘piélago de la corte’, a partir de un comportamiento ejemplar, que puede ser sancionado positivamente por el monarca (*Los Guzmanes de Toral, La fortuna merecida, Los Vargas de Castilla, Las cuentas del Gran capitán, Los Tellos de Meneses, II*), o verse injustamente truncado al no ser ratificado por el monarca (*La inocente sangre*), que presta oídos a las falsas acusaciones de los envidiosos.” (32)

The general plot for most plays, therefore, follows a *privado*’s rise from obscurity into the heights of power and ends with his fall (and sometimes death) because of ungrateful kings.

Scholars generally consider Damián Salucio del Poyo’s 1601 play *La privanza y caída de don Álvaro de Luna* as the first *comedia de privanza*, both as a theme as well as a dramatic structure portraying the rise and fall of a favorite. While Salucio’s play provides the basic format for the genre, however, there are several important differences between his play and Lope and Mira’s works that were composed two decades later. First, Salucio’s *privado*, in this case Alvaro de Luna, is clearly guilty of usurping royal power. Luna’s crimes are not exaggerated like in many medieval historical chronicles, but Salucio acknowledges his historical reputation. For instance, after arranging Juan II’s marriage to Isabel of Portugal against the king’s wishes, Luna boasts to a servant:

no sabes que no es el Rey
 más de lo que quiero yo,

que soy quien te a dado el
 y quien te pudo hazer
 podrá deshacerte. (Salucio del Poyo 160)

Luna's boldness in exclaiming that the king is "no ... de lo qu quiero yo" mirrors charges against the historical Luna that he had completely usurped Juan's voluntad and could control his every move. In the third act, Luna's medieval reputation comes to full fruition when he stabs his political enemy Vivero to death in front of witnesses and exclaims that he is above punishment. Indeed Salucio's overtly "flawed" *privado* is unique, as both Lope and Mira seem to completely ignore any negative characteristics associated with historical *privados*.

Salucio penned another *privanza* play in 1604, but this time he sets the drama in two parts, the first corresponding to the favorite's rise, and the second to his fall. *La próspera fortuna de Ruy López de Avalos* and the subsequent *La adversa de Ruy López* present Ruy López de Avalos as a selfless servant to King Juan II and to Spain. However, other nobles in the court become jealous of his prosperity and decide to plot his downfall. They fabricate evidence that suggests that Ruy is secretly conspiring with the Moorish king against Juan, but before he can be thrown into prison, the framed servant flees to Aragon. Later, king Juan begs for forgiveness after he realizes Ruy's innocence, but the disgraced favorite decides not to return to Castile.

In retrospect, Salucio's three plays seem to offer political commentary on *privanza*. Luna usurps the king's authority in *La privanza y caida*, and Ruy is victimized by an ungrateful king in *Próspera and Adversa fortuna*. However, as Raymond McCurdy explains, it would not have yet occurred to anyone to associate Luna or a fallen *privado* with Lerma or Philip III since Lerma was relatively new on the Spanish political stage and would not fall for another twenty years (McCurdy 122). If he intended any political message at all, Feros argues that Salucio was

merely trying to offer an example of ideal *privanza* and would not have had any specific person or contemporary event in mind (168). This explains why Salucio felt comfortable referring to Luna's historical characterization as a usurper without fear of offending Lerma.

Lope de Vega and Mira de Amescua, on the other hand, wrote or published their plays after Lerma's 1618 fall from power and his secretary's 1621 execution. By this time, political theorists had routinely evoked Alvaro de Luna to describe Philip III's reliance on Lerma and writers could not help but notice Rodrigo Calderón's similar fate when he, like Luna, was publically executed after a rapid fall from power. The playwrights would have known full well that their dramatic *privados* would have been interpreted as commentary about Lerma, Calderón, or the recently elevated Olivares, so they constructed their plays without any direct references to their *privados'* villainy. Lope's favorites in *La inocente sangre* are exalted as heroes of Spain and humble servants of Fernando IV. Similarly, Mira de Amescua omits all references to Luna's historic reputation as a usurper even though Salucio's earlier version is clearly the play's source.

Critics have noted that both Lope and Mira adhere to traditional Spanish visions of the "Christian Prince," whose piety and dedication to God allows justice to extend to the whole kingdom through absolute monarchy and direct royal rule. In order to conserve this political philosophy, Spanish political theorists took great lengths to define the *privado* as the king's "other self" who rules as his representative. Olivares's chaplain Mateo Renzi, for example, wrote in a 1622 that a *privado* and king should be indistinguishable from each other, even visually, so that "quien no tiene la vista delgada muchas vezes confunde al Principe con el Privado" (4). This rhetorical practice of "doubling" the king and his favorite was designed to glorify the *privado* while at the same time conforming to Spanish expectations of absolute monarchy. As we shall

see, however, emerging concepts of autonomy tests the limits of *privanza* and its effects on the king's self.

Privanza, therefore, brings the concept of subjectivity to the forefront in seventeenth-century Spain by introducing questions of manipulation, control, and self-representation. As we shall see in the following chapters, Lope de Vega present *privanza* as a test against a king's ability to maintain his autonomy against an institution which, it was thought, owed its very existence to a courtier's ability to manipulate the monarch into submission. Nevertheless, Lope and Mira internalize this struggle and offer scenarios in which the kings voluntarily hand themselves over to bondage. By presenting a series of weak kings who allow their *voluntades* to become enslaved, the playwrights suggest that the monarch's true power emanates from his ability to recognize and to control his internal self. *Privanza*, however, proves to be a constant danger to a king's efforts to realize this potential, and offers example after example of kings who fail to enforce their own autonomy.

CHAPTER 2

LEGENDARY INJUSTICE: MAD KINGS AND MURDERED PRIVADOS IN
LOPE DE VEGA'S *LA INOCENTE SANGRE*

Lope de Vega's *La inocente sangre* (1623) dramatizes the famous Carvajal legend in which Fernando IV becomes so enraged and obsessed with vengeance that he murders two of his *privados* by having them thrown off the Peña de Martos, a rocky cliff in Jaén. Rather than being a formulaic “bad king” play, however, *Inocente sangre* is unique in two important ways. First, Lope's dramatized version of Fernando IV is a multi-layered character who is driven to obsessive anger over the course of the play, thereby offering spectators a psychological study on the root causes of his defects. Secondly, by masquerading the legend of Fernando IV as a history play, Lope simultaneously presents highly subjective characters under the guise of Spanish historical figures and relies on the audience's familiarity with the Fernando stories to add a sense of urgency to the plot as it relates to parallel events unfolding in the Hapsburg courts. Relying on centuries of oral legend and *romancero* traditions that brand Fernando IV as a vicious tyrant, the *Inocente sangre* offers a dramatized psychological portrait of the Castilian monarch's cruelty, and suggests that *privanza*, if used improperly, can destroy innocent victims and kings alike.

Despite receiving almost no serious critical attention, scholars have recognized *La inocente sangre* as unique among Lope's king plays. In an almost inflammatory move, Lope draws his inspiration from oral legends surrounding Fernando IV of Castile (1295 – 1312), who, according to popular legend, was “summoned” to judgment by God Himself as punishment for his extreme cruelty. Mary Cauvin attributes the play's 1623 publication to Lope being “moved

by the sudden pronouncement of the death sentence on [Rodrigo] Calderón ... as soon as that ill-fated courtier's enemies came into power at the accession of Philip IV" (Cauvin 442). This certainly seems to be the case, especially given the prologue's charged language with which Lope decries the fate of the Carvajal brothers at the hands of Fernando IV: "cruel fue la sentencia, la muerte injusta, el valor con que la sufrieron, digno de eternal fama" (Vega, "Inocente Sangre" 30). Given the publicity and intense public interest in Rodrigo Calderón's death sentence imposed in 1621 by the newly ascended Philip IV, the Carvajal brothers' parallel fate offered Lope a platform in which to dramatize Calderón's demise, still fresh in Madrid's mind when the play was introduced to the theaters and to print.

In this chapter, we shall see how *La inocente sangre* offers a window into Lope's ability to interweave his plots with oral legend which parallel similar events happening in Madrid, resulting in a play which not only questions the institution of *privanza*, but also invites the audience to criticize the king for his emotional dependence on his favorite minister. Because the Carvajal story was a popular oral tradition in Spain, it is likely that Lope's audience would have already known the basic plot before the play even began. As we shall see, Lope capitalizes on their familiarity with Fernando IV's cruelty and causes them to question why the Castilian king is cruel in the first place. Surprisingly, Lope presents Fernando as a model of justice in the first scene of the play, but he soon rejects seventeenth-century political wisdom that held that a monarch should not become emotionally compromised by befriending someone of a lower station. Eventually, his dependence on his *privado* spins out of control when Gomez is murdered, and Fernando lashes out at his other two *privados*, the Carvajal brothers, and unjustly has them executed. By offering the audience a glimpse into the mind of a historical figure they already

know to be cruel, Lope questions how *privanza* contributes to Fernando's inability to control his impulses, and as a result, how he loses his autonomy and his life.

Legend as Source Material

La inocente sangre was published in 1623, although Lope himself says in the prologue that he composed the *comedia* earlier: “años ha que escribí este suceso; y como ahora saliese en la impression lo que antes en el teatro” (Inocente Sangre 30). As there is no other evidence other than the prologue to indicate an approximate composition date, Morley and Burton have used their system of meter analysis to place it between 1604 and 1608 (209). However, the play's reference to *La gloria de Niquea*, another 1622 *comedia*, has convinced most scholars that Lope substantially reworked *Inocente sangre* immediately prior sending it for publication around 1622 (Morley and Bruerton 209). The play has been almost completely ignored by critics, possibly because of Menéndez y Pelayo's unfortunate dismissal of the *comedia* as “muy primitivo” and “no es ciertamente de las mejores [de Lope]” (240). Even if Lope's normal multiple-level conflicts are not present, as Menendez y Pelayo complains, his reintroduction of the Carvajal legend into popular discourse after Calderón's execution and the striking deviation from his normal king-play formula merits our attention.

As with many Lope plays, it appears the playwright consulted the *Valerio de las historias* as his primary source material (Menendez y Pelayo 236). The account is short, only one long paragraph, but the murdered *privado*'s name appears as Gomez de Benavides, just as in Lope's play, instead of Juan Alonso de Benavides as he is named in the more detailed version chronicled in *Memorias de don Fernando el ceremonioso*. The account is also unique in that while most fourteenth-century chronicles only recount the details of the Carvajal brothers' death sentence, the *Valerio* is more concerned about the execution's effect on Fernando IV. Recast as a legend,

the chronicler Juan Antonio Moreno attributes the king's sudden death thirty days after the Carvajals' execution as the result of a curse. Before they are thrown from the Martos, the innocent brothers exclaim that the unjust king would "en treinta dias [aparece] con ellos a juicio ante Dios" (Moreno 230-31). And just as the brothers predicted, the king was found dead in his bed exactly 30 days later, the cause of death unknown. It was then agreed that his untimely demise must have been divine justice for ruthlessly murdering his innocent and loyal servants (Moreno 231).

Given the very short description of the Carvajal incident in the *Valerio de las historias*, it seems that most of Lope's poetic license derives from legends and oral traditions surrounding the event and speculation about Fernando's death. While there are very few surviving written examples of the Carvajal literary legacy, evidence indicates that it flourished as an oral tradition well into seventeenth century and beyond. By 1444, for example, Juan de Mena's comments about Fernando in *Laberinto de fortuna* indicate that the monarch's fame was tied inextricably his mysterious death caused by murdering the Carvajals. The poet writes:

irá ya dexando de ver nuestro viso
 todos los fechos del terçer Fernando,
 aquel que Alcaudete ganó batallando,
 del que se dize morir emplazado
 de los que de Martos ovo despeñado,
 segunt dizen rústicos d'esto cantando (Mena 2291-96)²

Mena's assertion that "rústicos" were singing about the Carvajal incident in the fifteenth century

² All other sources unanimously attribute the Carvajal legend to Fernando IV, not Fernando III as Juan de Mena erroneously claims.

indicates that there was a thriving *romancero* tradition surrounding the execution. The fact that he does not feel the need to name the Carvajal brothers also indicates that Mena expects his readers to be familiar enough with the story to know that they were unjustly thrown from the Martos.

As with any orally transmitted narration, however, the event was exaggerated through years of retelling. When the legend next appears in print in 1550, Fernando's cruelty not only included throwing the Carvajals from the Martos, but also cutting off their hands and feet:

Mándales cortar los pies,

Mándales cortar los manos,

Y mandalos despeñar

De aquella peña de Martos (Wolf 123)

The various oral traditions about Fernando IV and the Carvajals were eventually compiled into one long romance titled "La peña de Martos" and published in 1865 in Valencia, largely influenced by romantic literary preferences of the day. Scholars who have studied the Romantic version, however, are certain that the poem exhibits a "larguísima tradición literaria" dating back to the fourteenth century (Pérez Ortega 11).

When the brothers next appear in 1621 as major characters in Tirso de Molina's *La prudencia en la mujer*, *privanza* becomes a primary source of conflict. *La prudencia* is a history play about Fernando IV's mother, María de Molina, who ruled Castile and Leon before her son was of age. When her brother-in-law Alonso challenges María's legitimacy as the regent monarch, the Carvajals become her primary defenders, defeating Enrique's forces and serving as her trusted political advisors. When Fernando finally comes of age however, he ungratefully imprisons his mother's supporters, largely on the advice of his *privado* Juan Benavides. Sensing

that Benavides was scheming against the Carvajales to advance his own interests, María warns Fernando “nunca os dejéis gobernar / de privado de manera / que salgais de vuestra esfera” (300). Instead of ending the play with the brothers’ execution, however, Tirso leaves the audience hanging and promises in the last line to follow up with a sequel exclusively dedicated to the Carvajales: “de los dos Carvajales / con la segunda comedia / Tirso, senado, os covida / si ha sido a vuestro gusto” (Molina 306). Unfortunately, the second play has been lost (assuming Tirso indeed wrote a sequel), but Ruth Kennedy has argued that the two plays together would have served as a warning to Philip IV against the dangers of *privanza*, as well as the injustice of victimizing his predecessor’s servants (Kennedy 1134).³

As with most medieval oral traditions, the Carvajal story produces only spotty and intermittent textual documentation, but it is certain that the legend was a popular story and well known in Spain in the seventeenth century, inspiring several *romancero* ballads as well as Tirso de Molina and Lope de Vega’s dramatic versions. We can safely assume, therefore, that many of Lope’s spectators would have grown up hearing of Fernando’s cruelty and of the Carvajal’s undeserved fate. By evoking refrains, images, and language from the oral traditions, Lope involves the audience on a personal level, inviting them to infuse their own recollection of the Carvajal story into the play. Nevertheless, Lope also includes new material and characters that did not appear in the short *romanceros* and songs about Fernando, forcing the audience to

³ Kennedy bases much of her argument on the premise that *La prudencia en la mujer* was written in 1621. While scholars have proposed a wide range of composition dates ranging from 1615 to 1635, Kennedy maintains that there are several references throughout the play, including a remark about the 1621 Spanish locust outbreak, which indicate that the play was written during Philip IV’s first year on the throne (1134).

compare the new material to their own knowledge of the event and interpret its meaning. More specifically, Lope's dramatic version of Fernando, who is not cruel in the first scenes of the play, provokes viewers to look for clues to his emerging cruel behavior. As we shall see later in this chapter, Lope blames Fernando's erratic behavior on his excessive dependence on his *privado*.

Lope presents *Inocente sangre* as a history play, claiming in the prologue that it is a "historia" which was documented in chronicles by "historiadores" (349). By "historia," he did not, however, intend to reenact the dry narratives he found in the pages of Spain's historical chronicles. Rather, Lope strove to embellish his "historias" with substance and emotion. This, in Lope's view, enlivened history and made it accessible to his audiences because his actors added a human quality to the past. Lope claims in the prologue of *La campaña de Aragón*, for example, that the *comedia* is a superior format in which to represent history because the human element unique to drama adds a certain "fuerza" to the stories. He writes:

La fuerza de las historias representadas es tanto mayor que leida, cuanto diferencia se advierte de la verdad a la pintura y del original retrato; porque en un cuadro están las figuras mudas y en una sola acción las personas; y en la comedia hablando y discurriendo, y en diversos afectos por instantes, cuales son los sucesos, guerras, paces, consejos, diferentes estados de fortuna, mudanzas, prosperidades, declinaciones de reinos y periodos de imperios y monarquías grandes. (Vega, *La Campaña De Aragón* 853).

The primary difference for Lope between the stage and other historical media such as written narrative or painted renderings lies with the audience's ability to see the human and personal stories behind history's great "sucesos." In other words, Lope's goal of adding "fuerza" to a history was to make it relevant and accessible to his audiences. He also liberally added

interpretations to include love intrigues, jealousies, and other human factors that are often left out of narrative accounts. Rather than representing medieval issues that would have been of little interest to theatergoers, Lope's historical plays, although set in Spain's distant past, spoke to seventeenth-century concerns.

Many critics have discussed how Lope's history plays disguised contemporary social issues with medieval plots. Anthony Cascardi, for example, has argued that Lope dramatized various "historical crises" in which the societal traumas of the rapidly changing social order are presented with "archaic recourses," in the form of history plays to neutralize contemporary concerns about class and political power (30). This is accomplished when Lope's main plot conflicts are rapidly and harmoniously resolved at the end of the play, thereby restoring social order. Anthony Carreño-Rodríguez furthermore classifies Lope's use of history, particularly king plays, as "dramas de moralidad política" in which the playwright offers "una serie de reflexiones sobre el buen y mal gobernante, o sobre la relación entre el orden del reino y los valores de la recta política" (218). History plays were intended to be viewed, therefore, as commentary on present-day political and social concerns.

By embedding current issues in his depictions of the great "sucesos" of Spain's distant past, Lope's audience becomes an integral component of the plays' interpretations. Indeed, Melveena McKendrick writes that the audience would have no other choice but to view history plays through seventeenth-century lenses due to their restricted concept of past events:

[king plays] contributed, therefore, to the Spaniards' consciousness of Spain's identity as a nation and of the historical continuum of the nation. Thus links were formed between past and present. That these representations were fictionalized was immaterial, for the audience's grasp of historical events – even the educated

audience's – was necessarily partial and unreliable. The past is always a creation of the present, or a succession of presents, and Lope's recasting of Spain's history may be seen as an attempt to help audiences understand the present rather than the past – the issues they address are Renaissance issues in medieval cloths. (McKendrick 101)

According to McKendrick's view, the average audience member watching a king play in the *corrales* had no concept of past historical events as a culmination of politics, events, and worldviews specific to that era, and as a result, they were not interested in history's correct interpretation and reconstruction, but rather, they viewed history plays within a contemporary context (101).

While McKendrick asserts that the audience's inability to conceive of history led to interpretations corresponding to contemporary concerns, she neglects to consider how their familiarity with *romancero* ballads and oral traditions would affect their conception of history plays. Lope relied heavily on oral traditions to add substance to his characters, often recycling lines verbatim from popular romances. Indeed, *la Inocente sangre* pulls directly from *romancero* sources which many theatergoers would have recognized, especially in the climactic moment in which Fernando has the Carvajals thrown from the Martos. One of the *romanceros* recorded in the sixteenth century, for example, phrases Fernando's infamous order as “y mándalos despeñar / de aquella peña de Martos” (Alcala-Galeano 367). Similarly, Lope has his dramatized Fernando repeat the line “y despeñadlos de esa Peña” (*Inocente* 370) twice, and his henchman Garcia repeats it a third time before the Carvajals' execution. In another example, a *romancero* recounts Juan Carvajal's direct appeal to God and the saints for justice:

Querellámonos, el rey,

Para ante Dios soberano

Que dentro de treinta dias

Vais con nosotros a plazo

Y podemos por testigos

A san Pedro y a san Pablo (Alcala-Galeano 367)

Juan's famous last words form the crux of the entire Carvajal legend. Not only does he blatantly accuse the monarch of being unjust, he also declares that the king has no authority to judge him and his brother, instead declaring that God will decide who among them is guilty. In Lope's parallel scene, Juan's speech mirrors its *romancero* counterpart, but the playwright changes the word order to emphasize "justicia" as Juan's last word.

Y así, vuelto al cielo santo

Digo que pues inocente

Muero, al Rey Fernando emplazo

Para el tribunal de Dios

Donde los dos nos veamos

A ver quién tiene justicia (*Inocente* 374)

As we shall see later in this chapter, Lope considered justice to be the most important virtue of a monarch, and the quality that allowed the wellbeing of the state and its people. By ending the most dramatic scene in the play with Juan's plea for "justicia," Lope makes it clear that Fernando lacks this virtue. Moreover, the audience's familiarity with the Carvajal oral tradition allows them to foresee the king's own death when God would seek justice for the Carvajals by striking Fernando dead.

Geraldine Coats has argued that reusing lines from *romancero* ballads would have engaged the audience on a very interactive level – drawing from their collective experiences and

familiarity with popular legend to add a sense of participation. The critic writes:

Recognizing lines the lines of popular ballads must have been intensely emotive for the play's audience, and remembering would place the individual within a broader framework of belonging. Lope exploits these factors in his theater, but creates a deeper, subtler layer of memory in his emotive and protean treatment of Spain's past. (Coates 146)

Instead of watching unfamiliar scenes with unanticipated outcomes, Lope's reliance on the established Carvajal legend and known *romancero* traditions allows the audience to assume the role of interpreters of history. Because they already know the basic plot from oral tradition, Lope's audience is free to concentrate on his particular spin as to why Fernando behaves so cruelly. Robert Lauer's definition of a history play as "a work which uses historical personages (or names) for the poet's aesthetic, moral, or political intentions," (Lauer 17), therefore, becomes especially pertinent considering this extra dimension of interpretation afforded to Lope's audience because of their ability to recognize a given historical *comedia* from oral traditions and anticipate the ending. Knowing the general plot of the story before seeing the play would have made Lope's exaggerations, additions, and poetic licenses very clear, and his "political intentions" would have been difficult to miss. More importantly, however, Lope places interpretive responsibilities on the audience, allowing their familiarity with the Carvajal legend to guide their critiques of Fernando's personality as to why he victimizes his loyal *privados*.

Pillars of Justice: The Christian Prince

In order to fully understand how Lope views Fernando IV as a flawed monarch, it is important to first look at how, in *La inocente sangre*, he deviates from his formulaic theatrical kings. Like many seventeenth-century Spaniards, Lope largely followed classical and medieval

notions that kings should rule by fairness and reason. Additionally, political writers in Spain almost universally held that the king should derive his sense of justice from spiritual piety and dedication to the Church. Lope himself articulates this when, for instance, he writes a condolence letter to Philip IV encouraging him to look to his father as an example of a “tan católico, religioso y justo Principe” (*Cartas* 608). David Roas sums up Lope’s presentation of the monarch as conforming to Spanish political expectations of the ideal Christian Prince:

Así, la idea del monarca del drama lopesco se construye a partir de algunos conceptos bastante complejos: el rey aparece (y esa es la idea de monarquía autoritaria propugnada por los reyes católicos y los Habsburgo) como jefe absoluto del estado, en el cual se personifican la justicia y el orden social.

Además, el rey tiene una misión divina: la defensa de la fe católica. Lope reflejará todas estas ideas en sus comedias, aunque un tanto renovadas por las corrientes intelectuales y los tratadistas políticos de la época, popularizando de este modo los conceptos de ideología monárquica y exaltando la figura del rey, con lo que contribuirá a la vigencia de esa idea de la monarquía en la mente popular. (Roas 191)

This uniquely Spanish version of ideal kingship – just, rational, and religious – grew out of two important historical factors.

First, political thinkers used the medieval *corpus mysticum* analogy to describe the king’s political power as it relates to God’s rule over the world. Originally, *corpus mysticum* served as Thomas Aquinas’s illustration of church organization, described in the *Summa Theologiae* as “one mystical body by analogy with man’s physical body, Christ being its head, and its different members having functions in the whole” (Aquinas 487). While Aquinas intended this analogy to

illustrate the Church, Ernst Kantorowicz has demonstrated that this concept was adapted by individual states in medieval Europe to organize their political structures, and the same language was routinely evoked well into the seventeenth century (Kantorowicz 208, 09). Spain, like many European countries, adapted the ecclesiastical language to describe their own dominion over the state and its divisions. Frey Juan de Madariaga's 1619 publication *Del senado y de su principe*, for example, describes the Spanish state as an "inmenso cuerpo mistico" with eyes, ears, limbs, and feet (6). Being the head also carried connotations of reason and rationality, the principal attributes of the head and brain. Madariaga captures this when he attributes the head, or the king, as being responsible for the "pensamientos del gobierno", stating that, besides the heart, the head is responsible for thinking and decision making (Madariaga 6).

Secondly, stressing the necessity for the prince's spiritual piety was largely a backlash against Machiavellian ideas of an amoral state. Indeed, Machiavelli's suggestion that "it is not necessary for a prince to have [virtuous] qualities in fact, but it is indeed necessary to appear to have them" (Machiavelli 70) was widely rejected in Spain. Instead, most political theorists argued that piety is the most important virtue for a monarch, and all other virtues such as justice, prudence, and reason will emanate from his devotion to Christ. Influential anti-Machiavellian theorist Pedro de Ribadeneyra, for example, that the prince's virtues should be genuine, claiming "esta bondad [...] es opuesta y totalmente contraria a la mascara de vitudes que enseña Maquiavelo" (521). Rather than the Machiavellian notion of "statecraft" in which the ruler promotes the good of the state at all costs, Ribadeneyra maintains that state power and tranquility will naturally result from a Christian prince's internal virtues.

He writes, for example, that Spain's present strength did not come from political strategy or military conquest, but rather Fernando and Isabel's spiritual piety and personal devotion to justice:

debe vuestra alteza imitar, y tener por espejo á los esclarecidos Reyes Católicos don Fernando y doña Isabel, sus rebisagüelos, que con su gran religión y valor [...], y con él la pureza de nuestra santa fe y la justicia, y la paz y la seguridad en que al presente vivimos. (Ribadeneyra 453)

Indeed, Ribadeneyra's notion that good government emanates out of virtuous rulers becomes a dominant political idea in the seventeenth century. Juan Salazar, for example, writes in *Politica española* (1619) that Spain's greatness lies precisely in "la potencia y grandeza del Rey Catolico", and praises the Spanish monarchy for founding itself on "la Religión, el Sacrificio, y culto divino, y el zelo de la honra y servicio de Dios", all of which, concludes Salazar, leads the kings to a commitment to "la igual administración, que a todos haze justicia" (Salazar 21). Similarly, Jeronimo Zavallos's outline for a successful monarchy in *Arte real* (1623) suggests that rulers look to Solomon as an example of how to properly govern:

Y viendo el pueblo la prudencia con que [Solomon] avia juzgado el caso tan dudoso, con tanta justicia, le amaron, y echaron de ver, que no estava en la edad el bueno, o mal gobierno, sino en la prudencia, y sabiduria que Dios da a los Reyes, como sus vicaros en lo temporal, a quien V. Magestad deve dar infinitas gracias, por el don de prudencia con que le dotó, acudiendo por su persona a las juntas, y administrando a todos igual justicia. (Zeballos 44)

For Zavallos, justice is not a product of "gobierno," or *razon de estado*, to use a Machiavellian term, but rather emanates from a prudent and rational ruler who gains wisdom through his

devotion to God. Zavallos also evokes the *corpus mysticum* by claiming that kings are God's temporal rulers on earth who insure "igual justicia" (44).

The king's ability to dispense justice through his reason and prudence is a central theme in many in many of Lope's *comedias*. Throughout *Fuenteovejuna*, for example, DyLys Ostlund notices that the villagers "consistently refer to [the monarchs] as sources of order" (47). In the midst of a civil war, the tyrannical Comendador victimizes the citizens of Fuente Ovejuna to such an extent that they concede that the only remedy is to rise up against him in rebellion. While the villagers are very aware that rebellion is a serious crime, they are convinced that Fernando and Isabel, the Catholic monarchs, will be persuaded by their adherence to absolute justice and pardon the town. In fact, their battle cry as they march to kill the Comendador becomes "Los Reyes, nuestros señores / vivan!" (1811-12) and "Vivan Fernando y Isabel!" (1864). When the cornered Comendador accuses them of rebellion, exclaiming "yo soy vuestro señor" (1884), the villagers all reply in unison "Nuestros señores / son los Reyes Catolicos" (1885-6). The towns people are utterly convinced, not only of their moral right to depose the tyrant, but also of Fernando and Isabel's ability to judge the matter in their favor.

After the rebellion of Fuente Ovejuna, the monarchs predictably show they are committed to justice. They dispatch judges to investigate the details of the incident and to determine the responsible parties. While rebellion is never excusable, as Fernando and Isabel emphatically state, the mayor Esteban implies that they had the moral right to overthrow an unjust lord:

La sobrada tiranía
y el insufrible rigor
del muerto Comendador,

que mil insultos hazía,
 fue el autor de tanto daño.
 Las haziendas nos robaba
 y las donzellas forçaba,
 siendo de piedad extraño. (*Fuente Ovejuna* 2394-401)

Esteban explains their actions by recalling the Comendador's egregious behavior against them, yet he never really tries to defend the town's actions, pleading only the monarchs' "clamencia" (2438). After having heard the villagers' pleas for mercy, the king pardons them for lack of evidence, but reiterates the seriousness of rebellion, adding "aunque fue grave el delito / y por fuerça ha de perdonarse" (2444-5). It is worth noting that Lope's primary source for the story, the *Crónica de las tres Ordenes y Caballerías de Santiago*, published in 1572, records that the monarchs are convinced by the villagers' arguments that the Comendador was a tyrant who deserved death for his crimes (María Martín 189). María concludes in his edition of *Fuenteovejuna* that Lope's changed version of the king and queen in the *comedia* "no dejan lugar a dudas [que] el crimen es absolutamente condenado" (189). By removing the villager's legal right to rebel, Lope places the Catholic Monarchs as the only source of justice. The town cannot protect itself by legal recourse, as it does in the *Crónica*, and must therefore rely totally on Fernando and Isabel's sense of fairness. The monarchs do not fail to deliver, and guided by absolute dedication to justice, they condemn the rebellion while at the same time pardoning the villagers.

Lope will take this a step further in *El mejor alcalde, el rey*, casting the king not only as the familiar source of justice, but also making him literally and personally responsible for

insuring fairness in his realm.⁴ In *El mejor alcalde, el rey*, the king is unique in his active role in dispensing justice. While other monarchs can issue decrees and expect that their wills be obeyed, such as Fernando and Isabel in *Fuente Ovejuna*, king Alfonso VII actively insures his laws are enforced. The play begins when a local lord, don Tello, falls in love with the peasant Elvira who is promised to the villager don Sancho. After Tello kidnaps and rapes Elvira, Sancho travels to the court of king Alfonso to plead for justice. The king writes to Tello demanding that he release Elvira, but the wicked lord ignores the order. Unnerved at the injustice in his kingdom, Alfonso personally travels to Galicia to remedy the situation. He forces Tello to marry the violated Elvira, but then decrees that he will immediately be executed, thereby leaving Elvira as Tello's widow and heiress to his lands and fortune. Elvira, now rich, is then free to marry Sancho.

Alfonso, just as the Catholic Monarchs in *Fuenteovejuna*, is considered the ultimate source of justice and described as “recto y justiciero” (1174) and “supremo juez / para deshacer agravios” (1537-38). These attributes even take on supernatural qualities, the king being so just that he can command thunder and lightning (2042-47). Indeed, Pelayo exclaims that “los reyes castellanos / deben de ser angeles” (1398-99) and Alfonso himself describes monarchy's justice as absolute and unmovable, comparing it to a stone tablet in which God has written His law (1709-15). Galicia's distance from Castile also illustrates that the king's justice is far reaching and is just as effective in remote corners of Spain as it is in Castile.

Despite the lofty language about kingship and justice, however, Alfonso's direct involvement in traveling to Galicia in disguise to address injustice represents, in Melveena McKendrick's words, “Lope's expression of belief in personal kingship” (McKendrick 37).

⁴ Although the play was not published until 1629, Morley and Bruerton conclude that it was composed between 1620 and 1623 (219).

While McKendrick argues that these lofty portrayals of kings criticize the Hapsburg monarchs' failure to conform to Spanish notions of ideal kingship, Lope nevertheless give his audiences the formula for great kings. Most cases, as the above examples indicate, exalt justice as the *sine qua non* of monarchy. Of course, there are numerous exceptions, but many scholars, especially in the twentieth century, have used such elevated views of kingship to deduce that plays were state propaganda which propagate the notion that social well-being and happiness can only be attained by submitting to the monarch's authority. Similarly, injustice and misery occur whenever the king's authority is undermined, such as the case in *Fuenteovejuna* and *El mayor alcalde, el rey*.

La inocente sangre

Summing up early modern views on a prince's principal virtues, Michal Foucault writes that a monarch was expected be temperate in all things. Rather than being subject to the whims of his passions, a monarch should rule by *ratio* and intellect:

the leader, the person who commands, the sovereign must be a master of himself ,
in the sense that he must be temperate, able to keep his desires within appropriate
limits, to moderate them, thus avoiding the discord which prevents symphony.

(Foucault 270)

Linking justice and self-control was longstanding political wisdom, and even the Greek philosophers viewed a tyrant as a king who himself was ruled by passions. Indeed, Plato writes in the *Republic* that "every day and every night their desires will grow in number, becoming stronger and making more demands" (336). Finally, writes Plato, tyrants are overwhelmed by passions until nothing else remains: "When nothing is left, desires will crowd into the nest of the soul like young ravens crying out for food. Goaded by them ... tyrants will look for someone they can cheat ... whether by fraud or violence" (Plato 336). St. Thomas Aquinas reiterates

Plato's notions in *De Regimine Principium* and defines tyranny as erratic and unpredictable behaviors by a monarch who is guilty of "having contempt for the common good and seeking their private good ... depending on the various passions to which they are subject" (Aquinas 68). Unable to govern their own faculties, these rulers become subject to the whims of their emotional tirades. While bad kings may become enslaved to different passions, including greed and lust, both classical and medieval political theorists warn that anger is the most dangerous. Indeed, Seneca calls ire "the most hideous and frenzied of all the emotions" (106), and Aquinas describes the vengeful monarch as "one who is subject to the passion of wrath will shed blood for nothing" (68).

As indicated in the above examples, Lope's usual kings are sources of justice and rule by fairness and rationality. The *Inocente sangre*'s Fernando IV, on the other hand, deviates from this pattern and follows a monarch's slow descent into obsessive anger resulting in the random victimization of two loyal *privados*. As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, Fernando was the topic of oral traditions and legends who, according to Juan Atienza, "se distinguió por sus atrabilarias decisiones y por un evidente grado de crueldad caprichoso" (Atienza and Díez 76). Rather than presenting Fernando as a cruel tyrant from the beginning, however, Lope has his version of the monarch demonstrate a process in which an unhealthy dependence on his *privado* Gomez Benavides leads to emotional instability, fulfilling the classical and medieval notions of the tyrant who is ruled by his own passions. In this case, however, it is excessive affection for the *privado* which leads Fernando to lose control of his faculties.

From the very opening scene in *Inocente sangre*, Fernando at first seems overwhelmingly committed to justice. For instance, after defeating his usurping uncle Alonso in battle, Fernando

laments the opposing army's casualties, claiming the soldiers were loyal Castilians who had the misfortune of being caught up in his uncle's evil schemes:

Si hubiera puesto las manos
 En guerra de moros, piensa
 Que yo vengara su ofensa;
 Pero no contra cristianos.
 Mis vasallos son también
 Los soldados de mi tío:
 Y vengarme en lo que es mio
 Ni es justo, ni me está bien (350)

Having an established reputation as a bloodthirsty tyrant, Fernando's concern for his fellow Castilians would have surprised Lope's audience, especially when he states that it is unjust that rebel soldiers paid the price for the Infante Alonso's treason.

His apparent sense of justice surfaces again when the king is presented with his defeated uncle. The queen, moved by the people's suffering, convinces Alfonso to renounce his claim to the throne and pleads on his behalf to Fernando for leniency. Fernando accepts, exclaiming, "¿qué diré a lo que es tan justo / si basta que tu lo mandes" (352). He then agrees that he will no longer attack Alonso:

Bien que en amor te gane.
 Tocad las cajas a fiestas,
 Y los ejercitos marchen
 A Palencia, donde quiero
 Que huelgen y regalen;

Que mayor harán las leyes

Lo que las armas no hacen. (352)

Here, Fernando conforms to Lope's expectation of a magnanimous monarch. He seeks justice, but is willing to extend mercy and compassion like the Catholic kings in *Fuenteovejuna*, and he exalts adherence to the law like king Alfonso in *Mejor alcalde*. Indeed, Fernando's diplomatic solution to the succession crises would have surprised anyone familiar with his violent reputation portrayed by the *romancero* tradition.

At the same time, however, Lope also hints at personal flaws that will eventually lead to Fernando's destruction. From the very opening scene of the play, Fernando disregards seventeenth-century political wisdom stating that the king must maintain his proper station and view his *privado* as a vassal and not an equal. After a decisive victory over his uncle don Alonso's army, for example, *Inocente Sangre* opens with Fernando physically embracing Benavides:

Gomez: Invicto señor

Rey: Dame los brazos

Gomez: Bien creo conoces mi deseo

Rey: Tu deseo y tu valor

Gomez: Este pendón, que el blason

Muestra quién el dueño es

Gran Señor, pongo a tus pies (350)

Gomez remedies the awkward exchange by bowing in supplication, at least metaphorically, at the monarch's feet. However, by hugging Gomez, Fernando makes it clear that he views his *privado* as an equal and not as vassal.

The inappropriateness of a Spanish monarch embracing a subject is illustrated by Philip III's habit of hugging Lerma at public ceremonies. When the monarch was receiving guests in Valencia in 1599, for example, most visitors followed protocol and greeted Philip by kissing his hand. In the middle of the procession, however, Philip leapt out of his chair to embrace the duke of Lerma. The royal chronicler Cordoba records the event: "y ellos le besaron la mano por la merced. Cuando llegó el marques de Denia, aunque porfió, no se la quiso dar, antes se levantó de la silla y le abrazó" (Cordoba 11). Elizabeth Wright attests that such an event would have shocked onlookers and illustrates Philip's desire to publically exalt Lerma as his favorite and friend (56). A similar incident occurred at a 1608 ceremony honoring the future Philip IV, and guests were again puzzled by the outward emotional affection the king demonstrated. A witness records that a long procession of grandees presented themselves to the young prince and proceeded pay homage to Philip III by kissing his hand. When it came time for Lerma to present himself to the royal family, however, the king again rose out of his chair and hugged the *privado*: "començaron los treçe grandes ... aunque con el Duque de Lerma diferente que con todos, que llegando el Duque se levantó el Rey, y dio un passo y le abrazó muy amorosament, y luego le dio la mano que se la besasse" (*Relación Verdadera* 55). In both instances, is important to note that the king is responsible for the improper familiarity with the *privado*, suggesting in both cases that it is the monarch who wants his favorite to be viewed as an equal.

While Philip III and Lerma's public displays of affection grew more and more common, a Spanish king's familiarity with his subject still elicited scandal even as late as 1626. Indeed, debates regarding friendship between the monarch and his *privado* never reached a real consensus, and political theorists engaged in heated debates as to the ability of a monarch to have friends. For example, sixteenth-century political theorist Patrizi cites classical wisdom stating

that friendships are based on equality, and as such, kings do not have equals in which to share commonalities: “ansí que semejante amistad sería en gran manera desigual, porque los Reyes y Príncipes no se dignarían admitir a tan estrecha conversación a los que son en tanto grado más baxos que ellos” (Patrizi 343). Martir Rizo also illustrates that equality is at the heart of friendship and concludes in his 1626 treatise *Norte de príncipes* that “no pueden los principes crecer de amigos, porque la maquina del gobierno está fundada sobre la reputación, y el principe aunque obre bien, ignora la suya” (Rizo 74). If the monarch absolutely insists on maintaining friendships, Rizo suggests that they possess their own enormous fortunes so at least they can be somewhat equal to the king, even if only financially (74).

The most adamant protests came from Jeronimo Zaballos, who warns that friendship with a king is not only impossible, but also extremely dangerous to anyone who makes an attempt. He writes in his 1626 treatise *Arte real*, for instance, that “los Reyes tienen la calidad del fuego, que los que andan un poco desviados de él, se calientan, pero los que se acercan se queman, como hazen las mariposas por llegarse tan cerca a la luz de la candela” (69). Antonio Feros explains that as the early modern definition of friendship held equality at its core, almost all writers argued that the king’s “unequaled” station precluded friends. Feros writes:

...royal favorites were seldom depicted as the king’s friends in sixteenth century Spain. The concepts of friendship and kingship seemed mutually incompatible. Classical and early modern writers alike believed that only individuals of similar status and qualities could establish friendships, an impossibility for a monarch and one of his subjects. Under the logic of friendship, a king would be obliged to share with his subject not only his feelings and ideas but also his powers and royal sovereignty. (Feros 122)

While this attitude abounded in the sixteenth century, writers like Rizo and Zaballos propagated the idea that the king should not view a *privado* as a friend well into the seventeenth century.

Not all theorists followed this line of logic. In 1609, for instance, Pedro Maldonado's pamphlet *Perfecto privado* countered the "unequaled" king idea and suggested that a monarch should have a personal confidant, or "amigo particular" with whom he could share the tremendous emotional burdens of ruling his kingdom (3). Whereas other writers used the classical notion of friendship to claim that royal authority is diluted if a king shares confidence and feelings with another person, Maldonado turns this argument around and insists that anyone designated as the king's "friend", and therefore equal, would not share his power but merely reflect it. He also normalizes the position, claiming that every king since antiquity has depended on a personal friend and confidant, and Philip III is no different from any other ruler in history. He writes, "concluyo con que nunca al pueblo de Dios le fue bien sino quando su Principe tenía un buen privado, Jaraon un Josef, Asuero un Mardoqueo, Baltasar un Daniel, y Saul un Samuel" (5). As the Duke of Lerma's personal confessor, Maldonado would certainly have had motive to help legitimize his employer's power in Philip III's court. Not surprisingly, Lerma instituted the "friendship" language provided by Maldonado's treatise to help define his position. Feros explains this strategy, writing that "if the favorite was the king's friend, then the king was in no danger of diffusing royal power and prerogatives because the *valido* was his other self, the clone of the king himself" (123). As indicated above, however, writers continued to argue that the monarch should not consider anyone a personal friend or equal even as late as the 1630s.

Lope inserts himself into this debate in *Inocente sangre* when Fernando continuously refers to Benavides with terms of love and friendship, calling him "mi alegría," "mi esperanza," (*Inocente* 356) and his "más querido privado" (354). The favoritism extends beyond mere words.

As a celebratory gesture for defeating his usurping uncle, for example, Fernando regales Gomez with the best land in Spain, as the *privado* later boasts, “de la encomienda mayor / que hoy me dio el Rey de Castilla” (356). Even the villagers are aware that Fernando favors Gomez above all his other servants. During a public appearance, a townswoman recognizes the favorite and identifies him as the king’s “Gomez de Benavides / su más querido y privado” (354).

While these epithets by themselves may not be excessive, Fernando’s emotional dependence becomes unhealthy when, after Gomez is murdered, he becomes increasingly obsessed with his *privado* and unable to control his own emotions, even to the point of not functioning as a ruler. When Gomez is discovered lying stabbed on the street, the king rushes to his side and delivers an emotional outburst, “Espire mi alegría, mi esperanza / ¡Ah Gomez! ¡Ah Benavides! / Llevadle a su casa. ¡Ah cielo! (356), and “¡Ay Gomez de Benavides” (357). Even after Gomez is gone, Fernando continues fawning over him with even more excessive language, and in one instance he speaks directly to his dead friend, exclaiming, “para mi en el cielo estás / Gomez; más presto verás / que fui tu Rey y tu amigo” (360-61). Indeed, Gomez’s physical absence does not stop Fernando from continuing to declare his loyalty and friendship as if his favorite were present.

Eventually, the king’s emotional outbursts and sulking behaviors catches the attention of two of his servants, García and Ramiro. After the king declares that he is too distraught to remain in Palencia, the two servants exchange observations on how the king is behaving emotionally:

Don García: ¡Notable sentimiento el Rey ha hecho

Por Benavides!

Don Ramiro: Él lo merecía

Por las virtudes de su heroico pecho

Don García: Con extraña y mortal melancolía

Vino desde Palencia a Salamanca.

Don Ramiro: Tiernamente le amaba, don García. (357)

Ramiro and García attribute the king's strange behavior to grief, and their choice of emotional words such as "sentimiento", "mortal melancolia," and "tiernamente" testify to the Fernando's abandonment of prudence and *ratio* as his primary attributes. Moreover, the servants' observation that Fernando's behavior is "extraña" indicates that his emotional reaction to Benavides is not dismissed as normal grief.

Later, the king decides to spend a period of mourning in Salamanca and plans to attend a ceremony honoring his late father, King Sancho. While at a reception hosted by the Count of Benavente, the local noble, the king overhears Garcia and Ramiro speculating that the Carvajal brothers may have been Gomez's murderers. For the emotionally compromised Fernando, this is all the proof he needs and he immediately begins planning the Carvajals' death sentences. Benavente, however, is horrified by Fernando's eagerness to issue execution orders with no evidence, and warns the king that a serious miscarriage of justice may occur unless he acts with prudence. In a striking conversation, Benavente continually attempts to urge the king to proceed with caution and to make justice his primary goal. He raises questions about the lack of evidence, and insists that the Carvajals had no motive. However, the king succumbs to another emotional tirade. He ignores the count's warnings and instead appeals to his emotional need for vengeance:

Rey: Pues ¿cómo dieran testigos,

y dos caballeros tales?

Conde: Nunca los Carvajales

fueron, Señor, enemigos de Gomez de Benavides.

Rey: ¿No bastaba amarle yo?

Invidia los obligó.

¿Qué más ocasión le pides?

Conde: Bien dices, sólo sería

la invidia....

Conde: Triste está tu Majestad.

Rey: Vive Dios, bárbaros fieros,

Qué ha de ser ejemplo del mundo

vuestro castigo!

Conde: Señor,

no dés lugar al rigor.

Rey: Ya en la justicia me fundo.

Conde: Es verdad; más para hacerla

Disimula, y no prendas

Hasta que ser cierto entiendas.

Rey: Todo el amor lo atropella.

Quise a Benavides bien;

Hoy su muerte se prueba,

El dolor se me renueva,

Y la venganza bien.

Conde: Créeme, que es menester

Ir con tiento, gran Señor.

Rey: Si me da lugar amor

para templar el poder;
 que si no. Terrible furia,
 Carvajales traidores,
 Os amenaza!

Conde: Son los daños de la injuria;

Pero eso importa al castigo. (361)

This exchange marks the turning point for Fernando when his emotional dependence on his *privado* turns to rage directed at the Carvajals. His incessant rejection of the Count's call for justice and prudence also makes him a tyrant, which, as we have seen earlier in this chapter, was defined by both classical and medieval writers as a king who cannot control his impulses.

Fernando's rage is uncontrollable, and he directs his ire at servants, first to the Carvajals, and then to Ramiro and García because he believes they concealed the brothers' involvement in Gomez's murder. All the while, the Count of Benavente continues attempting to persuade the king to use reason and prudence, and to not let his anger cause injustice. However, the king continues his tirades, exclaiming:

Que aspereza, qué furia, qué desdenes
 vistas en mi? Si cuando entre robles
 de Arlanza desnudastes el acero
 Contra vuestro señor y rey primero,
 Yo os hiciera poner entre sus ramas
 colgados de los cuellos en dos sogas... (362)

Similar to Fernando's previous conversation with the count, highly charged and emotional language permeates his speech, including "triste," "dolor," "furia," "desden," "aspereza," etc.

The Count notices this, and tries to direct the king's attention to his emotional state and continually implores the king over and over to temper his rage.

To highlight the monarch's emotional state even more, Lope introduces two other characters who, at the last minute, beseech the king to see reason. In one scene, Sandoval explains to the king that he is blinded by love for his departed *privado*, exclaiming:

te ruego
 que no procedas tan ciego,
 supuesto que hayas querido
 a Gomez de Benavides
 más que un vasallo, señor (369)

If one were not convening enough, Alvaro, a second nobleman, warns the king that he is not thinking clearly due to his grief over Gomez, attributing his lapse of judgment to ire:

yo sé
 que te lleva y mueve a ira
 de Gomez el gran amor,
 porque puede ser, Señor,
 esta sospecha mentira (369)

Here, Lope also gives his audience a glimpse of the cruel Fernando from the familiar *romancero* traditions. Instead of presenting him as an archetypal tyrant, however, the Castilian king's enraged and unfounded call for violence against the Carvajals is juxtaposed against his equally impassioned commitment to justice at the beginning of the play. As his conversation with the Count illustrates, Lope attributes this dramatic shift from magnanimous king to villain to an excessive dependence on his *privado* that leaves the monarch emotionally unstable and unable to

function. Indeed, he is so focused on vengeance that he does not even respond to the Count's questions, and instead repeats over and over he will make the brothers pay. Ironically, the enraged king does not realize that the execution will serve as an "ejemplo del mundo" of his own cruelty.

La Peña de Martos

One of the primary dangers of *privanza*, as many seventeenth-century Spanish political theorists emphasize, is that history suggests that kings are prone to murdering their *privados* at the slightest provocation. The most cited example was disseminated by Boccaccio, whose hagiographic *De casibus virorum illustrium* was widely read in throughout Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In Book IV, Boccaccio describes Callisthenes, a student of Aristotle, as a faithful and devoted servant to Alexander the Great. While debating the nature of divinity with Alexander one day, the philosopher suggested that kings should not place themselves as equal to the gods. Interpreting the harmless remark as a personal insult, Alexander suddenly and without warning brutalized his servant and ordered him to be tortured and executed. Boccaccio records the horrific event:

At last Alexander succumbed to the anger that was habitual with him, and resolved to punish the innocent man severely. He charged this man [...] of conspiring against him with many others. By Alexander's orders, this teacher of the king, robed according to his office, was led as an object of ridicule into the presence of the army. (119)

Following Plato and Aquinas's definition of a tyrant – a monarch who is governed by passions – Boccaccio accuses Alexander of being a "monster", whose "insanity" was insatiable (119-20). Boccaccio continues, claiming that "these horrors did not yet satisfy the madness of the

emperor,” and that the tyrant then decreed his former favorite locked in a cave with a ravenous dog (119-20).⁵

Boccaccio’s vivid account of Callisthene’s fate branded Alexander as a brutal tyrant, a reputation that appears in many medieval and early modern descriptions of the Macedonian conqueror. In fact, Pedro Maldonado cites Alexander in his 1609 treatise as a warning to *privados* seeking a monarchs’ favor, and he offers a second example of how Alexander randomly stabbed yet another favorite, Clito, after a fit of rage. The writer records that “[Alejandro] atraviesa con una lanza el Corazon de ... su mayor Privado” (25). Despite Alexander’s reputation as erratic, however, Maldonado warns any prince is capable of unpredictability. Indeed, he references a third example in which the Byzantine Emperor Justinian turned on his favorite general and advisor when he “Sacó los ojos a su querido Belisario” (25).

While not as graphic as Boccaccio or Maldonado, Jerónimo Zavallos is no less dramatic when he presents example after example of kings turning against their *privados*. Not only is it possible for any *privado* to die, he writes in *Arte real*, the *privado*’s death is almost inevitable given history’s numerous examples:

⁵ Plutarch recounts Alexander and Callisthenes’s relationship in much more detail in *Lives of the Illustrious Men*, but he is skeptical of exaggerated stories concerning Callisthenes’s execution, even suggesting that the favorite may have died of old age in prison (Plutarch 746). Boccaccio, on the other hand, describes Alexander as the vicious torturer and murderer of his former tutor. It is this version that became accepted as fact in the middle ages and the early modern period, causing Alexander’s reputation as a tyrant.

Traigase a la memoria el suceso del Secretario Pedro de las Viñas, que fue gran privado del Emperador Frederico Segundo, el cual le mandó sacar los ojos, y entregarlo a sus enemigos. También Eugelidis fue gran privado del Rey Ptolomeo, y porque le vio hablar con una su amiga, le mandó ahorcar a su puerta. Y Plauciano lo fue del Emperador Severo, y porque entró con armas secretas en su aposento le mandó cortar su cabeza. Lo mismo hizo el Emperador Conmodo ... Y Alcamanes Rey de los Griegos mandó ahorcar a Panonio su criado, porque jugando a la pelota le contradixo una chaça. Esto mismo hizo el Emperador Constancio con su privado Ortense, que porque le dio a firmar unas provisiones con una pluma mal cortada, y tinta que no señalaba, le mandó a cortar la cabeza. Y lo mismo hizo Alexandro Magno con su querido Cratero. Y Pirro con su secretario. El Emperador Diocleciano con Apatribo. Y Diaguemo con Panfilo. Lo mismo sucedió a Pedro Bronca, gran privado del Rey Felipo... Y lo mismo a Luis de Luzeña, Condestable de aquel reino, al cual Ludoucio onzeno mandó a cortar la cabeça. (69)

The surprising number of Zavallos's illustrations do not stop, and he goes on even further to list the more recent cases in which kings and queens victimized their *privados*, including Pedro IV of Aragon and his *privado* Bernardo de Cabrera, Queen Juana of Naples and her advisor Juan Caraciolo, Henry VIII and both of his favorites, Cardinal Woolsey and Thomas Cromwell, and of course, Juan II of Castile and Alvaro de Luna, the most famous example of disastrous *privanza*. Zavallos's repetitive refrain "lo mismo hizo," which he repeats nearly a dozen times, ominously implies that any king-*privado* relationship is doomed to the same violent fate. Certainly, Zavallos was not suggesting that Philip IV could be provoked into a murderous

rampage if someone handed him a dull pen, or if a *privado* beat him in a game of chess, but the sheer number of examples of such occurrences throughout history provide a dramatic warning to anyone hoping to gain the king's favor.

In *Inocente sangre*, several characters associate Fernando with Alexander's homicidal rages, referring to the monarch on several occasions as "otro Alejandro," once by his servant Ramiro and again by the *gracioso* Morata. Although these characters are trying to shower the king with compliments, their unwitting comparisons also evoke Alexander's infamy as a *privado* murderer. In another incident, Morata flatters Fernando by comparing him to great historical conquerors, but the lackey ends by exclaiming that Fernando is "más que Pirro y que Alejandro" (374). Pyrrhus and Alexander, of course, are included in Zavallo's treatise as examples of notorious rulers who murder their favorites.

The Carvajals, on the other hand, are always referred to as noble, brave, and virtuous. Similar to Zavallos's long list of unfortunate favorites, the *Inocente sangre* holds that the brothers are undeserving of their terrible fate, calling them in the prologue "ilustres hermanos" with "virtudes heróicas y clarísima sangre" (349). In the play, they are continuously lauded for their bravery and are dubbed at one point "Cides" by Gomez (350). Even faced with the brutal king, the brothers never break their loyalty, only insisting that the otherwise just and magnanimous king must have been misled. When about to be thrown off the cliff, for example, Pedro does not blame the king, but instead claims Fernando was misinformed by bad advisors:

El rey es mancebo tierno,
y aunque justísimo y santo,
Pudo engañarse; que es hombre.
Ay de quien hizo el engaño! (370)

When juxtaposed against the brother's innocence and bravery, the king's willingness to permit injustice to satiate his ire becomes even clearer.

As we have seen from the examples in *Fuenteovejuna* and *El major alcalde, el rey*, Lope frequently places the Spanish monarch as the ultimate source of justice and rigorous defender of the law. When Fernando loses control of his faculties and succumbs to rage, he destroys his ability to administer his primary function as king, and in doing so, opens the door for injustices and abuse. The Count recognizes this after Juan and Pedro were thrown off the rocky cliff to their deaths, declaring, "si agravia el Rey la justicia / ¿Quien habrá que la defienda?" (367). Fernando, however, is not a typical tyrant, and as we have seen, actually begins the play with a strong commitment to justice.

In one of the most important monologues in the play, the king explains his obsession with vengeance and admits that he reacts so violently because he loved his *privado* Gomez de Benavides:

Cuantas veces, Conde amigo,
 Los Carvajales veo,
 Más la venganza deseo,
 Si lo es justo castigo
 Basta el odio por testigo
 De quien son los que le han muerto
 A Gomez; pues es tan cierto
 Que en viendoles se me altera
 La sangre, como si fuera
 En las heridas del muerto,

Causa aqueste efecto en mi
 Que Gomez era mi amigo,
 Y como vive conmigo,
 Siento lo que hiciera en si” (367)

In some regards, this monologue represents a moment of clarity in which Fernando recognizes that he is acting irrationally, even admitting he wants to kill the Carvajals because looking at them causes him pain. He also describes his closeness with Gómez, claiming that they were so close that he can physically feel his unfortunate *privado*'s wounds. Nevertheless, Fernando resolves to ignore justice and instead orders the brothers to be thrown off the cliff.

Following the *romancero* tradition, Lope ends the play with the Carvajals appealing directly to God for justice. Rather than simply ending the play with the king's mysterious death, however, *Inocente sangre* concludes by openly criticizing the king for his injustice. In the last scene of the play, Fernando falls into a trance and hears an unidentified “voz” which warns that kings are bound by duty to seek justice:

Los que en la tierra juzgais,
 Mirad que los inocentes
 Están a cargo de Dios,
 Que siempre por ellos vuelve.
 No os ciegue passion ni amor,
 Jurad juridicamente ;
 Que quien castiga sin culpa,
 A Dios la piedad ofende. (371)

Following medieval definitions of a tyrant, the voice accuses Fernando of becoming blinded by passions. Rather than limiting passions to the negative emotions such as anger, however, the voice also warns that “amor” can impede a king’s ability to administer justice.

Inocente sangre concludes by linking Fernando’s metaphoric blindness and tyranny to his uncontrolled passions. While the *romancero* tradition also does this, the oral ballads do not explain why Fernando murders the Carvajals. To explain his digression in to rage, Lope adds the king’s favorite, Gomez de Benavides, as a major character in the play and pivots the entire plot around the *privado*’s death. Indeed, Lope’s addition to the already famous legend changes the focus of Fernando’s cruelty and causes the audience to view *privanza*, or rather the abuse of it, as the cause of the king’s rage. In the dramatic version, Lope simultaneously appeals to the audience’s previous conception of Fernando as cruel, but his addition of Gomez into the plot invites the audience to link the king’s erratic behaviors to an abuse of *privanza*.

Whereas the Fernando in the oral traditions was simply accepted as a vicious tyrant, Lope’s dramatic king is driven to cruelty by extreme grief over his *privado*’s murder. This allows the playwright to provide a two-fold warning. First, Lope attributes Fernando’s injustice to becoming emotionally compromised when he allows himself to become too attached to his *privado*. Second, Lope follows Zavallos’s lead and warns that the random victimization of innocent *privados* at the hand of the monarch can happen at any moment and without warning. When the king and all three of his favorites are dead at the end of the play, the audience could not help but view *privanza* as an extremely dangerous institution.

Indeed, the Christian Prince model espoused by many political writers held that a monarch’s external ability to administer justice in his kingdom emanates from internal virtue and piety. Fernando attempts to adhere to justice in the first act of the play when he pardons his

treacherous uncle and tries to minimize casualties suffered by his uncle's armies. However, he disregards political wisdom stating that a king cannot reduce himself to another person's level, and instead he embraces his Gomez as an equal. In doing so, he relinquishes his *voluntad* to his *privado*, and is literally unable to cope when Gomez dies. Lope shows that in Fernando's case, excessive emotional attachment to a *privado* causes the king to lose control of his autonomy and become subject to whims of rage.

CHAPTER 3

ECLIPSED AUTONOMY IN ANTONIO MIRA DE AMESCUA'S

ALVARO DE LUNA PLAYS

*Los que priváis con los reyes,
notad bien la historia mía,
cantad que a la fin se engaña
el hombre que en hombres fía.*
Mira, *Adversa fortuna* 3. 2361-4

Perhaps because of Alvaro de Luna's name, the celestial movements became major analogies with which chroniclers and poets described the *privado*'s spectacular rise and fall in the fifteenth-century Castilian court of Juan II. Continuing this long literary tradition of conceptualizing Luna as a waxing and waning moon, Antonio Mira de Amescua employs eclipse references throughout the *Próspera fortuna* and *Adversa fortuna de don Álvaro de Luna* (c. 1623). Mira's choice of Luna as the title character also evokes strong historical associations with the famous medieval *privado*'s reputation as usurper of royal authority, whose supposed diabolical powers enslaved Juan II for almost his entire reign. The fifteenth-century chronicler Carrillo de Huete best captures the court's fear of Luna, the Condestable de Castilla, when he reports that the grandees penned a secret letter to Juan II warning him of his enslavement:

...el dicho [Alvaro de Luna] tiene ligadas e atadas todas vuestras potencias corporals e animals por mágicas diabólicas encantaciones, para que vuestra señoría non faga sino lo que él quisiere, ni vuestra memoria rremienbre, ni vuestro

etendimiento entienda, ni vuestra voluntad ame, ni vuestra voluntad fable, salvo lo que él quiera e le plazze. (Carrillo de Huete 332)⁶

In the letter, the nobles claim that the Condestable controls Juan's *voluntad* to such an extent that he is utterly at the mercy of Luna's control. Moreover, they claim that Luna somehow even controls the king's memory so that he is unaware that his every action caters to Luna's whims.

While these allegations were certainly used as political weapons by Luna's enemies, the most noted chroniclers of the time participated in branding Luna as a magician who bewitched the king. Alfonso de Palencia records in *Cronica de Enrique IV* for example, that "Juan ya desde su más tierna edad se había entregado en manos de D. Álvaro de Luna, no sin sospecha de algún trato indecoroso y de lascivas complacencias por parte del Privado en su familiaridad con el Rey" and speculates that the *privado* derives his power from "artes mágicas" (Palencia 9). Similarly, Pérez de Guzmán, another fifteenth-century chronicler, writes in *Generaciones y semblanzas* that Luna possessed knowledge of "arte e malizia de fechizos" which he used to subdue Juan into total "obediencia" (Pérez de Guzmán 127). To be sure, Luna was not universally maligned, and there are several chroniclers, most notably Chacón's *Crónica de Alvaro de Luna*, which defend him as a loyal servant. However, Nicholas Round maintains that the more forgiving histories were not widely circulated and perhaps were even unavailable to most sixteenth-century readers (Round 217). Early modern writers digging for source information about Luna, therefore, had to rely on the more accessible – albeit wildly scandalous – versions of the Condestable transmitted by Palencia, Guzmán, and Huete.

⁶ Mira references this letter in *Adversa fortuna* when Juan reads a "carta" from the court denouncing Luna which is signed by, among others, the Marquee of Santillana (3. 2173-5)

Relying on Luna's reputation as a usurper, Mira de Amescua's *Prospera* and *Adversa fortuna* debate the interaction between bondage and free will and explore how *privanza* engages the emerging early modern concept of autonomy. At first glance, Alvaro de Luna is locked into a predetermined Wheel of Fortune that destines him to fall into ruin after his spectacular rise to power. Similarly, Luna's historical reputation even in seventeenth-century Spain was that of a master manipulator who controlled Juan II, raising questions as to the nature of free will as it relates to the king's ability – or not – to resist Luna's influence. The purpose of this chapter is to rethink the eclipse analogies in the *Prospera* and *Adversa fortuna* in a political context, both as a dramatic structure and as the pervasive motif with which Mira de Amescua frames his poetics.

To consider how the plays manipulate established imagery in response to new concerns regarding *privanza* that emerged in the early seventeenth century, it is important to view the solar / lunar analogy in two contexts: first within rhetorical strategies used by seventeenth-century writers to describe contemporary *privados*, and second, in relation to both medieval and seventeenth-century fears that a malevolent "advisor" could gain control of the monarch. When examined in conjunction, it becomes clear that Mira de Amescua deviates from standard *privanza* analogies and creates a modified eclipse analogy that suggests that King Juan's autonomy is so damaged by Alvaro de Luna that the monarchy is not able to fully recover. While Lope warns, as we saw in the last chapter, that excessive friendship with a *privado* can lead to tyranny, Mira takes a much more subjective approach and presents a king so dependant on his favorite that he loses his very identity.

Of the very few studies that exist on Mira's two plays, most defer to Raymond McCurdy's arguments that the two-part *comedia* is a rare example of early modern Spanish tragedy, and as such, the eclipse motif compliments the play's "structural principle analogous in

function to the Wheel of Fortune” (112). McCurdy bases his premise on Bernardo Gicovate’s observations that when viewed as a singular work, the *Próspera* and *Adversa fortuna* illustrate “the full circle of the *privado*’s rise and fall [and] becomes a perfect example of Aristotelian tragedy” (335). In other words, Luna’s rise and fall in the play is an exercise in Aristotelian tragic structures and is not necessarily concerned with *privanza* as a political institution. This interpretation explains, as many critics have noted, why Mira, on the surface, ignores Luna’s historic reputation as a manipulative usurper in order to present the *privado* as a convincing tragic hero. McCurdy also assumes that Luna is the central figure in the two plays, with the cyclical structure mirroring his rise and fall. King Juan, on the other hand, does not take a central role in the Wheel of Fortune theme because of his unmovable status as king. Reflecting the notions of many seventeenth-century political theorists, the monarch is viewed as an immutable *sol* that could either illuminate or burn his *privados* depending on how high they attempt to rise (Pérez 66; Portocarrero 265; Zeballos, 68, 69). Because of Mira’s dependence on established *sol* / *sombra* analogies and adherence to a Wheel of Fortune-inspired structure, one would also expect that Luna’s death in the play would also result in Juan’s full restoration to power. As I hope to show, however, Mira undermines this very structure and does not allow Juan to return to glory, and in a surprising deviation from the eclipse motif, the monarch is only further weakened by his favorite’s absence from court.

However, McCurdy’s reading of the two plays as an exercise in tragedy, especially concerning Luna’s fated fall, does not consider Mira’s philosophical stance that a person’s autonomy, or ability to freely exercise *voluntad*, is not compatible with a fatalistic interpretation of Fortune. Indeed, scholars have attributed Mira’s interest in free will to his admiration of sixteenth-century theologian Luis de Molina, who in 1588 published the *Concordia liberi arbitrii*

cum gratiae donis, an influential treatise which defends the concept of human autonomy as it relates to divine providence. Taking a Jesuit position, Molina maintains that self autonomy is defined by “indifference,” or rather, the freedom to resist any influence, including God’s will (Molina 256). In this view, God showers his grace on individuals to encourage them toward a specific course of action, but ultimately the choice to comply or to refuse remains with the person. In other words, “man retains the power to dissent,” to quote Henry Sullivan (33). Second, Molina insisted that God’s knowledge is described as *scientia media*, which, in Alistair McGrath’s definition “relates to the hypothetical and the contingent – which includes the decisions of an individual free will under a given set of circumstances” (352). In other words, God sees infinite hypothetical situations and is able to discern a person’s future path based on the totality of their circumstances. Yet because this foreknowledge remains a hypothetical, a person still retains the ability of “indifference” and can continuously choose any options among the choices presented to him or her. While Molina’s theology caused a heated debate among Spanish theologians, many counterreformation advocates found the ideas a convincing rebuttal against Calvinist arguments in favor of predestination. The debate also became a popular theme for playwrights Mira de Amescua, Tirso de Molina, and Calderón de la Barca, whose themes of autonomy and destiny pull heavily from the Jesuit priest’s ideas (Lozano Alonso 628).

Mira’s clearest dramatization of this doctrine is his most famous work, *El esclavo del demonio*, which explores the concepts of predestination, bondage, and autonomy when the protagonist Gil sells his soul to the Devil. In the religious play, Gil determines that predestination makes resisting temptation pointless. He reasons that if he is among God’s elect, then no action can keep him out of heaven. If, on the other hand, he is not predestined for an eternal reward, then it makes no sense to deny himself earthly pleasures. Gil concludes that this logical paradox

gives him license to pursue a life of carnal gratification. After he succumbs to his lusts, the mysterious character Angelio appears to Gil and offers to teach him necromancy to aid in his pursuit of sin. In exchange, Gil signs a contract in blood promising his soul. Gil quickly learns, however, that chasing lust is not liberating and when he discovers that Angelio is actually the Devil, he reneges the contract and instead devotes his life to spiritual piety and to the Church.

Throughout *El esclavo del demonio*, Gil claims that he is a slave to his passions when he continually reminds anyone who will listen that he is a murderer, rapist, and necromancer. When other characters try to convince him to repent of his wickedness, he replies that he cannot because he is enslaved to the Devil and to his binding contract. Notwithstanding Gil's claims however, Mira's Molinist theology becomes evident when Gil's condition as a "slave" is revealed to be an illusion – just as he freely rejects God's offers of salvation in the first act, he later cancels his signed contract with the Devil simply by changing his mind. When he prays to God "borrad aquella escritura," the contract is nullified (Mira 3. 2905). Any state of spiritual or emotional bondage, therefore, is self-inflicted since Mira de Amescua (per Luis de Molina) held that any individual is "indifferent" to all external influences.

Describing Molina's view on the totality of autonomy, the twentieth-century philosopher Frank Costello summarizes the Jesuit's theology as "liberty is ours, so indisputably ours, with the help of God's gifts, it lies within our power to avoid all mortal sin" (231). Despite *El esclavo del demonio*'s pervasive language denoting bondage, Mira shows that Gil's actions were always under his own control and any perception of a predetermined fate was an illusion. While Mira frames *El esclavo del demonio* as a religious lesson that debunks the Calvinist concept of predestination, this same theme will take on a political importance in *Próspera* and *Adversa fortuna*. Specifically, Philip III's dependence on his *privado* Lerma (the first favorite in Spain to

rule publically since Luna) brought new concerns over the king's *voluntad* and his ability to resist manipulation. This fear came to the forefront in 1621 when Rodrigo Calderón, Lerma's secretary, was charged and executed for corruption and murder. His proximity to the Spanish monarch, as well as allegations that he used magic to bewitch the king, introduced a new interest in Alvaro de Luna and renewed debates about *privanza*, monarchy, and autonomy.

Furthermore, most political writers in the seventeenth century utilized Luna as the archetypal *privado*. His rapid and violent fall from favor, as well as the examples of countless of other favorites thought history, provided theorists with what seemed to be an inevitable pattern, and almost every seventeenth-century treatise on *privanza* predicts the favorite's disastrous end. Even Pedro Maldonado's 1609 defense of *privanza* warns "la fortuna es rueda, lo alto es lo prospero, lo bajo es lo adverso [pero] solo Dios es immutable, y assi solo lo que es el estriba no está sujeta a mudanza" (Maldonado 25). The Wheel of Fortune describes a person's changing prosperities and hardships and was not necessarily implying a fatalistic conclusion. As we saw in the last chapter, however, early modern political theorists routinely infused a sense of inevitability and Fate to their language when they warned that every favorite is destined to fall violently. Of course, this interpretation of a predetermined outcome contradicts Mira de Amescua's philosophy of "indifference."

In *Próspera fortuna* and *Adversa fortuna de Alvaro de Luna*, Mira tests the standard seventeenth-century *privanza* analogies against an emerging early modern awareness of individual autonomy. Because the historic Alvaro de Luna was reported to have complete dominion over Juan II's *voluntad*, Mira's dramatic version of the Condestable becomes a perfect outlet to test his Molinist notions of a person's ability to resist influence. Similarly, Luna's

position as the archetypal *privado* who is destined to die raises questions about a person's ability to overcome fate.

Ensnaring the Monarch

Critics and historians contest the actual composition dates of the two plays. However, Sánchez-Arce has identified a 1623 contract in which a Madrid theater company agreed to purchase the rights to “dos comedias nuevas de Mira de Amescua” (Sánchez-Arce 15). While the titles of the plays are not specifically mentioned, the contract proposes a specific actor for the role of Garcia, suggesting that they are in fact the Alvaro de Luna *comedias*. In addition, the Inquisition approved *Adversa fortuna* in October of 1624 and indicated that it is ready to “salir al teatro” (ctd. in Sánchez-Arce 152). With these two pieces of information, Sánchez-Arce places the composition date to 1623 and, by tracing the known whereabouts of the theater troop, deduces that the plays would have been performed in Madrid in 1624 (15).

The timing of Mira's dramatic two-part play, therefore, suggest that spectators were meant to envision the parallel fate of Rodrigo Calderón, the Marquee of Siete Iglesias, who was accused of bewitching Philip III and his family. As a member of the Duke of Lerma's inner circle, Calderón had enjoyed a lofty office in the court of Philip III until a series of corruption charges resulted in his arrest and public execution. His demise began in 1611 when the secretary was overheard speaking ill of Philip III's wife, Queen Margaret of Austria. A scandalous feud ensued between the queen and the secretary, and Margaret eventually banned Calderón's son from entering court, thereby restricting his ability to interact with Prince Philip IV (Martínez Hernández 139, 40). When the Queen died in childbirth a short time later, Calderón's enemies blamed him for her untimely death. Armed with rumors of the queen's murder, as well as growing evidence of Calderón's blatant corruption, the newly empowered Duke of Olivares and

his allies found useful pawn in their quest to discredit Lerma. While Olivares had previously supported Calderón prior to his 1618 arrest, the rising new favorite set out to destroy the secretary's reputation (and by extension, Lerma), by painting him as a seventeenth-century Alvaro de Luna.⁷ In fact, Olivares himself strategically publicized Calderón's trial to persuade the court to ban Lerma from Madrid, thereby keeping the former favorite from reasserting himself into prince Philip IV's household (Elliott 41). Moreover, Olivares seemed to have carefully orchestrated historical parallels between the secretary and Luna. For example, Olivares arranged for Calderón to be arrested in Valladolid, the site of Luna's execution, and even had him incarcerated in Alvaro de Luna's actual former residence to await transfer to a prison in Madrid (Martínez-Hernández 46).

Mirroring the medieval chronicler Alfonso de Palencia's claims that Luna controlled Juan II through unnatural means, the secretary was accused of bewitching Philip III. One seventeenth-

⁷ Mira de Amescua was no bystander to Lerma's last effort to maintain his power in court.

Indeed, Lerma commissioned Mira to write a play commemorating the expulsion of the Moriscos to be performed in the presence of Philip III at a festival hosted by the ducal palace of Lerma in 1617. The entire festival, Marchete-Aragón argues, was strategically designed to keep the *privado* in the king's favor, especially during this time in which Lerma's political future was being undermined by Olivares and his uncle Baltázar de Zuñiga (Marchante-Aragón 99). While the actual play is now lost, Marchete-Aragón extrapolates from eyewitnesses that Mira's nationalistic themes were specifically commissioned by Lerma to present himself "as the pillar on which the preservation of national ethnic purity and defense of the Hapsburg imperial project rested" (99).

century chronicler, for example, charges Calderón with “haber dado hechizos, y con ellos haber procurado atraer así las voluntades de nuestro monarca y otras personas” (Almansa y Mendoza 135). Moreover, rumors circulated that he had also used magic to murder Queen Margaret several years earlier, recalling Alonso de Palencia’s accusation in *Chronica de Enrique IV* that Luna had murdered both Queen María of Castile and her sister Queen Isabel of Portugal, and when his property was confiscated after his arrest, Julio Caro Baroja reports that guards discovered a huge collection of magical spell books, strange objects such as unidentifiable animal claws, jars full of blood, and even hair clippings that were assumed to belong to Philip IV and his sister, Princess Ana (99). After a priest was summoned to confirm the demonic nature of the artifacts, they concluded that Calderón was attempting to bewitch the next royal family just as he had done to Philip III and Margaret (Caro Barroja 99). Like his fourteenth-century counterpart Alvaro de Luna, Calderón gained a reputation as a usurping sorcerer whose supernatural powers allowed him to control the king of Spain.

The criminal charges were equally scandalous. The ill-fated secretary was accused of murdering both Queen Margaret and Luis de Aliaga, Philip III’s personal confessor, among many others, by poison and witchcraft. Calderón’s notoriety increased when he was blamed for trying to poison the court investigator, Agustín de Ávila, from his prison cell (Almanza y Mendoza 135). As many historians attest, the charges of witchcraft were hype and eventually dismissed at his trial (Feros 257). Nevertheless, the bizarre nature of the allegations caught the public’s imagination and by 1621, Lerma’s secretary had grown so famous that one eyewitness speculates that his execution attracted the largest number of spectators at any event in Spain since the conquest of Granada in 1492 (*Relación de la adversa fortuna* 150). Another attendee reports immense crowds hoping to glimpse the doomed *privado* and his execution packed the

entire Plaza Mayor and all of its surrounding streets (*Relación...de la sentencia* 155).

Similar to his arrest, the secretary's execution was no less theatrical. Having been in prison for almost 4 years, Calderón had not been allowed to shave or cut his hair, and onlookers marveled at his disheveled appearance. His demise was also exceptionally gruesome. Unlike most executions of the time, his death was prolonged for several seconds while his face was in plain view of spectators, and accounts testify that Calderón's throat was slit while he was sitting upright in a chair facing the crowds. One ballad composed after the event captures the details of the horrific event:

Llegaron a la gran Plaza,
 donde el verdugo le espera,
 con dos agudos cuchillos,
 para cumplir la sentencia.
 Subió Rodrigo al tablado,
 Y en la Silla que está hacha
 Se sintió, y los Religiosos
 Hymnos, y Psalmos le rezan.
 Degollóle el Verdugo,
 Pero no tan mal le degüella,
 Que el cuerpo está agonizando,
 Pasando terribles penas.
 Segunda y tercera vez
 Al cuello el cuchillo entrega,
 Y allí se oyeron gemidos

De las ventanas y rejas. (Pérez Gómez 94)

In a last act of humiliation after his throat was slit, guards striped the secretary's corpse naked in front of the crowds of onlookers. When the fallen favorite was finally buried in a Valladolid cemetery designated for criminals, Francisco Quevedo commented in *Grandes anales de quince días* that even though Calderón and Luna held nothing in common except their falls from royal favor, public opinion had nevertheless branded Lerma's secretary as a seventeenth-century Alvaro de Luna (Quevedo 754). The public spectacle of Rodrigo Calderón's trial, especially regarding sorcery, testifies to a profound anxiety in seventeenth-century Spain that the kings could fall under the control of a sinister advisor.

Celestial cycles

Because of the egregious charges levied against Calderón, Olivares naturally assumed the crowds would have cheered his execution, thereby symbolizing Lerma's complete loss of power. Curiously, however, the execution sparked a different reaction altogether, and writers and poets penned somber tributes to Calderón's dignified acceptance of his fate. Almost immediately after the execution, Madrid's literary circles shifted public perceptions of Calderón and eulogized the fallen secretary as a tragic victim. One somber *lira* attributed to Lope de Vega, for example, details Calderón's noble attempt to mutter "Jesús" at the moment of his death, implying that the repentant secretary was undeserving of such violence inflicted by the teenage Philip IV (Vega 56).⁸ A similarly melancholy sonnet, purportedly by Guillén de Castro, ignores the scandalous

⁸ Pérez Gómez includes this *lira* as "ballad 35" in the appendix of his anthology of *romances* dedicated to Rodrigo Calderón, but does not assign authorship to any of the poems (98). The manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional de España (MS 9306), however, attributes this specific poem to Lope de Vega (54).

accusations completely and writes simply that Calderón's sin was pride: "viose gloriosamente poderoso / sobre sí mismo al cielo levantado / y en hombros de si mismo derribado / fue indigna oposición al sol hermoso" (Castro 63). These poems are not unique. Indeed, much of the literary production after Calderón's bloody demise in 1621 appears forgiving, and even sympathetic, to the *privado*'s precarious relationship with fortune. In his 1623 history of Madrid, Philip IV's own chronicler even compares Calderón to Saint Paul, writing "en la vida Christiana lo que se alaba es el fin, no los principios. San Pablo [también] comenzó mal, y acabó bien" (Gonzales Davila 175). This new sympathetic and sanitized opinion of Calderón became so widespread after 1621 that Francisco Quevedo lambasts writers for praising a man when, only a year earlier, they had reviled him as a demonic sorcerer and demanding his head on a platter:

Sigieron a la muerte de don Rodrigo elogios muy encarecidos; y los poetas que le fulminaron el primer proceso en consonantes, le hicieron otros tantos epitafios, como decimos, llorando como cocodrilos al que habían comido. Y ya en España su voz decienta las honras; a sus coplas siguen las calamidades; y luego canonizar los delincuentes por ofender la reputación de los jueces. Y si esto no se ataja, las musas serán más criminales que sonoras (*Anales* 754).

This abrupt shift in how poets perceived the *privado* certainly caught Quevedo's attention, as evident in the above quote, but letters and written accounts penned after 1621 underline the gruesomeness of his execution. Witnessing one of the most powerful figures in Philip III's court publicly humiliated and killed in front of all of Madrid provided a striking real-life example of the mutability of fortune, reminding spectators that even seemingly unreachable nobles can fall dramatically. The secretary's death became an example that anyone, no matter how powerful, was vulnerable. A witness writes of the secretary, for example:

[desnudarle en publico] exemplese en este lastimoso suceso la fragilidad humana, lo que hay que fiar en las mayores felicidades de la vida, lo poco que valen las riquezas, pues quando Dios dispone los sucesos, a la mayor prosperidad derriba la menor desdicha, y en la muerte le iguala lo prospero y lo adverso. (*Relación* 151)

Similarly, seventeenth-century writer Andrés de Almansa compares Calderón to a shooting star, writing that despite the stratospheric heights of power attained by the Marquee, Fortune stripped him of everything as if his rise to prominence and wealth never happened:

...pues desde puestos tan altos derriban las culas propias, para topar el desengaño y el castigo, cuando el juyzio humano le considera mas apartado: quien fia en prosperidades de viento? Juzguelo v.m. por este suceso, y por el curso apresurado de la vida deste cometa, que desde el punto indivisible de su principio humilde corrio el Cielo de la mayor privança, y de la mayor riqueza, y al fin vino a parar en su principio” (Almansa y Mendoza 142)

As a result of such visible examples of the mutability of fortune, even for society’s most powerful, the *privado*’s ascent and descent became a major theme in Spanish literature, primarily originating with Alvaro de Luna’s administration of Castile, and the solar and lunar eclipses became perfect analogies to illustrate both the *privado*’s rise and fall, as well as the king’s waxing and waning power.

Seventeenth-century political theorists describing *privanza* inevitably compared the king to the sun and envisioned anyone who ventured too close as Icarus. He showers warmth and generosity on his subjects, but the king will also scorch anyone who attempts to climb too high. The rising and falling *privados* are also juxtaposed against the monarch’s permanence. As Pedro Portocarro writes in *Theatrico monárchico*, for example, “el Príncipe siempre es Príncipe, hasta

que muere, y los consejos siempre permanecen; los validos no” (Portocarrero 256). Zeballos gives a more vivid description of the king’s imutability and calls him a sun which can unmake fog, writing “niebla deshaze con los rayos del sol, que es el rostro ayrado de un principe” (68). These descriptions are nothing unique, and most seventeenth-century writers conform to this notion of the king as a permanent and unmovable celestial figure. The *privado*, on the other hand, rises and falls at the king’s pleasure.

Indeed, Alvaro de Luna’s name draws obvious parallels to the celestial cycles of the moon, which, rising in its luminosity, becomes the dominant image in the night sky only to disappear later after a gradual waning. In order to better understand Mira’s use of this eclipse analogy as an illustration of self-autonomy, it would be helpful to briefly examine how medieval and early modern poets first utilized the solar / lunar metaphors to describe Luna. The Marquee of Santillana, one of the Condestable’s most outspoken critics, took advantage of his name and describes his rise to unnatural power as a lunar cycle:

De tu resplendor ¡O luna!
 Te ha privado la fortuna.
 O luna más luminosa
 Que la luz meridiana,
 Clareciente, radiosa,
 Prepotente, soberana,
 Tu claror universal
 Por el mundo era sonado:
 Un ser atan prosperado
 Non vio onbre terrenal. (355)

Santillana also gives the moon's eternal "rayos" a political context, adding "o Luna que en toda España / los tus rayos trascendían / le tu mirable fazaña / infinitos departía" (343). Not only is the *luna* outshining the sun specifically in Spain, but its radiance and power have seemed reached an eternal state, contrary to the corruptible nature of the moon.

The imagery of permanency in which the moon and its "infinite" light are presented establishes conflicting expectations when anticipating the ending of the poem. The reader is aware of the intrinsic mutability of the moon, and its fall from radiance is no surprise. The proud heavenly body, however, is showered with accolades that are appropriate only to the sun and therefore does not foresee its impending destruction. Santillana continues:

O Luna eclipsada
 Y llena de oscuridad,
 Tembrosa y fuscada,
 Conpilda de ceguidad,
 Toda negra ya pareces
 De clareza careciente,
 Galardón equivalente
 Recibes según mereces. (343)

In this stanza, the moon falls from its former splendor and is now described with a string of antithetical nouns and adjectives emphasizing its blackness, and whereas the beginning stanzas claim that the light radiates from the face of the moon, the eclipse exposes the moon as being dark, black, and shadowy. The structure of the poem is not cyclical, and the emphatic concluding phrase "recibes según mereces" adds finality to the moon's fate and does not anticipate another rise. While McCurdy has identified the lunar analogy in the earlier Alvaro romances, as well as

the *privanza* plays, Santillana's poem shows that the use of the moon as an extended metaphor for the *Condestable* is not a simple commentary on the "phases" of his rise and fall, or an analogy to the Wheel of Fortune. There is a deeper metaphor of usurpation, and the moon acquires a sense of unnaturalness by aspiring to emulate the sun.

In his seventeenth-century adaptation of the Luna poem, Quevedo's "A don Alvaro de Luna" imitates Santillana's antithetical rhetoric, associating the rise and fall of the *privado* with binary oppositions of radiance and darkness. Quevedo, however, politicizes the image even further and associates Luna with Lucifer:

Ve de Luzbel la privanza,
 Que cayó por su soberbia,
 Que aun los ángeles peligran
 En la privanza y alteza.
 Fuiste cohete en el mundo,
 Subiste a las nubes mismas,
 Subiste resplandeciente,

Bajas ya ceniza a tierra. (Quevedo, "A don Álvaro" 87)

Again, the *Condestable* ascends to an unnatural height and is burned by his proximity to the celestial realm. Quevedo's attention to words such as "cohete" evokes a tone of rapid motion, both in Luna's ascent and in his fall, and the play on the name Luzbel/Luna underscores the diminished luminosity of the fallen figure. Finally, Quevedo also associates the *caída* with *soberbia*, noting that angels who attempt to impose their council on God fall to the Earth as ashes.

The images repeated by Santillana and Quevedo are merely representative of a large body of poetry that compares Luna to a celestial eclipse. As McCurdy points out, Luna's fate was also a popular theme among the *romanceros*, and a long oral tradition produced hundreds of ballads about Luna which contemplate the mutability of Fortune (117). In many cases, the numerous anonymous romances mirror Santillana's boastful moon and ascribe it with solar properties in versus such as "por mí la luna en el mundo / más que el sol resplandecía" and "siendo luna crecí tanto / que quise igualar el sol / mas como fue sol hebrero" (Ochoa 234). In this example, which is typical of many Luna romances, the moon is again guilty of *soberbia* and attempts to rival the radiance and height of the sun.

In all of the above examples, the image of the eclipse is applied to both the sun and to the usurper. The moon and Lucifer all ascend into brilliance and splendor and compare themselves to the sun, evoking language that describes them as eternal fixtures in the sky. Because their mutable natures do not allow them to approach the solar or heavenly realms, however, their light is eclipsed and they fall back to earth as black shadows or as charred ashes. Their nature is therefore a paradox. They are addressed in terms that imply their eternity, yet because they are indeed not the sun or, in Lucifer's case, God, such language becomes a commentary on the inevitable mutability of the *privado*.

It becomes clear, when analyzing the eclipse imagery in earlier as well as more contemporary works, that Mira de Amescua inherited a firmly established poetic tradition. As previous studies have recognized, the waxing and waning of the *luna* is a principal metaphor for the Condestable and provides poets useful material in which to chronicle the *privado*'s ascent and demise, thus emphasizing the Wheel of Fortune theme. While Mira de Amescua utilizes these familiar strategies for representing the instability of *privanza*, however, he also fuses the

eclipse imagery with his Molinist defense of free will, thereby creating a rhetorical analogy that explores the role of autonomy in the monarch-*privado* relationship. Light and darkness, as we shall see, provide Mira with a poetic framework in which to explore early modern notions of autonomy against Juan and Luna's historical reputations that suggest a person can be enslaved by both coercion and fortune.

Próspera fortuna

Like Lope's surprising initial presentation of Fernando IV in *La inocente sangre* as merciful and just, Mira's introduction of Juan II in the *Próspera fortuna* is completely out of line with his historic reputation. Chroniclers famously dismissed Juan as a weak ruler whose passivity endangered Castile. Gonzalo de Hinojosa, for example, claims that Juan's lack of autonomy was so extensive that "non podía estar ni folgar sin [Luna] nin quería que durmiese otro con él en su cámara" (Hinojosa 112). Similarly, Palencia records that "vivió el monarca sumiso a la voluntad que la que el deseo o el capricho de este [Luna] le concedía," and despite the best efforts of the Castilian nobles, the king never showed any desire to free himself from his "yugo humillante" (108). Pérez de Guzman blames Juan's passivity on personal defects and claims that even after Luna was executed, the king remained the same weak man as before, and "se quedó en aquella misma remission e negligencia que primero, nin fizo apto alguno de virtud nin de fortaleza en que se mostrase ser más ome que primero" (132-33). Even seventeenth-century writers debated Luna's hold on the king. In his 1601 *Historia de España*, for example, Juan Mariana echoes Guzman's criticism that the monarch was unable to function without his *privado* after he was banished from court the first time:

Ningun dia amaneció alegre para el Rey, nunca le vieron sino con rostro torcido y ánimo desgraciado despues que le quitaron a don Alvaro. Dél hablaba entre dia, y

de él pensaba de noche, y ordinariamente traia delante su entendimiento y se le representaba la imagen del que ausente tenia. Los que andaban en la casa del Rey y le acompañaban. (Mariana 86)

Indeed, both medieval and early modern chroniclers were divided on whether to blame the king's feebleness or Luna's unnatural ability to control him, but most agree that he was utterly disinterested in ruling and incapable of any assertiveness.

Breaking from Juan II's reputation inherited from the medieval chroniclers, Mira introduces the teenage monarch as headstrong and assertive in the first act of *Prospera fortuna*. A far cry from Guzman's "negligente" king, Mira's Juan attempts to defy his father's decree when he orders Ruy Gomez, his father's *privado*, to crown him six months early so that, in his own words, "yo estos reinos administre" (1. 147-8). Although Juan acknowledges that he has a host of *grandees* to assist him in governing the kingdom, he dismisses them all as unnecessary and insists that he can rule Castile by himself. Juan's assertiveness surfaces again when Alvaro de Luna is presented to court and the young monarch defines their future relationship as that of king and servant:

Deseo que me serváis;
 Y creo que acertaréis,
 Porque ya se han confrontado
 Nuestras sangres y he pensado
 Que buen vasallo seréis. (1. 280-5)

Here, Juan again deviates from his historical reputation and insists that Luna is a vassal, whose previous service to the royal "sangre" proves that he is a reliable subordinate. Luna again confirms this relationship when he refuses to reveal his opinion about anything, exclaiming "la

elocuencia del vasallo / es callar y obedecer” (Mira 3. 515-6).

Reflecting Juan’s initial strength as a monarch, Mira adapts his light / dark analogies to present the Castilian king as a shining sun. When he visits Ruy Lopez’s house, for example, his father’s old *privado* exclaims that Juan is the sun and he is merely a dim star in the presence of his magnanimous luminosity: “Rey y monarca español, / que me deslumbro con ella, / y cualquier merced estrella / será delante el sol” (1. 123-6). Later in Act 1, Alvaro de Luna repeats the same light analogy, praising the permanence of Juan’s luminosity while diminishing his own presence:

¿Qué luz de breve faro
o qué centella atrevida
tiene aliento, tiene vida,
si está delante el sol...
Yo, fuente, ¿puede tratar
misterios del océano?
yo, centella, ¿al sol humano
podré nunca aconsejar? (I.391-98)

With this declaration, Alvaro mirrors Ruy’s appropriateness in maintaining a proper invisibility while in the monarch’s presence. Relinquishing their positions to a mere background presence, the light from the dim “estrella,” the “breve faro,” and the “centella” all but disappear, even though the *privados* maintain a physical proximity. Luna also appears to reject his role as Icarus, stating that he wishes to attain neither the radiance of the sun nor the depths of the sea.

Mira again utilizes the light / dark analogy to reinforce Juan’s control over his own court, and suggests that just as the king’s light can shower favor on his vassals, it can also be withheld.

When his father's old favorite whips Luna for allowing the king to leave the palace, Juan metaphorically eclipses Ruy by casting him out of the royal chamber into darkness, symbolizing his separation from the monarch's illuminating radiance. Ruy's fall from favor takes a physical manifestation when he finds himself alone in a dark room. Distraught at his loss of favor, Ruy exclaims:

¿aún no hay luces en mi cuarto?
 sombras y figuras las desdichas que paso
 Reventando estoy, ¿qué es esto?
 Etnas en el alma traigo;
 Aun mi vestido me cansa (2. 861-66)

Contemplating his estrangement from Juan, Ruy says that the king's words are lightning that can unmake any man. He proceeds to deliver a lengthy monologue about how the Wheel of Fortune granted him great favor in the court of Enrique II, but now has humbled him to a solitary room in the dark. Luna overhears the monologue and further isolates the *privado* when he dismisses Ruy as a strange incorporeal voice, "voces da sin luz y a oscuras" (2. 884). Reinforcing both Ruy and Luna's initial claims that Juan is the sun, Mira's light and dark analogies complement the king's control over his own court. Reflecting seventeenth-century political theorists' visions of an unmovable king, Juan gives and rescinds royal favor at his pleasure.

Juan also gives this power to his representatives and the interaction between light / dark during the king's absence reflects Mira de Amescua's play on Hapsburg tendencies to invoke regal presence invisibility. In chapter one, we saw how Philip III's power was enhanced by his strategic absence, for example at his dramatic invisibility at Margaret's funeral. Similarly, Ruy Lopez symbolically reinforces the monarch's power in *Prospera fortuna* when he allows a

visiting Alcalde to sit in the king's chair. Fallen into disfavor after his page tricks him into signing incriminating letters to the Moorish king, Ruy is visited by the Alcalde to discuss the accusations of disloyalty. In Act 1, Ruy had delivered a lengthy monologue proclaiming that a special chair in his home is reserved for the king only. As such, only Juan and his father Enrique had ever used it. When the Alcalde visits, however, he declares that as the king's representative, it would be appropriate for Ruy to offer him the royal chair. The *privado* acquiesces, exclaiming:

como los demás. Rey es
o imagen suya, y así
quita ese asiento de ahí
que ya quiero que le des
aquella silla, y concluya,
pues sus acciones son leyes;
a donde se sientan reyes,
síentase la imagen suya. (3. 311-18)

In this scene, Ruy Lopez reinforces what Laura Bass describes as “hierarchy or reflections that emanate from God to the king, God’s representative on Earth, to his ministers ... as they ruled literally in his place” (Bass 89). Because the Alcalde represents the king in regards to Ruy’s alleged (and unfounded) treachery, Ruy rightly permits him to sit in the distinguished chair in Juan’s stead and he is allowed to “illuminate” the room with the king’s authority.

Notwithstanding his lack of presence, Juan is still a radiant and powerful monarch.

Despite *Prospera fortuna*’s conformity to contemporary notions of royal immutability, however, Juan begins to foreshadow his own loss of autonomy. In the second act, for example, Juan de Mena visits the court to dedicate *Laberinto de fortuna* to Juan II and to witness the royal

coronation. Curiously, Mira's dramatic version of Mena actually reads the first stanza of *Laberinto de Fortuna* almost verbatim, but he changes the line "al que con Fortuna es bien fortunado" (Mena 75) to "al que es en las lides bien afortunado" (2. 78). Mira's redaction of the original text alters the focus of the stanza, and instead of praising Juan's position on top of the Wheel of Fortune, as the real Mena does in his poem, Mira's character merely praises Juan's prowess in battle. By ignoring Fortune implied by Mena's presence on stage, Mira draws attention to Juan's present autonomy. He is no slave to fortune, but rather forges his own path on the battlefields.

Notwithstanding Juan's initial image as a strong monarch, his interaction with Mena begins to foreshadow his impending bondage and loss of autonomy. Juan tries to impress the famous poet and declares that he too composes poetry. When he reads his poem aloud to the court, however the monarch fittingly describes how love enslaves its victims and imprisons their souls, leading to a complete loss of free will:

Que tuvieras tal poder,
 Que pudieras deshacer
 La firmeza de una fe,
 Hasta ahora que lo sé.
 Es tu fuerza sin igual,
 Pues lleva tu inclinación
 Al más fuerte corazón
 Rendido a tu tribunal
 Para en pena de su mal.

Ya en tus cárceles se ve
 Un alma libre hasta aquí:
 Nunca la fuerza creí
 Del poder que en ti miré
 Hasta ahora que lo sé. (2. 405-20)

Juan's poem ominously forecasts his own mental and spiritual incarceration in *Adversa fortuna* when he will more closely resemble Guzmán and Palencia's feeble king who completely submits to Luna's commands. The monarch's lines, "ya en tus cárceles se ve / un alma libre hasta aquí," illustrate the conflicting nature between autonomy, free will, and bondage. Breaking from the historical Luna however, the poem suggests that Juan's future enslavement will not be caused by witchcraft or some diabolical power of Luna. Rather, the "cárcel" that awaits the king is psychological and is of his own making.

The first indication that Luna may live up to his historical potential occurs after Ruy Lopez's aids falsify a letter that implicates him in treason. As punishment, Juan strips Ruy of his lands and titles and declares that Luna is the new *Condestable de Castilla*. Luna accepts the promotion, and declares that he will strive to earn glory for Juan, exclaiming:

En la Guerra peleando,
 Ya venciendo, ya muriendo,
 Honras iré mereciendo,
 Mercedes iré ganando;

 Porque no escriban de mí
 Apasionadas historias

Que sin sangre y sin victorias

Tus favores recibí. (3. 573-580)

Considering how the histories of Palencia, Guzman, and Hinojosa ensured that Luna would be remembered as one of Spain's greatest villain, this statement is indeed ironic.

As we shall see, however, Mira never directly acknowledges Luna's reputation as a usurper. Instead, he employs the extended eclipse analogy to symbolize the waxing and waning of Luna's power over Juan's free will. This stylized image of the *privado's* influence over the king also allows Mira to take a more subjective approach to *privanza*, and instead of political commentary, the light and dark imagery become a metaphor for the king's internal battle for his own self-autonomy.

Adversa fortuna

The eclipse analogies reflect the structure of the two plays and suggest that the play's ending will conform to formulaic expectations. Luna will outshine the king, and he is doomed to fall into ruin in order for the monarch to be restored. Indeed, the historical Juan II's chronicler records that after the execution of Alvaro de Luna in 1453, the Castilian monarch sent letters to the kings of Europe announcing that he had freed himself from the grips of the Condestable and "recobrado su libertad tras larga y humillante servidumbre" (Palencia 49). In an equally dramatic display, Juan issued a public statement regarding the arrest and execution of his lifelong favorite:

[Alvaro de Luna] has for a long time held and usurped a chief position near me and in my household and court, and despite having been admonished about his excessive pride and effrontery he has preserved in . . . grasping more power to himself each day, excessively, without temperance or measure, so that there remains no room for me to rule and administer my kingdoms (ctd. in Boyden 29)

Juan's propagandists clearly portray Luna as a usurper, and his death was represented as a full restoration of the monarchy to its proper order.

Nineteenth-century hispanist William Prescott found the eclipse metaphor useful to describe Luna dominated the Castilian court, writing:

when [Luna] rode abroad, he was accompanied by numerous knights and nobles, which left his sovereign's court comparatively deserted; so that royalty might be said on all occasions, whether of business or pleasure, to be eclipsed by the superior splendors of its satellite. (Prescott 79)

Despite such a long historical precedence for portraying Luna as a usurper, however, Mira's dramatic character never overtly usurps Juan's authority, nor does he coerce the monarch into submission. In fact, Mira seems to completely ignore Luna's historical connotations and presents the favorite as a dedicated and devoted servant. This accomplishes two important thematic ends. First, Luna's seeming adherence to proper monarch / *privado* protocol places more attention on Juan and his struggle with his own autonomy. It is indeed puzzling why Juan diminishes to such a weak and submissive state by the end of *Adversa fortuna* considering that Mira's Luna does not exert any external influence over him.

Second, by ignoring allegations of coercion, Mira frames the entire play as a physiological study of Juan and explores how the "enslavement" of his will is self-imposed. Without referring to Luna's coercive powers, of course, the *Adversa fortuna* relies entirely on the light / dark motif to illustrate the waxing and waning of Luna and Juan's autonomy. For example, the Condestable establishes an analogy in which the king's glory depends on his proximity to Luna when he exclaims "mi propio ser, mi Rey eres / Y poder estar sin ti / Es querer que el sol esté / Sin la luz que en él se ve. (1. 410-14). By declaring that the king is his "own

being,” the sun analogy depends not on the king’s radiance, but rather on Juan himself. Clearly framed as praise that reflects the play’s light motif, Luna nonetheless complicates the language by making the king’s immutability depend on his *privado*.

Juan also utters very similar statements that bind his being to Luna’s presence. For instance, when the grandees, supported by the queen, expel Luna from court, Juan claims that his favorite’s departure will diminish him to the point where it will be impossible to be king: “si a don Alvaro pierdo / Ni soy dichoso Rey, ni amigo cuerdo (2. 739, 40). When Juan finally delivers the news to Luna, he again laments the *privado*’s exile and devises that the only way for him to continue living is to receive daily letters from the Condestable. Distraught that Luna’s absence will diminish his existence, Juan instructs his *privado* to send letters to sustain him while he is away, exclaiming “tu ausencia dará lugar / A que puede sosegar / Esta embidiosa porfía / Escribeme cada día (Mira de Amescua 2. 934-37). The presence/absence construction is reversed from Ruy’s statement in *Prospera fortuna* that the king’s presence can be embodied by his representatives. Indeed, Juan now declares that he has no presence at all without his *privado*.

While Mira’s light / dark analogy indicates a waning of Juan’s sense of self, they also symbolize Luna’s struggle with fortune. The eclipse metaphor, of course, indicates that Luna will suffer the familiar end that befalls every *privado* – he has flown too close to the king’s majesty and he is destined to fall. Juan evokes this analogy, for example, when courtiers jealous of Luna’s rise to power convince the reluctant king to banish him from court. Juan agrees to send Luna away, but blames the conspiring nobles for his departure. By again referring to himself as the sun, Juan laments that his illuminating light has been blocked and that he has been prevented from showering light onto his “luna”:

Yo, amigo, podré decirte
 que la luna contemplaba
 muchas veces cuando hermosa
 hurta al sol rayos de plata,
 por ser tu nombre, y decía:
 Si yo soy el sol de España
 y e de iluminar mi luna,
 ¿Qué mar, qué tierra pesada
 se ha puesto en medio y no dexa
 que penetre esferas altas
 mi luz. Hiriendo y dorando
 de rosicleres su cara,
 sosegué al fin el eclipsi
 que le envidia te causaba (2. 1267-80)

Juan's comparison of himself to the sun continues, but instead of describing Luna as a spark as he did in the last play, the *privado* is now the moon. On one hand, Juan preserves his own language of radiance by claiming to be the sun, but this additional analogy elevates the *privado*'s position to one of prominence. Although the court's envy is eclipsing Luna's favor, Juan concludes by implying that the solar/lunar cycle will resume again and the *privado* will be re-illuminated.

This dialogue surfaces again in when Luna is welcomed back into court. Determined to strengthen the king's alliance with Portugal, the *privado* plans to arrange a marriage between Juan and Isabel of Portugal. Before the Luna promises him to the princess, however, Juan

becomes enamored with María of France's portrait and voices his intent to marry her. Luna attempts to solve the dilemma by sneaking into Juan's bedchamber and switching the painting, hoping that Juan will instead fall in love with Isabel's image and agree to the more politically advantageous union. Alone in his room, Juan relies on the same solar imagery to describe the radiance of his beloved. When he realizes that the painting has been swapped, Juan accuses the thief of eclipsing María's light:

¿Qué es esto? ¿Quién se atreve
a volver sombras oscuras
perfiles de estrellas puras,
líneas de luz y de nieve?
¿Qué occidente o mar elado,
qué nube sin arbol
hurtó de mi mano el sol,
y la sombra me a dexado? (2.1591-98)

In this outburst, Juan directs the imagery at María's portrait and accuses its thief of casting a shadow on her luminosity. Given the fact that it is Luna who has swapped the painting, however, such language is doubled to include the Condestable's eclipsing of Juan himself. Juan is consistently referred to as the sun, yet Luna disregards his elevated station and casts a "sombra" over the monarch. Contrasting even further the original dim spark against a radiant sun image that Luna establishes in Act 1 of *Próspera fortuna*, Luna admits to changing the painting and eclipsing María's beauty:

Yo fui el mar, y el occidente,
Yo fui la embidia y la nube

Que ese atrevimiento tuve

Este sol resplandeciente (2. 1604-10).

Although the conversation is supposedly about María's image, the portrait displaces the original surface-level meaning by employing the eclipsed sun analogy. The same references, as we have seen, appear repeatedly as an analogy of Luna's position to Juan. By using the same language, then, Juan and the Condestable provide a double meaning and the argument reads as metaphorical commentary on Luna's inappropriate power.

By the third act, Juan has lost so much of his autonomy that he claims that he is literally unable to exist without Luna. After Luna is banished from court a second time, for instance, the distressed king laments, "un nubeo soldado tienes, / Maestre de Santiago, / Vivir no puedo sin verte, Tu sombra soy y te sigo" (2004-7). The strong and vocal king of the opening scene of *Prospera fortuna* who orders his *privado* to crown him six months early is rendered helpless and weak. This initial image of Juan becomes increasingly ironic when he repeatedly threatens to renounce his throne if Luna is sent away from court. Eventually, however, the conspiring grandees force Juan to sign his death warrant. Faced with a cruel twist of fate, Luna concludes that life itself is transitory and is made of dust and shadows: "Si humo, nada, sombra, viento / es la vida, ¿qué sera / el bien que el mundo nos da?" (2345-7).

In the last act of the play, Luna is arrested and sent to prison. Curiously, there are no specific charges levied against him other than the grandees' insistence that Luna's removal will maintain "paz y quietud" in the kingdom (3. 2175) and the king dismisses their motives as "malicia" y "embidia cruel" (3. 2179,83). More importantly, however, he frames Luna's arrest within the light / dark metaphor, claiming that nothing can be done for the Condestable because Fortune has begun moving against him: "obstinación de fortuna / quiere eclipsar esta luna" (3.

2171,72) When Luna is told the news of his impending arrest, he begins a series of long monologues in which he decries the inevitability of fate, exclaiming:

Si el tiempo y la fortuna
 A un mismo passo caminan,
 Y en ese cielo declinan
 Los aspectos de la luna
 Si no ay constancia ninguna
 En cuanto el cielo crio,
 Mi declinación llegó
 Ya mi rüina prevengo (3. 2451-57)

Although he is clearly upset about losing his position in court, Luna accepts his fall with a fatalistic outlook and starts speaking in circular proverbs that illustrate the inevitability of his death. He laments, for example:

siempre a miserias nacimos,
 siempre en miserias estamos,
 quando nacemos lloramos,
 lloramos quando morimos. (3. 2866-70)

And in another circular exclamation, he cries:

El que nace, salir quiere
 de un sepulcro; en otro yace
 sepulcro dexa el que nace
 a sepulcro va el que muere. (3. 2871-74)

The redundancy of Luna's circular observations about life reflect the Wheel of Fortune's

fatalistic hold on him and mirror the light and dark analogies that pervade both plays. Like Ruy Gomes, Juan's first favorite who was cast into darkness, Luna's Wheel of Fortune seems to have fated him for the execution block.

As we have seen, however, Mira de Amescua does not completely accept a character's bondage to fate. Indeed, a Molinist view would hold that a person can escape external influences and choose their own path. While Luna seems to have accepted his end, his wife Juana Pimentel dramatically contradicts this fatalistic interpretation of Fortune. When the royal guards arrive at Luna's house to take him into custody, for example, Juana provides him with the option of resistance. She rejects submitting to misfortune and instead takes matters into her own hands. Armed with a sword, Juana commands her entire household to attack the king's soldiers so they can create a diversion while Luna escapes, exclaiming, "no se a de dar a prisión / ni sujetar a injusticias! ... Tomad armas, criados" (3. 2543-5). Luna, however, insists in accepting his "fortuna" and agrees to go with the guards to his prison cell.

The notion of the Wheel of Fortune as fatalistic is again questioned when Juana marches into the king's court and directly accuses the monarch of injustice. Indeed, she delivers a stinging indictment which dismisses Juan's dependence on eclipsing language to explain Luna's death:

Desdichas son tus Mercedes:
 una de dos, Rey airado;
 si [Luna] erró, tú estás culpado
 en darle onor imprudente;
 si no erró, y es inocente,
 por qué a de ser desdichado (3. 2957-62)

While Juan has maintained over and over that nothing could be done to save Luna because fortune had aligned against him, Juana's declaration suggests both Luna's death and Juan's utter submission to his nobles was of his own making.

In her book *Playing the King*, McKendrick discusses the political and discursive implications of representing kings on stage. She observes that seventeenth-century playwrights frequently build their king-plays around past royal figures, thereby avoiding accusations of political mischief (23). McKendrick thus argues that the contemporary understanding of the historical characters was to draw parallel conclusions to the present, noting "it was no consequence that the plots were historical, quasi-historical or fictional, for to think that audiences then would watch kings on stage and not draw parallels between what they heard and saw and the contemporary political situation" (23). Historical figures, then, are revived on stage for the purposes of "reclaiming Spain's past for the purposes of the present" (McKendrick 71). The audience watching Mira de Amescua's plays could not help but remember the same fate of Calderón that transpired so publicly only a few years earlier.

Indeed, Francisco de Quevedo warns that Calderón's execution should serve as a warning to those who would seek political power, writing "la muerte de don Rodrigo Calderón fue lo que vivió, y su vida no fue más que su muerte. Oid la historia de dos hombre en una vida, y atended a la historia del privado que nació de su ruina [y] veréis uno que se edifica con su caída" (*Grandes annales* 752). Quevedo implies, of course, that Calderón's ruin, and therefore Lerma's fall from favor, allowed the Duke of Olivares's rise as the new *privado*. Given the cyclical structure of rising and falling *privados* in Mira's plays, one cannot help but see the veiled warning to Olivares that he too will fall like Icarus from his lofty office. Nevertheless, Mira insists that no one can be controlled by fortune and that fate is of our own making. Olivares may indeed avoid a

similar fall if he heeds the warning.

Notwithstanding the obvious contemporary parallels, Mira de Amescua's dramatic versions of Luna and Juan omit all direct political similarities between the historical Luna and Calderón. Luna does not overtly attempt to control Juan, nor does he do anything that may be interpreted as usurping royal authority. Instead of referring to historical precedence for presenting usurping *privados*, Mira opts for a metaphoric framework of solar and lunar eclipse analogies to illustrate the waxing and waning of Juan's autonomy in relation to his favorite. Bradner attributes this to Mira's intent not to represent history or to make political statements, but rather to reformulate "great public events" and explore their "effect on the private lives of the characters" (103). The effect of limiting historical explanations for Luna's downfall, Bradner writes, opens the possibility for more "psychological depth" and development of the characters (102). By using the extended sun/moon analogy throughout the *Propsera* and the *Adversa fortuna*, Mira provides a theoretical reference for an ideal *privado*-monarch relationship, yet simultaneously criticizes the *privado*, and indeed the king, for abusing these positions. As we have seen with the sun analogy, the same language that is used to describe Juan as the radiant monarch doubles as equally condemning when he allows himself to become eclipsed by a lesser figure.

Luna's departure from his historical reputation allows Mira's Molinist views to become even more evident. All bondage is self-inflicted, as Juana Pimentel so passionately states in the last scene of *Adversa fortuna*, and Mira has shown again and again in his plays that while external forces may appear to coerce a subject's *voluntad*, everyone is by nature "indifferent" and able to control his or her own autonomy. Unfortunately for Juan, he does not need Guzman's magician Luna to bewitch him into submission. He freely renounces his autonomy, and by the

end of the *Adversa fortuna*, he symbolically is unable to exist. In the same way, Luna is presented with the choice to reject the injustices levied against him by Juan's court and flee Castile. Like the king, however, he submits to his own demise. At the end of the play, Luna is dead and Juan is left so diminished that he is not able to even lift his hand to sign the execution order. Rhetorically, the Wheel of Fortune cycle is complete but Mira also ends the play with Juana Pimentel's indictment against the monarch stating that the whole tragedy was of his own making.

CHAPTER 4

BAROQUE PERCEPTIONS: PRIVANZA AND MACHIAVELLIAN FAILURES IN

ANTONIO MIRA DE AMESCUA'S BERNARDO DE CABRERA PLAYS

“Las cosas no pasan por lo que son,
sino por lo que parecen”
(Gracián, *Arte de prudencia* 156).

In Mira's Luna plays, as we have seen, the playwright takes a stylistic approach to presenting *privanza* and employs the light / dark metaphors to represent Luna and Juan's internal conditions. He does this by failing to include political and historical factors surrounding Luna's *privanza* – the Condestable's motives throughout the two plays are never questioned, and Mira never quite explains how Luna rises to power, how the nobles at court are able to secure his fall from favor, or why Juan agrees to execute Luna. By omitting all references to Luna's reputation as a usurper and historical reasons for his downfall, Mira denies the audience access to possible ulterior motives usually associated with a *privado* character, and instead structures the metaphoric eclipses as an extension of Juan and Luna's psychological reactions to *privanza*. At the same time, Luna's notorious fame as a usurper, as well as Rodrigo Calderón's execution which placed Luna back into the forefront of political discussions in 1621, provided an extra-dramatic dimension to the characters even though they are never directly addressed on stage. The fact that his devotion to Juan does not coincide with his reputation encourages the audience to wonder if Luna's motives are as selfless as they seem. This question is never answered, but it suggests that Luna may have an internal self that he is not sharing with the audience or with any other character.

In the *Próspera* and *Adversa fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera*, however, Mira shows a disconnect between characters' internal selves and how they represent themselves to the outside world. By revealing both the internal thought processes of the characters as well as how they interact with each other, the Cabrera plays explore how detailed mechanisms of scheming, deceit, manipulation, and chance all combine to cause a *privado*'s rise and fall. The Cabrera plays, therefore, shift the psychological focus away from a close analysis of the king and instead present all of the characters as embroiled in elaborate games of manipulation. The two *privados*, Bernardo de Cabrera and Lope de Luna, are not the only ones creating a false perception of themselves. Indeed, nearly everyone in the play, including the king and his sister Princess Violante, openly strategize about how to manipulate other characters in order to get what they want. Moreover, they resort to disguises, forged letters, lies, and flattery to accomplish their goals. Throughout the entire façade, however, each character delivers detailed asides on their inner thoughts, thereby giving the audience and the readers unimpeded access to their motives and thought processes. By including asides in almost every conversation, Mira reveals the characters' internal motives, thereby exposing their outward dialogues as deliberate projections designed to manipulate other people.

The purpose of this chapter is to study the *Próspera* and *Adversa fortuna de Bernardo de Cabrera* as a continued example of Mira's commentary on *privanza* and the early modern concept of the self. In these *comedias*, the playwright's extensive use of internal monologues and dramatic asides provides a useful tool for exploring how characters view themselves and how they manipulate dialogue in order to make themselves perceived in a more advantageous manor. Similar to the Luna plays, Mira continues the formulaic *comedia de privanza* convention of presenting the royal favorites in a positive light. They are dedicated servants, and all of the

rhetorical games they devise to persuade the king to a particular opinion is often to benefit another person. Nevertheless, Mira shows how endless rhetorical games of self-promotion at court, even if well intentioned, cannot sustain themselves and eventually some of the players will receive, to borrow Baltasar Gracián's chess term, a checkmate (117). In Cabrera's case, losing the game literally costs him his life.

El arte de mover voluntades

Baltasar Gracián's 1647 *Arte de prudencia* seems to contradict earlier seventeenth-century anti-Machiavellian political theorists when he advises his readers to carefully orchestrate how others perceive them. Pedro Ribadeneira, Juan Salazar, and Jeronimo Zaballos, as we have seen in the last chapters, maintain that a person's external qualities radiate out from internal virtue. Under this concept, there is no difference between the self and its representation. This view of the self is at the heart of the Christian Prince model espoused by many Spanish political writers which held that a ruler's internal virtue caused external qualities such as justice and prudence. Without internal piety, these virtues cannot be externally projected.

However, Gracián's *Arte de prudencia* states to the contrary that "las cosas no pasan por lo que son, sino por lo que parecen" (165) and argues that there is an inherent disconnect between how a person is perceived and their internal reality. Moreover, Gracián suggests that careful self-contemplation and an adept understanding of human nature would grant a person control over their own *representation*. This notion, of course, establishes a conflict between the self and external influences. As Carlos Vaillo explains, Gracián "recomienda insistentemente la introspección y la vigilancia continua ante los peligros exteriores" (489). This idea is similar to Juan de Molina's *indifference* theology, but whereas Molina resigns his notion of free will to hypotheticals – meaning that people can choose for themselves any potion presented to them

without interference from external influence – Gracián warns that autonomy must be carefully guarded against those who would seek to control it. At the same time, he suggests that a person can project exterior perceptions that are not necessarily true to his or her internal qualities, thereby manipulating their external influence on people.

There is, of course, another side to Gracián’s axiom, as *perception* depends not only on the object being perceived, but also on the person doing the perceiving. When both parties are aware that the other is controlling how they are being perceived, this interplay between the two manipulated perceptions establishes what Foucault has called a “game of deception.” Indeed, the theorist identifies seventeenth-century language, especially in Spain, as marking the “end of the age of resemblance,” in which “resemblance and sign respond inevitably to one another” (68), and the beginning of a Baroque code of representation marked by “games.” Foucault explains:

...during the period that has been termed, rightly of wrongly the Baroque, thought ceases to move in the element of resemblance. Similitude is no longer the form of knowledge but rather the occasion for error, the danger one exposes oneself when one does not examine the obscure region of confusions ... The age of resemblance is drawing to a close. It leaves nothing behind but games. Games whose powers of enchantment grow out of the new kinship between resemblance and illusion...it is the age of deceiving the senses” (51).

Foucault’s observation provides us a useful framework for interpreting Gracián’s statement that *perception* is more important than a thing itself. The Jesuit priest’s premise that a person can project a convincing façade to the world, especially when applied to a monarch, seems to reject Pedro Ribadeneyra, Juan Salazar, and Jeronimo Zeballos’s calls for an authentic and Christian prince whose internal piousness shines outwardly and visibly, manifesting itself in all of his

deeds. Simultaneously, the notion that people can create false perceptions of themselves for the purpose of controlling another's *voluntad* raises fears that a *privado* has somehow gained control over the king.

Gracián explains in more detail in *Arte de prudencia* that anyone who masters both an internal knowledge of the self as well as its external representations can, in the writer's own words, play people's *voluntades* like a "game of chess":

hallarse su torcedor a cada uno. Es el arte de mover voluntades; más consiste en destreza que en resolución: un saber por dónde se le ha de entrar a cada uno. No ai voluntad sin especial afición, y diferentes según la variedad de los gustos. Todos son idólatras: unos de la estimación, otros del interés y los más de deleite. La maña está en conocer estos ídolos para el potivar, conociéndole a casa uno su eficaz impulso: es como tener la llave del querer ageno. Hasse de ir al primer mobiles, que no siempre es el supremo, las más vezes es el ínfimo, porque son más en el mundo los desordenados que los subordinados. Hásle de previnir el genio primero, tocarle el verbo después, cargar con la afición, que infaliblemente dará mate al alvedrío. (116-117)

Gracián's bold assertion that person's *voluntad* can be strategically played like a board game raises profound questions about *privanza*, as *privados* were by their nature suspected of having compromised the monarch's *voluntad* by some means of manipulation. *Privados* have long been accused of having hidden agendas and false personalities, as charges against Luna, Lerma and Calderón attest, but Gracián finally vocalizes their possible methods of control. Instead of attributing the *privado*'s influence over the monarch to external powers such as demonic coercion or magical enchantments, as did both Alvaro de Luna and Rodrigo Calderón's

contemporaries, Gracián suggests that manipulating a person's will is a game of carefully coordinating one's *representation*, and thereby controlling how one is perceived. This shift can be described, using Anthony Cascardi's words, as "an internalization of the control mechanisms that have been inherited from the Counter-Reformation world" (129). Indeed, the critic explains that:

in Gracián the privileged place of control is not the church, but the society of the court and the psyche of the subject. The authority of control in force at court has been transferred to the subject-self, in such a way that what acquires value in the emergent discourse of the self the relativity "rationalized" psychology of self-control. (Cascardi 129)

Such self-control, when properly disciplined, can allow a person to carefully adapt how they react to every situation, and in doing so construct how others perceive them. This constructed representation of the self, in turn, can be used to manipulate less disciplined individuals into acquiescence.

As Cascardi explains, Gracián effectively moves the battle of wills internally. Under this new construct, magic and demonic influence is no longer needed to explain a *privado*'s power over the monarch. *Arte de prudencia* was written about twenty five years after the political struggle between Lerma and Olivares, but it nevertheless captures Baroque fears that a person may not be what they seem, and that a royal counselor may be capable of manipulating his own representation in order to "mover voluntades," especially the *voluntad* of the monarch.

Perceptions of power

Antonio Mira de Amescua, like Lope de Vega and most Spanish writers of the day, believed in an absolute monarchy where spiritual piety and adherence to the Catholic faith was

of paramount importance. All other regal qualities, such as justice and wisdom, emanate from this principal virtue. Unfortunately, Mira did not leave behind a vast collection of personal letters like Lope indicating his political beliefs, but Mira scholar Antonio Muñoz Palmares maintains that his *comedias* and *autos sacramentales* indicate that the playwright held the Spanish monarchy as “defensora de los principios católicos frente a la horda de herejes que asolan Europa” (22). Stable governments and national peace, in this view, are the result of the king’s administration of justice under strict adherence to Catholic principals.

This notion emerged partly because of an anti-Machiavellian backlash which, according to Donald Bleznick, “served somewhat as a catalytic agent for a number of Spanish political treatises in the seventeenth century” (545). When Machiavelli’s *Il Principe* began circulating in Spain in the later half of the sixteenth century, it assaulted closely held Spanish political beliefs on two fronts. The first and most shocking idea for Spaniards was the recommendation that the state’s welfare should take precedence above religion, claiming that a prince “cannot observe faith, nor should he, when that observance turns against him” (69). In other words, a monarch should only adhere to religion when it is advantageous to him and he should not keep such convictions if they become a political hindrance. Secondly, the Florentine strategist insists that in politics, appearances are more important than innate virtues. For Machiavelli, a prince’s internal attributes are irrelevant so long as he projects an effective reputation onto the populous. Whether he is internally committed to justice or not is of no consequence as long as his subjects perceive him as just. After all, the strategist concludes, “the vulgar are taken in by the appearance and the outcome of a thing, and in the world there is no one but the vulgar” (71). In effect, perception and appearance are everything.

To most early modern Spaniards, this was heresy and had the potential of destroying any kingdom that followed Machiavelli's advice. As Bleznick's study attests, Spanish writers lined up to criticize the political theory as soon as it began circulating in Spain in the mid sixteenth century (545). Political theoretician Pedro de Rivandeneira was one of the first to harshly reject what he called the "satanic" Machiavellian practices of external self-promotion and political savvy above Christian principals of internal piety and justice. Warning Philip III of supposed Machiavellian counselors who have infiltrated his court, the priest lambasts royal advisors who manipulate political situations for their own advancement:

Pues desta misma manera estos que llaman políticos, haciendo profesión de sabios consejeros, de valerosos soldados y de prudentes y leales gobernadores de la república, aconsejan á los príncipes tales cosas, y ponen tales como primeros principios para el gobierno della, que siguiéndolos, necesariamente se han de perder, y con nombre de conservación del Estado arruinar sus estados y señoríos; porque tomando una máscara y dulce nombre de razón de estado (cuya conservación y acrecentamiento es el blanco en que los príncipes comunmente tienen puesta la mira), todo lo que consultan, tratan y determinan, miden con esta medida y nivelan con este nivel. (Rivandeneira 452)

Indeed, Rivandeneira expresses what will become a common negative reaction to Machiavellian political theory in Spain, especially in the early seventeenth century. As we have seen in the second chapter, writers such as Juan Salazar, Jeronimo Zeballos, Martir Rizo, Mateo Renzi and Pedro Maldonado all propagate the idea of a "Christian prince," whose exemplary virtues will naturally produce outstanding political success. Of course, this is antithetical to Machiavelli's

“razón de estado” in which the prince sacrifices his internal virtues, if he has any at all, in order to maintain the appearance of being an effective ruler.

Even Baltazar Gracián, who is often accused of endorsing a modified form of Machiavellianism because his *Arte de prudencia* stresses appearance over substance, nevertheless joins his Spanish counterparts in condemning the Florentine for placing the state above the Church. Indeed, he even conforms to the idea of a Christian prince, which he expresses clearly in *El heroe* when he lauds Spain’s national success as a natural product of the spiritual strength of its rulers, exclaiming, “los reyes católicos, Fernando e Isabel, fueron el *non plus ultra*, digo columnas de la fe. El bueno, casto, el pio, el zeloso de los Felipos españoles, no perdiendo un palmo de tierra, ganó a varas el cielo, y de verdad, que venció más monstrous con su virtud que Alcides con su clava” (*Heroe* 74). Gracián’s statements indicate that as late as the 1650s, the Christian prince was still the dominant political theory in Spain.

However, writers such as Gracián and Saavedra Fajardo began exploring ideas suggesting that in politics, perceptions and reality do not necessarily need to complement each other. In his 1640 treatise *Idea de un principe político-cristiano*, for example, Saavedra tries to merge Spanish Christian prince doctrines with Machiavellian principals of controlling perceptions by suggesting that monarchs have multiple and contradictory layers. To illustrate, he proposes that kings are like an oyster that hides its pearl with an outer husk. Because its outward appearance does not reflect its internal qualities, reasons Saavedra, the oyster’s characteristics are entirely relative to the perspective of the viewer – it can be either a beautiful jewel, or an ugly mollusk depending on how one perceives it. The ambassador explains: “nadie juzgaría su belleza por lo exterior, tosco, i mal pulido. Asi se engañan los sentidos en el examen de las acciones exteriors, obrando por las primeras apariencias de las cosas, sin pernetrar lo que está dentro de ellas” (215).

Once a prince realizes that outer layers can deceive the senses, he can use this epiphany to his benefit. The point of Saavedra's analogy is to illustrate that perception and representation are the two most important weapons in a prince's arsenal and are often the determining factors in a successful campaign:

en la magestad real no hay más fuerza que respecto, el que nace de la admiracion, y del temor ... fundada en la opinion agena ... Esta reputación obra mayors efectos en la Guerra, donde corta más que la espada, y obra más la opinion que el valor. (208-09)

Saavedra, like Gracián, attempts to link Machavelli's idea of using perception and representations as a political weapon, while at the same time conforming to Spanish notions of a Christian prince, who, despite strategically manipulating his outward *representation*, nevertheless maintains a virtuous internal-self. At least in this regard, they reject Machiavelli's premise that internal virtue is irrelevant and conform the Spanish notion that a monarch's internal are paramount to his or her ability to administer justice. Nevertheless, Gracián and Saavedra admit that perception and internal reality often do not coincide, and a prudent person will use this fact to their benefit.

Similarly, Mira de Amescua's *Cabrera* plays present political scenarios in which the characters carefully craft their self-representations at the Aragonese court of Pedro IV. When viewed under the lens of the *privado* / monarch relationship, Gracián's chess game of *voluntades* becomes especially evident in Mira's theatrical method of infusing almost every dialogue with an extraordinary number of asides, thereby revealing that the characters' spoken words do not reflect their inner thoughts. Such a disconnect between reality and perception, however, does not benefit anyone in the long term, and Mira warns that manipulating *voluntades* is a catalyst for

disaster. In this way, Mira anticipates writers like Gracián and Saavedra by staging *privanza* as an experiment in self-representation. Ultimately, Mira rejects notions of projecting an inauthentic self for political advancement and maintains that any achievements won in such a fashion, like the manor in which they are attained, are nothing but smoke and mirrors.

Próspera fortuna

Mira de Amescua's *La próspera* and *Adversa fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera* follow the same model as the Luna plays by tracing one *privado*'s rise to power at the same time another royal favorite falls into ruin. Even though Mira scholar James Castañeda has identified the Cabrera *comedias* as "one of the best dramatic treatments of the theme of the fallen favorite" (58), critics have routinely ignored the plays. In fact, until Argalló's 2003 critical edition, there was not even a modern version of the plays available.

Unlike the historical Carvajal brothers and Alvaro de Luna, Bernardo de Cabrera's fame as a fallen *privado* never generated much interest before Mira's two plays. The plays' monarch, Pedro IV of Aragon, was similarly undistinguished and did not enjoy the same notoriety in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Juan II or Fernando IV. Jeronimo Zavallos mentions them in *Arte real* in a long list of murdered *privados*, claiming Spain was filled with "otros ejemplos tragicos de privanza como el de don Bernardo de Cabrera a quien don Pedro el quarto Rey de Aragon mandó a matar" (69), but there are no *romanceros* recorded which mention him, and other than passing references in the occasional chronicle, Cabrera seems to have been forgotten to history until Mira dramatizes his rise and fall.

There are two sources that would have been available to Mira at plot material: the fourteenth-century *Crónica del Rey de Aragón Don Pedro IV el Ceremonioso*, written in Latin supposedly by Pedro IV himself and reprinted in 1546 (Bofarull ix), and sixteenth-century

historian Zurita y Castro's history, the *Anales de la corona de Aragón*. Although they report the same event, the two sources are very different in their interpretation of Cabrera's execution.

Zurita y Castro, like Zaballos, views the *privado*'s fall as just another example of how *privanza* to the king inevitably leads to destruction. He writes:

A don Bernaldo de Cabrera le fue veneno su privanza. De la prisión de don Bernaldo de Cabrera se persuadieron las gentes que sus culpas eran tan graves que era él solo el autor de todos los daños recibidos en las guerras pasadas. Y como es cosa ordinaria que los grandes privados de los príncipes sean envidiados comúnmente y malquistos, este caballero lo fue mucho más por tener gran lugar en la privanza de un rey, que por su condición y naturaleza fue demasíadamente áspero y riguroso, como lo mostró con sus propios hermanos. (Zurita y Castro 335)

Here, the chronicler describes Cabrera's downfall as a "cosa ordinaria" that occurs with every *privado*, mirroring *Arte real*'s warning that every favorite is destined for death at the hands of the monarch. Like Icarus, he rose too high in the court and allowed himself to become burned by power.

Although much less detailed in its information about Cabrera, the *Crónica del rey de Aragón* is especially striking because it was supposedly penned by Pedro IV himself. The monarch's cold, emotionless prose is indeed ominous as he describes sending his former favorite to the execution block:

... encontramos que dicho mosen Bernardo de Cabrera era digno de muerte y de la perdida de todos sus bienes, por lo que, en pleno consejo, declaramos y quisimos que perdiese la cabeza y se le confiscasen aquellos ... dieses muerte al

referido mosen Bernardo de Cabrera, esto es, que en la plaza de la puerta llamada de Toledo de dicha ciudad se le hiciese cortar la cabeza. (367)

He never discusses Cabrera as a great *privado* like Zurita y Castro, but Pedro's cold and almost casual statement that "quisimios que perdiese la cabeza" would have fit the seventeenth-century mold of an ungrateful monarch who murders his counselors, just like Jeronimo Zavallos and Pedro Maldonado warn in their treatises.

Notwithstanding Mira's source material, information about Pedro and Cabrera seems to have not been widely circulated, and certainly not to the same level as the Luna and Carvajal stories. Indeed, Alvaro de Luna and the Carvajal brother's fall from royal favor was legendary, and, as we saw in the last chapters, was widely known in the seventeenth-century. Unless there was a seasoned historian in Mira's audience who had read Zurita y Castro, however, most theatergoers would likely be unfamiliar with Cabrera and would have no preconceived notions about him or about Pedro IV. As a result, Mira's dramatic characters would have been blank slates on which he could portray them in any way he wanted. Luna, Juan, Fernando IV, and the Carvajals may have carried much historical baggage onto the stage, but Cabrera and Pedro IV, at least in this case, depend entirely on Mira for their characterizations.

Explaining Lope de Vega's historical kings, Melveena Mckendrick writes that the playwright utilized medieval history because its remoteness from the audience allowed them to project onto the plots their own experiences and knowledge of current political problems (162). At the same time, vague notions of past monarchs allowed the playwright to show the audience to compare example after example of rulers who exemplify idealized images of monarchy, as well as examples of those who fail to measure up to such standards. She writes:

the contradictions of monarchy were more effectively as well as more tactfully understood in the context of the more intimate medieval pattern of kingship rather than in terms of Renaissance political abstractions. Medieval kings are dehistoricized in order to create images of kingship convenient to the representation of general kingship issues. (162)

While McKendrick speaks to Lope's use of medieval history, Mira de Amescua's resurrection of medieval *privados* accomplishes a similar purpose, as the audience watching would almost certainly envision similar events occurring in the courts of Philip III and Philip IV. Moreover, Mira's choice of obscure historical figures for the Bernardo de Cabrera plays allow the characters to directly dialogue with the audience. With no preconceived notions about who Cabrera or Pedro are, it is their dramatic asides which reveal their true inner selves to the audience, thereby exposing the play's dialogue as artificial and deceitful.

Before continuing, a brief summary would be helpful. The *Próspera fortuna* begins with two friends, Bernardo de Cabrera and Lope de Luna traveling to the Aragonese court of Pedro IV in the hope of gaining favors in the king's service. Both men are equal in every way. Although they are currently impoverished, both men descend from illustrious families who served the previous monarch with distinction. Their fathers' reputations, they hope, will allow them access to King Pedro in order to seek their fortunes. Armed with the goal of helping each other attain wealth and favor, Cabrera and Luna walk into court on equal footing. Fortune seems to have different plans, however, when the king immediately elevates Cabrera to *privado* and *gentilhombre de la camara* but ignores Luna's acts of service. Luna and Cabrera devise various covert strategies to influence the king's opinion of Lope in his favor so that both friends might enjoy royal favor. Their efforts prove unsuccessful, however, largely because the king would

rather peruse doña Leonora, his love interest, than pay attention to his servants. At the same time, the new court arrivals catch the attentions of Princess Violante, the king's sister, along with her companion Leonora, who is the king's love interest and member of the influential Trastámara family, as well as their servant Dorotea. Violante and Leonora immediately reveal that they are both in love with Cabrera, while Dorotea becomes enamored with Luna. Each of these ladies proceeds to engage in court intrigues that lasts the entire *comedia*. In a highly manipulative effort to persuade Cabrera's interests in their favor while at the same time dissuading him from any sentiments that may benefit their competitors, Violante, Leonora, and Dorotea each resort to Machiavellian measures try to outcompete each other. They forge letters with each other's signatures, lie to courtiers, and even wear disguises in hopes of elevating their own chances with Cabrera while at the same time sabotaging the other ladies' efforts.

Act two opens with the king appointing Cabrera to lead a military expedition to Sardinia in order to crush a rebellion that has broken out there. Cabrera sees this as a perfect chance for Luna to showcase his bravery and to catch the king's attention. The soldiers return victorious, and Cabrera tries several more times to persuade the king to honor Luna, who performed bravely in battle. Each time Cabrera brings Luna's name into a conversation, however, Pedro ignores the hints. Meanwhile, Violante, Leonora, and Dorotea's schemes have become more elaborate. For example, Violante arranges a meeting with Cabrera at night in order to profess her love, but before she can meet the *privado*, her servant Leonora intercepts the rendezvous information. She strategizes that Cabrera will lose interest in the princess if he thinks she has another lover, so Leonora disguises herself as a man and lingers in the garden where the meeting is supposed to take place. Her plan succeeds, and Cabrera sees the "suitor" and decides not to wait for the princess.

Act three portrays the movements of the Wheel of Fortune and the *privanza* genre most clearly. Cabrera reaches his highest point of power when king Pedro arranges a Roman-styled triumph for the *privado* when he returns from another battle. In front of all of Zaragoza, Cabrera is crowned with a laurel wreath amid an enormous crowd of cheering subjects. At the same time, Luna has resigned himself to failure at court and accepted the seemingly inevitable fact that the king will never show him favors. At his lowest point, Luna announces that he intends to give up on life and hide away in a monastery.

Mira continues the Wheel of Fortune and eclipsing analogies from the Luna plays, this time playing off of Lope de Luna's name. Mira even jokes at the predictability of the eclipse imagery when the *gracioso* character Lazaro comments that Luna will enjoy great fortune because his name implies he will rise in luminosity. When Lazaro encounters Cabrera and Luna on the road to Zaragoza at the beginning of the first act, he declares that he wants to accompany them to court because he is in need of employment. The lackey decides that it would be in his best interest to serve the man who will most likely advance the highest at court. Having nothing but their names to rely on, however, the Lazaro chooses to serve Luna because his name sounds more lucrative:

Y 'cabrera' no me suena
 bien; mejor es la 'luna',
 que quizá se verá llena
 de riqueza y fortuna,
 y será mi dicha buena (1. 193-202)

The *gracioso*'s statements establish Mira's formulaic eclipse imagery in the very first scene, and true to form, the playwright continues the analogy throughout both *comedias* with constant

references to interplay between light / dark, sun / moon, and waxing / waning. However, Lazaro also introduces a new motif that distinguishes the Cabrera plays from the Luna *comedias*. Indeed, the dramatic text marks the above quote as an aside, and as such, it is meant to be viewed as an internal monologue that Cabrera and Luna cannot hear. The only part the *privados* are allowed to hear is the simplistic statement that Lazaro utters at them, “escojo ... Don Lope ha de ser mi amo” (1. 189, 203). In between the two simplistic and plain lines fed to the *privados*, however Lazaro delivers a full seventeen-line aside about how Luna will be the master who is most likely to bring wealth to his employees. By separating his thought process from the normal dialogue, the *gracioso* effectively reveals his inner thoughts to the audience while controlling how the other two characters perceive him.

Critics who have studied the use of monological language in plays maintain that the aside’s theatrical function is to interrupt the dialogue between the onstage characters to inform the audience of some hidden information in order to heighten dramatic irony. As Manfred Pfister writes, “ [the] aside enables the author to either to present the figure’s thoughts directly ... [or] to give frank commentary on a particular situation free of any strategic considerations” (138). Jeremy Lopez adds that “all asides create and rely on for their effects a simple dramatic irony: the audience and some characters know more than some other characters” (57). The heart of the aside, therefore, is concealment and deception, as Lopez adds that “characters tend to use asides to say exactly the opposite of what they have just said or what is being said by others in the main dialogue” (Lopez 64). In the same instance the character breaks from the dialogue and directly addresses the audience, he or she is simultaneously concealing information from the other characters. It is no surprise, therefore, that Pfister notices that the most pervasive employers of asides usually “scheming villains” (Pfister 139).

Indeed, the *Próspera fortuna* presents a Spanish court in which manipulation is the standard currency. The *privados* constantly scheme to persuade the king to shower Luna with favors, and the ladies' incessant plots of sabotage are a striking difference from Mira's earlier *privanza* plays that omit court intrigue. As stated earlier, however, Mira infuses almost all of the dialogues with detailed asides that allow the audience to follow each character's internal thought processes regardless of what they are saying out loud. As the asides show, everyone carefully considers how other characters will interpret his or her words, and they studiously analyze each other's speech for possible hidden motives, offering an example of what Baltazar Gracián meant when he envisioned courtiers manipulating *perceptions* and *voluntades* like they might move chess pieces around a game board.

Curiously, King Pedro is the character who uses the most asides in the *Próspera fortuna*, although this will later change in the *Adversa fortuna*. When Cabrera and Luna arrive at court in the first scene, for example, the king seems extremely distracted over his current love interest in doña Leonora. In an almost whimsical fashion, Pedro instantly receives Cabrera into his service and appoints him to the royal chamber. It is clear, however, that the king is less concerned about Cabrera and Luna's qualities than he is about appeasing the guests so they will leave him alone to contemplate his love quandary. Indeed, when the fortune seekers enter his court for the first time, Pedro has just received a letter from Leonora stating that she is not interested in his pursuits. Luna begins narrating the heroic deeds of his father and begs the king for the chance to serve him. After the speech, however, the king reveals that he had not listened at all, exclaiming:

¡oh cruel Leonora

Yo he estado divertido, y no he escuchado

Lo que aqueste me ha dicho; encubrir quiero

Esta poca atención, que es gran defeto

En el rey y el juez. (1. 298-303)

Moreover, Pedro reveals in his aside that he plans to conceal the fact from the courtiers that he has not heard Luna, exclaiming that such a lapse will make him appear to be a bad king. Like a Machiavellian strategist, Pedro decides to uphold the appearance of “rey y juez” even though his distractions caused these qualities to momentarily lapse.

A dedicated friend, Cabrera tries again and again to use his new position at court to persuade the king to give Lope de Luna equal honors. However, the king’s overt disinterest in Cabrera continues. Despite feigning to show interest in his new *privado*, the king’s asides reveal that he is bored with Cabrera and considers him a distraction his pursuit of Leonora. For example, Cabrera plots to win Luna royal favor by arranging an audience in which Lope presents Pedro with his written credentials. Pedro, of course, wishes to be polite to both Cabrera and Lope and exclaims that he will read the letter “de buena gana” as they turn to walk out of the room (1. 702) However, because the king proceeds to read the note as an *aparte* out of Lope and Cabrera’s earshot, he feels no obligation to finish it. Halfway through reading the credentials, the secretary informs the king that that Leonora has arrived and requested an audience. Pedro stops reading Lope’s letter midsentence and drops the paper to the floor.

A parallel scene occurs when King Pedro yet again overlooks Lope de Luna’s service to the crown. Bringing news of Aragón’s victory in Sardinia, Cabrera seizes the opportunity to relay Luna’s dedication in hope that he will finally gain royal favor. When Cabrera begins recounting the battle of Sardinia, however, the king falls asleep and does not hear of Luna’s deeds. Cabrera, unaware that the king has dozed off, continues his monologue. When Pedro finally awakens, he mentions in an aside that he had no interest in hearing about the battle:

De su discurso
 He perdido gran pedazo,
 Que mi sentido sepulto
 En grave y profundo seño
 Por Cabrera disimulo,
 Que se correrá si entiene
 Que no escuché el fin. (2. 1294-1300)

Instead of inquiring further as to what happened in Sardinia, Pedro pretends that he heard the entire account in fear that Cabrera will repeat the speech if he realizes the king was asleep. His only concern, it seems, is to stop Cabrera from talking. Nevertheless, the king feigns interest and regales the brave participants in the battle with titles and awards. Because he was asleep when Lope's name was mentioned, however, he yet again fails to recognize the unfortunate Luna. This incident, along with the earlier examples when Pedro drops Luna's credentials on the floor and does not pay attention to his speech, show that the monarch is not interested in his ministers. Despite Pedro's admissions to the audience in his asides, however, he actively attempts to represent himself as an engaged and prudent monarch, even when his monologic speech says otherwise.

Indeed, Pedro is not the only character who openly strategizes about how to represent themselves to the other characters. In fact, Mira modifies his *privanza* analogy to reflect Cabrera and Luna's active role in seeking advancement in the court by presenting themselves in the most advantageous way possible. As we have seen, seventeenth-century language describing *privanza* frequently attributes the favorites rise and fall to the Wheel of Fortune. Both of Mira's Luna plays, as well as Salucio del Poyo's 1601 prototype *La cayda de don Alvaro de Luna*, follow

standard political treatises which claim that history has shown *privados* as being subjected to rises and falls. Indeed, the pattern is so common throughout history, as Zaballos and Rizo have pointed out, that the *privado*'s fall from favor came to be viewed as a necessary condition of the office itself.

In the Cabrera plays, however, the *privados* take a much more active role in determining their fortunes, and instead of being subjected to the Wheel's movements, they actively seek out fortune by their own efforts. Mirroring this conceptual change in royal favoritism, Mira has his *privados* suggests a new metaphor for *privanza* that compliments the characters' deliberate intent to raise their status at court. Whereas the Luna plays present *privanza* as a wheel or celestial light that is received without effort, Lope de Luna instead suggests that *privanza* is a tree that must be climbed:

Cuando dos en el verano
suben a un árbol ufano,
el que de más fuerzas es
sube primero y después
al otro le da la mano.
Un árbol es la privanza
que en su abril suele ofrecer
fruto y flores de esperanza
y a veces suele caer
el que las flores alcanza.
Si el favor un árbol es
y a mí de subir me priva

mi desdicha, como ves,
 trepa bien y sube arriba
 porque la mano me des.
 Verte levantado espero
 en las alas de tu dicha,
 y aunque yo seguirte quiero
 el peso de mi desdicha
 me hace no ser ligera. (*Prospera de Bernardo* 1. 608-27)

Luna's analogy here differs from the traditional lunar/solar metaphors in that it recognizes that royal favor requires effort to attain and to maintain. As a climber ascends a tree one branch at a time, so too must a *privado* rise to prominence at court by his own hand. In addition, Luna also enters a pact with Cabrera that they will share their mutual fortunes and use any position they may gain to help the other attain favors, thereby helping each other climb the tree of *privanza*.

Cabrera and Luna, it must be noted, carefully craft their representations in a positive light in order to win the king's favor, but they never overtly attempt to manipulate him in a manner that suggests a usurpation of his will. The *privados* may be more subtle in their strategies to win favor, but the female characters admit that they are manipulating people's perceptions for their own benefit. Explicitly following a Machiavellian strategy in which they falsify their external qualities to attain their goal, the court ladies reveal in their many asides that their internal selves are not what they represent in normal dialogue. When Leonora meets Cabrera, for example, she decides to peruse him as a love interest. Mira continues his dramatic strategy of revealing the character's internal motives with asides, and she interrupts a conversation with Cabrera and exclaims:

(Con industria se han domado
 reinos, que libres se vieron,
 remos el agua rompieron,
 hombres el aire han volado,
 muchas aves han hablado,
 frenos se han puesto a la fiera,
 prisión al ave ligera
 y silencio a la mujer;
 y con la industria he de hacer
 que don Bernardo me quiera). (1. 828-37)

Of course, the entire speech is monologic and is meant to be interpreted as Leonora's internal thought process that Cabrera cannot hear. Externally, she exclaims that she will assist Cabrera in winning Princess Violante by helping him write her a love letter, and she even directs him to a writing desk that has been left on stage by the Secretary. Internally, however, she reveals to the audience that she has no intentions of delivering the letter to the princess and instead vows to manipulate the situation in her favor.

Leonora's Machiavellian aside establishes Mira's mode for representing his dramatic characters as possessing two distinct personalities – the internal self which is expressed through asides, and an exterior façade in which characters carefully control their words in order to manipulate each other. Just as Luna's earlier remarks that one must climb *privanza* as one might climb a tree, Leonora affirms that a person must acquire what they want from effort. In her aside, she describes "industria" as capable of manipulating a thing to behave contrary to its nature –

just as it can make men fly in the air and imprison free birds, so too can Leonora use “industria” coerce Cabrera into falling in love with her.

Adversa fortuna

In the first Cabrera play, Mira shows how everyone, including the king, are concealing their thoughts and agendas from the other characters. Luna and Cabrera want to serve the king in order to win fortune, Violante and Leonora each secretly are in love with Cabrera, and King Pedro wants to eschew his responsibilities onto his advisors so he can enjoy a life of leisure. To this end, they carefully craft their external selves to adapt each situation to their benefit, following what Gracián, and indeed, Machiavelli espouse when they advocate the usefulness of presentation and appearance in attaining their goals.

In the *Adversa fortuna*, this game between the strategizing inner self and the carefully projected outer self continues. The beginning of the play does not imply any kind of time break between the two *comedias*, and act one begins where the *Próspera fortuna*'s act 3 ended. Cabrera has become engaged to Princess Violante, and King Pedro leaves the entire kingdom of Aragon in the *privado*'s hands, using his idleness to plan festivities for the palace. During a particularly wild night of celebrations commemorating the *Noche de San Juan*, Lope de Luna becomes involved in a street fight which results in the death of Lionido, a local musician. Cabrera hears the screams, and rushes to the victim's aid, not realizing that his friend Luna is the killer. Disturbed by what he thinks is a murder, Cabrera carries the body away for proper burial. Despite being responsible for the death, however, Luna's fortune begins its rapid ascent, and the king finally realizes that he has neglected years of Luna's dedicated service. Pedro summons Luna into his presence, and declares that Luna will be rewarded handsomely. Meanwhile, Violante inexplicably delays her wedding to Cabrera, much to the *privado*'s bewilderment.

Cabrera finally senses his downward turn of fortune when the king declines to intervene in the wedding plans, insisting instead that Cabrera obey the Princess's wishes.

At the end of act 1, both Cabrera and King Pedro are standing on stage together, yet Mira presents their entire exchange in a sequence of monologic asides, exposing their internal selves as quite different from how they construct their external representations. The king is clearly upset with his sister for rejecting his friend and *privado*, yet his royal duties require him to be perceived as siding the princess. Similarly, Cabrera reads the king's external stoicism as an indictment against him, not realizing that the king, at least internally, takes his side in the matter:

Cabrera:

(¿Qué tenéis, alma cobarde?

¿Qué novedades son éstas?

¿Qué no se hacen las fiestas

ni entra el Príncipe esta tarde?

El palacio está suspenso,

el vulgo maravillado,

y yo confuso y turbado,

quimeras no alegres pienso.

El Rey me mira; sospecho

que está triste y con enojos,

que el Rey descubre en los ojos

el odio o el amor del pecho.

La cara del Rey es luna

que nunca está en un estado,

y espejo en que ve el criado
su buena o mala fortuna).

Rey:

(Ya el Almirante ha sabido
la mudanza de la Infanta,
porque su tristeza es tanta
que el alma me ha enternecido.

¿Qué le podré responder
para no darle pesar?)

Cabrera:

(Animo, quiero llegar,
que a nadie dañó el saber).

¿Vuestra majestad está
bueno? ¿Qué tiene, señor?

Rey:

(Lágrimas vierto de amor).

La Infanta te lo dirá.

Cabrera:

(Largo pienso que ha de ser
mi pleito, pues se remite). (1. 920-49)

In this unique dramatic staging, both the king and the *privado* simultaneously reveal their inner thoughts to the audience in the form of extended asides. The entire scene contains thirty lines between the two of them, yet the only words that are exchanged in dialogue form are Cabrera's

question “¿Qué tiene, señor?” and the king’s reply, “la Infant a te lo dirá.” Everything else, as marked in Agulló’s critical edition in parenthesis, represents the king and Cabrera’s internal selves. Externally, they both project emotionless versions of themselves that minimize the princess’s snub to the *privado*. On the inside, however, they each scrutinizing the other’s tones, facial feature, and movements for possible clues as to their true disposition. Cabrera asks himself, for example:

El Rey me mira; sospecho
que está triste y con enojos,
que el Rey descubre en los ojos
el odio o el amor del pecho. (1. 928-31)

Indeed, Cabrera is not naïve as to believe that the king’s thought and speech are the same thing, and recognizes the fact that the monarch is concealing an inner self – one that seems to be angry and disappointed at his *privado*. This exchange also marks the point in the plays in which Cabrera becomes aware that Fortune has turned on him. Mirroring Mira’s eclipse analogy which pervades all four of his *privado* plays, Cabrera compares Pedro’s face to the moon, exclaiming that the favorite can see his own future waning in the king’s solemn expressions.

In the second act, Lope de Luna is elevated to *privado* status and named Admiral of Aragon, a title previously held by Cabrera. Cabrera, on the other hand, abandons the court for a monastery, exclaiming that the court is too dangerous. Although he has so far enjoyed the king’s blessings, Cabrera announces that monarchy is too unpredictable to anticipate continued fortune, exclaiming:

Yo en la corte fui privado,
avisóme la malicia,

al Rey vi, y, como es justicia,
 temí, y entréme en sagrado.
 El mar, y aunque en paz la sienta,
 vile yo turbado un día;
 y calma no confía
 el que ha visto la tormenta. (2. 2280-87)

In this exchange, Cabrera speaks directly to his lackey Lazaro and describes the king as a sea that can be calm or violent. Here, Cabrera seems to know what Zavallos articulates in *Arte real* -- a king can suddenly and without warning change his temperament with deadly consequences.

The king eventually orders Cabrera to return to court, however, and reaffirms that he has administrative powers over the entire kingdom and names him personal tutor to his son, Prince Juan. For a brief moment, both Cabrera and Luna enjoy the king's full favors just as they always wanted. Jealous courtiers led by the Count of Trastamara and Pedro's ungrateful son Juan, however, learn that Cabrera was seen carrying away the body of Lionido during the *Noche de San Juan* festival. They seize this new evidence as perfect ammunition in their quest to bring the *privado* down, and they start circulating rumors implicating Cabrera in Lionido's murder. At the same time, Pedro's estranged brother Carlos sends Cabrera a letter in order to recruit him to a scheme to usurp the Aragonese throne. Cabrera immediately dismisses the offer, but he thinks that he may be able to convince Carlos to reconcile with his brother. As he is dictating a letter to the rebel, however, the king walks by and hears Bernardo's closing statement:

Y así yo te serviré
 En todo cuanto mantares.
 Hazlo, Infante, desta suerte,

Y a fe qu te valga mucho. (2. 1667-70)

The statement is taken completely out of context, as Cabrera never had any treacherous intentions and iterated over and over again in asides that he wanted to persuade Carlos to submit to Pedro's authority. Nevertheless, the king interprets Cabrera's statement as treason and confines the *privado* to house arrest for conspiring with the usurper. If he breaks the incarceration, Cabrera is warned, he will be executed. Heartbroken at this act of ingratitude, the fallen *privado* arranges to have all of property returned to the royal treasury.

While in home confinement, however, Cabrera receives news that the king's brother Carlos plans to usurp the Aragonese crown by murdering Pedro. Cabrera leaves his room against orders and rides out to rescue the king, who at this time is hunting with Luna in the forest. The fallen favorite intercepts the hunting party and manages to drive away Carlos's assassins just in time to save the king. When Pedro and Luna arrive at the scene, however, the king misinterprets what he sees and assumes that Cabrera had been following him for sinister purposes. Once the most powerful man in Aragon, Cabrera is sentenced to death for treason and murder. Luna tries to use his new position to save his friend, but the king claims that pardoning Cabrera would be impossible because he is a murderer and a traitor. After Cabrera is beheaded, the king realizes that Cabrera was a victim of unfortunate circumstances and expresses profound grief over what he has done. Desperately trying to make amends for his ingratitude, Pedro posthumously restores Cabrera's titles and allows his family to inherit his wealth.

Throughout most of the two plays, Mira uses dramatic asides to demonstrate two versions of each character -- their internal thoughts which reveal their motives, and their audible dialogues in which they hide the internal, instead projecting representations of themselves in order to advance their interests at court. The final scenes of the *Adversa fortuna*, however, Mira

reverses this strategy in a dramatic moment when Cabrera finally abandons the “game” of representations, and instead desperately tries to reveal to the court his true self stripped of any rhetorical posturing or heightened representations:

Pues sois luz, Rey español,
 ved mi inocencia con ella;
 pero el Rey es luz de estrella,
 sólo Dios es luz del sol.
 Si poca luz podéis dar
 en esta verdad oscura,
 siendo sombra la pintura,
 ¿cómo la podrá alumbrar?
 ¡Plegue al cielo que tan alta
 tengáis la dicha real
 que este vasallo leal
 nunca llegue a haceros falta!
 No deshagáis los privados
 porque hay culpas aparentes,
 enemistad en las gentes
 y desdicha en los privados. (3. 2790-2805)

In this long monologue, Cabrera pleads for justice in front of the entire court as they all stand on stage. Perhaps for the first time in the play, Cabrera integrates his inner thoughts and feelings with the dialogue -- he tells the court exactly what he is thinking, thereby revealing his true self.

One by one, however, each character walks off stage while Cabrera continues to speak. The king leaves first after Cabrera professes that he did not conspire with the usurping Carlos. Ignoring the king's departure, Cabrera keeps speaking without interruption. Next the Count Ribagazore walks off and after Cabrera pleads his innocence in Lionido's murder. Eventually, all of the characters physically walk off the stage and leave Cabrera, who is still speaking, alone with Pedro's portrait. This unique scene shows that the characters in the Cabrera plays are so accustomed to dialogic "games" that they reject Cabrera's pleas to reveal his inner self. One by one, they leave the stage, thereby effectively rendering the *privado's* speech into a monologic aside that only the audience can hear. Interested in only appearances and representations, the court rejects Cabrera's inner self.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Mira's version of Juan II remains a passive monarch who has relinquished his autonomy and *voluntad*. As such, he is not even capable of contemplating his own role in Luna's death as evidenced by his despondent response to Juana Pimentel's indictment against his own accountability. This complements the plays' rhetorical strategy of not giving a reason for Luna's execution – Fate turned against him and he had to die. King Pedro, however, is forced to recognize that he executed an innocent man for reasons that were later revealed to be lies. This realization causes an extreme crisis in his conception of the monarchy as the source of justice:

¡Mal haya el rey que a las culpas
 crédito da sin mirarlas
 con atención y cuidado
 extraordinario! ¡Mal haya
 el que deshace su hechura

fácilmente, pues se engañan
 los ojos del rey a veces,
 y hay informaciones falsas!
 Miren los reyes primero
 a quién favorecen y aman
 y después tengan firmeza.
 Sus hechuras no deshagan
 sin mucha causa. ¡Ay de mí!
 Llamen crüel a quien mata
 sus amigos de este modo.
 ¡Oh, tragedia desdichada! (3. 3147-63)

In the final scene of the play, King Pedro recognizes that court intrigues and false information caused him to commit a grievous error in judgment. He failed to consider Cabrera's true self, and instead only perceived representations of the *privado* which were fed to him by jealous courtiers. Here, Mira de Amescua's rejection of Machiavellian concept of the artificial, external self is at its clearest. The king failed in his duty as Aragon's ultimate source of justice, and instead fell victim to false representations – he believed courtiers who were liars, and projected onto Cabrera a representation which was not real. Like Baltasar Gracián's chess game, Mira suggests that a court which plays people's *voluntades* for self-advancement will result in disaster.

Offering an example of what he defines as a divergence between things and their representations in the Baroque, Foucault describes Cervantes's Don Quixote as a character whose *representation* has successfully supplanted any former resemblance to an actual thing:

[Quixote] has achieved his reality – a reality he owes to language alone, and which resides entirely in the words. Don Quixote’s truth is not in the relation of the words to the world but in that slender and constant relation woven between themselves by verbal signs. (*Order of things* 8)

By never revealing anything but his external representation, Quixote becomes a projection who exists in a never-ending game which, in Foucault’s words, “deceive the senses” (51).

In a political context, Machiavelli advocates that a prince should follow a similar strategy and construct representations of himself which allow him to be different things at once. If a populous such as Spain demands that its monarch be religious, then the Florentine suggests deceiving their senses when he exclaims, “it is not necessary for a prince to have [virtuous] qualities in fact, but it is indeed necessary to appear to have them” (Machiavelli 70). For Machiavelli, fact and appearance do not have to coincide. Likewise, Mira de Amescua constructs each character in the Bernardo de Cabrera plays as having two distinct selves: an internal, psychological self which reveals itself through molologic asides, and a different, and often contradictory self which engages in normal dialogue. Despite conforming to what Machiavelli and Baltazar Gracián might laud as artful court politics, however, Mira’s counterreformation theology, especially his adherence to Molinist notions of absolute autonomy, rejects representations that have no basis in substance. In doing so, Mira defends the political theory of the Christian Prince and suggests that kings and courtiers who delve into games of deceit and false representations will suffer catastrophic consequences.

The Bernardo de Cabrera plays have received so little critical attention partly because they are considered as an exact formulaic example of Mira’s *comedia de privanza* genre, and as such, they are dismissed as an unoriginal copy the Luna plays, only with different characters. In

many regards, the Bernardo de Cabrera and Alvaro de Luna plays are indeed very similar – both frame their structure and language on the eclipse analogy and, in the process, evoke themes of power and fortune. However, there are also striking differences that allow the Cabrera plays to stand alone in their unique treatment of *privanza*. In the Luna plays, the *privados* Alvaro de Luna and Ruy Gomez do not seem to be aware of *privanza* as an institution or of its inherent danger. They only want to serve the king faithfully, and they are both shocked when fortune “unexpectedly” turned against them. Throughout the rise and fall of Cabrera, however, the *privados* overtly discuss royal favoritism as something that must be attained through diligent efforts and calculated self-representations. At the same time, Cabrera and Lope de Luna are keenly aware that at any time they may become victims to *privanza*’s instability and fall rapidly.

Unfortunately, Mira de Amescua has often been overlooked by critics as a playwright who merely imitates, albeit very artfully, Lope de Vega’s dramatic style. It was no secret that Mira admired Lope, often finding ways to insert himself into Madrid’s literary events where Lope was a featured guest. He never achieved the level of fame and status that Lope, Tirso, and Calderón enjoyed, but archival evidence indicates that his contemporaries recognized Mira as a gifted playwright in his own right.

As the Luna and Cabrera plays illustrate, however, Mira masterfully explores weighty philosophical themes of human autonomy, the self, and its representation by framing his *comedias* around royal favoritism, an institution which itself raises many of the same questions. In an age when the king was represented as a static icon with superhuman piety, theater allowed the public to delve deeper into the actual person and discover his thought processes, motives, and even failures. In doing so, the playwright give us a unique perspective on *privanza*, one of the most important political issues in seventeenth-century Spain, but more importantly Mira explores

how the emerging notion of the self maintained itself against negative influence. In each case, the king's failure to recognize his own autonomy resulted in his enslavement and bondage.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

As Antonio Feros attests, the rise of the “prime minister” figure represented a broader political shift in the seventeenth-century, and Philip III and Lerma mirror similar political structures across Europe, including England’s King James and Duke of Buckingham and Louis XIII’s dependence on Cardinal Richelieu in the French court (“Images” 205-08). In Spain, however, the many political treatises which struggled to define the *privado*-monarch structure testify to conceptual difficulties in comprehending and representing a ruler who relinquishes his power, especially during the age which, at least rhetorically, considered royal authority as absolute.

Returning to our initial image of Philip III’s appearance at Margaret’s 1611 funeral, Lerma’s play on perception illustrates how representation lay at the heart of how Spaniards considered the king. Philip renders himself invisible, thereby elevating his status as king when he appears as an almost divine presence when he emerged in a ghostly halo of candlelight. Paradoxically, however, such an image conceals another representation in which Lerma presides over the entire ceremony and the king is reduced to a spectacle which is subjected to gazes of the audience. Philip and Lerma are both and at once the center of the ceremony, and also its periphery.

By presenting this power structure on stage with flesh and blood kings, Lope, and to an even greater extent Mira de Amescua, internalize the tensions of power and representation. In *La inocente sangre*, Lope offers an example of a bad king whose tyranny is caused by the inability

to rule his own passions. In Fernando's case, excessive emotional dependence on his *privado* allows him to become enslaved to his rage and incapable of perusing justice. Similarly, Mira de Amescua's Luna plays offer a stylized approach to presenting a king who relinquished his autonomy to his *privado* to the point where when Luna dies, Juan is symbolically incapable of exerting any will whatsoever and even requires servants to physically move his arms for him. Mira continues this theme in the Cabrera plays, but he uses monologic asides to expose the characters as deliberately manipulating their speech to reflect a carefully constructed representation of themselves while concealing their internal motives. *Privanza*, in this case, is revealed to be a never-ending game of representations and projections in which courtiers and the king depend on appearance instead of substance.

Critics often look to Segismundo's famous monologue in Calderón de la Barca's *La vida es sueño* as an example of the early modern "self" declaring itself to be autonomous, and at the same time imposing internal restrictions which allow the individual to master self-control. Cascardi explains that this triumph of Segismundo's *voluntad* is born out of his ability to control himself, and that "whether the will is ultimately imagined in a philosophical or moral terms as 'free' or 'bound,' there can be no doubt that it was socially and culturally controlled" (124). Segismundo's ability to tame his brutish nature and self-impose order and civility suggests that everyone possesses the ability to regulate themselves.

Speaking to the notion of the self in seventeenth-century Spanish discourse, Cascardi writes that the concept of autonomy emerged from a premise that a person could control their internal wills:

The crisis of subjectivity in early modern Spain can be described as the product of a familiar structural conflict between two distinct value systems, each with its

own psychology and each with its modes of representation proper to it. On the one hand a hierarchical society, in which actions were legitimized according to a series of naturalistic principles, and in which social functions and roles were sedimented in to near-static patterns, was confronted with modes of thinking, feeling, acting, and evaluation based on the premises of a psychologizing ‘individualism,’ ... and in which the dominant cultural ethos was that of auto-regulation or *self*-control. (Cascardi 114)

Following this trend, Lope de Vega and Antonio Mira de Amescua’s *comedias de privanza* provide a glimpse into how seventeenth-century Spanish playwrights advocate the king’s individual autonomy as paramount to national stability by playing on fears that a *privado* can coerce and control the monarch’s *voluntad*. A strong king, therefore, would resist any such influence and govern the realm according to his own internal piety. After all, Foucault writes, the ability to effectively govern others first requires a monarch be become a “master of himself” (*The Government of Self* 270). It is for precisely this reason that in the plays this study analyzes, the king’s inability to “master himself” causes serious injustice to occur. In each case, Fernando IV, Juan II, and Pedro IV renounce their natural obligation to rule and allow their *voluntad* to become compromised by their *privados*.

Lope and Mira, therefore, infuse the early modern Christian Prince political model with emerging notions of the self, maintaining that a prince’s true power emanates from self-control and piety. In this regard, the playwrights criticize kings who do not live up to this ideal, but instead squander their *voluntad* by relinquishing everything, even their autonomy, to a *privado*. In each case, the king’s negligence in maintaining his autonomy causes injustice and death. However, the theatrical kings’ conditions also serve a didactic purpose and the playwrights

suggests that everyone in the audience can head Fernando, Juan, and Pedro's failures as lessons in maintaining proper control over their own *voluntades*. Indeed, seventeenth-century writer Saavedra suggests that a king is a mirror in which we see our own potentials reflected. He writes, for example that:

espejo es publico, en quien se mira el mundo, así las acciones de los Reyes, y cargando el cuidado en ellas. Porque los hombres tomen ejemplo dellos, de lo que les ven hacer, y sobre esto dijeron por ellos, que son como ejemplo, en que los hombres ven su semejanza de apostura o de enatieza. (221)

The kings' failure to guard their own autonomies, in this case, provides a warning to the audience that they too have the power to control their own *voluntad*, but it nevertheless requires effort and constant introspection to maintain.

Rodrigo Calderón's execution in 1621 testifies to the profound suspicion the Spanish held about *privados*, and charges of magical coercion reveal public anxiety over fears that the king could lose his autonomy. What Lope and Mira show, however, is that the real danger is internal, as all of the theatrical kings analyzed in this study lose their *voluntades* because of their own failures. To this end, this dissertation has attempted to show how *privanza* complicates seventeenth-century representations of both kingship as well as the notion of the self. As Lope and Mira's plays attest, a king who relinquishes his authority to another person elicits questions about power, nature of kingship, and individual autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Agulló, Antonio Serrano. *Teatro e historia en Mira de Amescua: Don Bernardo de Cabrera*. Kassel, Germany: Edition Reichenberger, 2006. Print.
- Alcala-Galiano, Antonio, Ed. *Romancero Castellano O Colección De Antiguos Romances Populares De Los Españoles*. Leipsique: F. A. Brockhaus, 1844. Print.
- Almansa y Mendoza, Andres de. "Carta Tercera Que Escrivio En Cavallero Desta Corte a Un Su Amigo." *Relaciones De Actos Públicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)*. Ed. Diaz, Jose Simon. Madrid Instituto de estudios madrileños, 1982. Print.
- . "Sexta Carta Que Escrivio Un Cavallero a Un Su Amigo." *Relaciones De Actos Públicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)*. Ed. Díaz, José Simon. Madrid: Instituto de estudios madrileños, 1982. 142-51. Print.
- Aquinas, Thomas *Summa Theologiae*. Ed. McDermott, Timothy. Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 1989. Print.
- Aquinas, Thomas and Ptolemy of Lucca. *De Regimine Principum*. Trans. Blythe, James M. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997. Print.
- Atienza, Juan G., and Manuel Díez. *Leyendas históricas de España y América: Leyendas que perviven en nuestras tradiciones como hechos históricos*. Madrid: Editorial Edaf, 1999. Print.
- Bass, Laura R. *The Drama of the Portrait : Theater and Visual Culture in Early Modern Spain*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008. Print.
- Bleznick, Donald W. "Spanish Reaction to Machiavelli in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19.4 (1958): 542-550. Print.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *The Fates of Illustrious Men*. Trans. Hall, Louis Brewer. New York: Frederick Unger Publishing, 1965. Print.

Bofarull, Antonio de. "Introducción." *Crónica del rey de Aragón don Pedro IV el ceremonioso, o del Punyalet escrita en lemosín por el mismo monarca*. by Pedro IV de Aragón. Trans. Antonio de Bofarull. Barcelona: Alberto Frexas, 1850. Print.

Boyden, James M. *The Courtier and the King: Ruy Gómez De Silva, Philip II, and the Court of Spain*. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1995.

---. "Fortune has Stripped You of Your Splendour: Favourites and their Fates in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Spain." *The World of the Favourite*. Eds. J. H. Elliott and W. B. Brockliss. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999. 26-37.

Caro Baroja, Julio. *Vidas mágicas e inquisición*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, 1992. Print.

Carreño-Rodríguez, Antonio. *Alegorías Del Poder: Crisis Imperial Y Comedia Nueva (1598-1659)*. Colección Támesis. Serie a, Monografías. Woodbridge ; Rochester, NY: Tamesis, 2009. Print.

Carrillo de Huete, Pedro. *Crónica Del Halconero De Juan II*. Ed. Juan de Mata Carriazo y Arroquia, Manuel González Jiménez, and Rafael Beltrán. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2006. Print.

Cascardi, Anthony J. *Ideologies of History in the Spanish Golden Age*. Penn State Studies in Romance Literatures. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State UP, 1997. Print.

Castañeda, James A. *Mira de Amescua*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977. Print.

Castro, Guillén de. *Al Sepulcro De Don Rodrigo Calderon.*" *Oración funebre en la muerte de Don Rodrigo Calderón*. MS 9306. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid. 63.

- Cauvin, Mary Austin. "The Comedia De Privanza in the Seventeenth Century." Thesis (Ph D in Romance Languages). Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Pennsylvania, 1957. Print.
- Coates, Geraldine. "Lope De Vega, the Chronicle-Legend Plays and Collective Memory." *A Companion to Lope De Vega*. Ed. Thacker, Jonathan and Alexander Samson. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2008. 131-46. Print.
- Cordoba, Cabrera de. *Relaciones De Las Cosas Sucidas En La Corte De España Desde 1599 Hasta 1614*. Madrid: J Martin Alegria 1857. Print.
- Costello, Frank B. . *The Political Philosophy of Luis De Molina*. Spokane: Gonzaga UP, 1974. Print.
- Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. "Biografía de Antonio Mira de Amescua." *Teatro completo*. Vol 3. Ed. Antonio Serrano Agulló. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2003. 7-22. Print.
- Elliott, John Huxtable. *The Count-Duke of Olivares : The Statesman in an Age of Decline*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986. Print.
- . *Imperial Spain, 1469-1716*. London: E. Arnold, 1963. Print.
- . *Spain and Its World, 1500-1700 : Selected Essays*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989. Print.
- Feros, Antonio. "Images of Evil, Images of Kings: The Contrasting Faces of the Royal Favourite and the Prime Minister in Early Modern European Political Literature." *The World of the Favourite*. Ed. Brockliss, W. B. and J.H Elliott. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999. 205-22. Print.
- . *Kingship and Favoritism in the Spain of Philip III, 1598-1621*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

- Ferrer Valls, Teresa “Lope De Vega y la dramatización de la materia genealógica (II): Lecturas de la historia .“ *La Teatralización De La Historia En El Siglo De Oro Español : Actas Del III Coloquio Del Aula-Biblioteca "Mira De Maescua" Celebrado En Granada Del 5 Al 7 De Noviembre De 1999 Y Cuatro Estudios Clásicos Sobre El Tema*. Eds. Castilla Pérez, Roberto and Miguel González Dengra. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2001. 687 p. Print.
- Forcione, Alban K. *Majesty and Humanity: Kings and their Doubles in the Political Drama of the Spanish Golden Age*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2009. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Government of Self and Others : Lectures at the College De France 1982-1983*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan; St Martin’s Press, 2010. Print.
- . *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973. Print.
- Gicovate, Bernardo. “Observations on the Dramatic Art of Tirso De Molina.” *Hispania* 43.1 (1960): 328-37. Print.
- Gomez de Mora, Juan. “Relación De Las Honras Funerales Que Se Hizieron Por La Reyna Doña Margarita De Austria.” *Relaciones De Actos Públicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)*. Ed. Simon Diaz, José Madrid: Instituto de estudios madrileños 1982. Print.
- Gonzales Davila, Gil. *Las Grandezas De La Villa De Madrid, Corte De Los Reyes*. Valladolid: Editorial Maxtor, 2003. Print.
- Gracián, Baltasar. *El heroe*. Amsterdam: Juan Blaeu, 1659.
- . *Oráculo manual y arte de prudencia*. Ed. Emilio Blanco. Madrid: Catedra, 1997. Print.
- Hinjosa, Gonzalo. *Crónica De España Por El Arzobispo De Toledo Don Rodrigo Jiménez De Rada, Traducida Al Castellano Y Continuada Por Don Gonzalo De La Hinojosa, Obispo*

- De Burgos*. Documentos Inéditos Para La Historia De España. Madrid: José Perales y Martínez, 1893. Print.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981. Print.
- Kennedy, Ruth L. "La Prudencia En La Mujer." *PMLA* 63.4 (1948): 1131-90. Print.
- Lauer, Robert A. "The Use and Abuse of History in the Spanish Theater of the Golden Age: The Regicide of Sancho II as Treated by Juan De La Cueva, Guillén De Castro, and Lope De Vega." *Hispanic Review* 56 (1988): 17-37. Print.
- Lopez, Jeremy. *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- Lozano Alonso, María Blanca. "El Despertar Al Mundo De Calderón." *Calderón 2000: Homenaje a Kurt Reichenberger En Su 80 Cumpleaños*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2002. 619-36. Print.
- Lynch, John. *Spain under the Habsburgs*. 2nd. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981. Print.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. Trans. Mansfield, Harvey C. Ed. Mansfield, Harvey C. 2 ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998. Print.
- Madariaga, Juan de. *Del Senado Y De Su Principe*. Valencia: Felipe Mey, 1619. Print.
- Maldonado, Pedro. *Discurso Del Perfecto Privado*. 1609. Mss. 6778. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.
- Maravall, José Antonio. *La Cultura Del Barroco : Análisis De Una Estructura Histórica*. Esplugues de Llobregat: Ariel, 1975. Print.

- Marchante-Aragón, Lucas A. "The King, the Nation, and the Moor: Imperial Spectacle and the Rejection of Hybridity in the Masque of the Expulsion of the Morisco." *The Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 8.1 (2008): 98-133. Print.
- María Martín, Juan. *Fuente Ovejuna por Lope De Vega*. Madrid: Catedra, 2008. Print.
- Mariana, Juan de. "Historia De España." *Obras Del Padre Juan De Mariana*. Vol. 2. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1854. 1-411. Print.
- Martínez Hernández, Santiago. *Rodrigo Calderón : La Sombra Del Valido : Privanza, Favor Y Corrupción En La Corte De Felipe III*. Colección Los Hombres Del Rey. Madrid: publicado por Centro de Estudios Europa Hispánica y Marcial Pons Historia, 2009. Print.
- McCurdy, Raymond R. *The Tragic Fall: Álvaro De Luna and Other Favorites in Spanish Golden Age Drama*. Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages : [distributed by U of North Carolina P], 1978. Print.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Ed. Carriazo, Juan de Mata. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.
- McKendrick, Melveena. *Playing the King : Lope De Vega and the Limits of Conformity*. Colección Tamesis. Serie a, Monografías. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK ; Rochester, NY, USA: Tamesis, 2000. Print.
- Mira de Amescua, Antonio. *Comedia Famosa De Ruy López De Avalos; Primera Parte De Don Alvaro De Luna. (Próspera Fortuna De Don Alvaro De Luna Y Adversa De Ruy López De Avalos) Notas Preliminares Y Nueva Ed. Revisada Por Nellie E. Sánchez-Arce*. México: Editorial Jus, 1965. Print.
- . *El Esclavo Del Demonio*. Ed. Castañeda, James Agustín. Madrid: Catedra, 1984. Print.
- . *La Adversa fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera. Teatro completo*. Vol 3. Ed. Antonio

- Serrano Agulló. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2003. 195-326. Print
- . *La Próspera fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera. Teatro completo*. Vol 3. Ed. Antonio Serrano Agulló. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2003. 25-194. Print.
- . *La Segunda De Don Alvaro, o Adversa Fortuna De Don Álvaro de Luna*. Ed. Sánchez-Arce, Nellie E.: Editorial JUS, 1960. Print.
- Mena, Juan de. *Laberinto De Fortuna*. Ed. Kerkhof, Maxin. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1997. Print.
- Molina, Luis de. *On Divine Foreknowledge*. Ed. Freddoso, Alfred J. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988. Print.
- Molina, Tirso de. "La Prudencia En La Mujer." *Biblioteca De Autores Españoles* Ed. Hartzenbusch, Juan Eugenio. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra 1885. 287-306. Print.
- Moreno, Juan Antonio, and Diego, Rodríguez de Almela. *Valerio De Las Historias De La Sagrada Escritura, Y De Los Hechos De España*. Nueva ed. Madrid,: Blas Román, 1793. Print.
- Morley, Sylvanus Griswold, and Courtney Bruerton. *Cronología De Las Comedias De Lope De Vega*. Biblioteca Románica Hispánica. 1, Tratados Y Monografías,. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1968. Print.
- Muñoz Palomares, Antonio. *El teatro de Mira De Amescua: Para una lectura política y social de la comedia áurea*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2007. Print.
- Ochoa, Eugenio, ed. *Tesoro de los romanceros y cancioneros españoles: Historicos, caballerescos, moriscos y otros*. Barcelona: SS. A. Pons, 1840. Print

- Oriel, Charles. "The Play of Presence and Absence: Writing and Supplementary in the Comedias De Privanz." *El Arte Nuevo De Estudiar Comedias: Literary Theory and Spanish Golden Age Drama*. Ed. Simerka, Barbara. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1996. 36-51. Print.
- Ostlund, DeLys. *The Re-Creation of History in the Fernando and Isabel Plays of Lope De Vega*. Ibérica. New York: P. Lang, 1997. Print.
- Patrizi, Francisco. *Del Reyno Y De La Institución Del Ha De Reynar*. Madrid: Luis Sanchez, 1591. Print.
- Peale, C. George. "Comienzos, Enfoques Y Constitución De La Comedia De Privanza En La Tercera Parte De Las Comedias De Lope De Vega Y Otros Auctores." *Hispanic Review* 72 (2004): 125-56. Print.
- Palencia, Alfonso. *Crónica De Enrique IV*. Ed. Paz y Melía, Antonio. Madrid: Ediciones Altas, 1973. Print.
- Pedro IV de Aragón. *Crónica del rey de Aragón don Pedro IV el ceremonioso, o del Punyalet, escrita en lemosín por el mismo monarcha*. Trans. Antonio de Bafarull. Barcelona: Alberto Frexas, 1850. Print.
- Pérez, Antonio. *Carta del secretario Antonio Pérez escrita al excelentísimo Duque de Lerma, dándole documentos para gobernarse en su privanza*. MS. 10916. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.
- Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán, and Jesús Domínguez Bordona. *Generaciones y Semblanzas*. Madrid: Clásicos Castellanos, 1924. Print.
- Pérez Gómez, Antonio. Ed. *Romancero De Rodrigo Calderón*. Valencia: La Fonte que Mana y Corre, 1955. Print.

- Pérez Ortega, Manuel Urbano. "Un Romance Olvidado De Los Carvajales Y 'El Emplazado', De José Lamarque De Novoa." *Elucidario* 7 (2009): 9-21. Print.
- Pfister, Manfred. *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*. Trans. John Halliday. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print
- Plato. *Republic*. Trans. Jowett, Benjamin. Millis, MA: Agora Publications, 2001. Print.
- Plutarch. *Lives of Illustrious Men*. Ed. Langhorne, J. Langhorne and W. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853. Print.
- Portocarrero y Guzmán, Pedro. *Theatro Monarchico De España Que Contiene Las Mas Puras, Como Catholicas, Maximas De Estado, Por Las Quales, Assi Los Principes, Como Las Republicas, Aumentan Y Mantienen Sus Dominios, Y Las Causas Que Motivan Su Ruyna*. Madrid: Juan García Infanzón, 1700. Print.
- Prescott, William H. *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic*. Vol. 1. New York: Fred DeFau and Co, 1845. Print.
- Quevedo, Francisco de. "A don Álvaro de Luna." *Antología poética: Francisco de Quevedo*. Ed. Roque Esteban Scarpa. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1967. 85-7.
- "Grandes Anales De Quince Días." *Obras Completas*. Ed. Felicidad Buendía. Madrid: Aguilar, 1958. 730-65. Print.
- "Relación de la adversa fortuna que don Rodrigo Calderón, secretario que fue de su Magestad el Rey Nuestro Señor Felipe Tercero tuvo en la corte de Madrid: Año De 1621 Por El Mes De Octubre" *Relaciones De Actos Publicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)*. Ed. Diaz, José Simon. Madrid: Instituto de estudios Madrileños 1982. 147-54. Print.

- “Relación de lo que sucedió en la ejecución de la sentencia que se dio a don Rodrigo Calderón, 1621”. *Relaciones De Actos Públicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)*. Ed. Díaz, José Simon. Madrid: Instituto de estudios madrileños 1982. 155-6. Print.
- “Relación Verdadera En Que Se Contiene Todas Las Ceremonias Y Demás Actos Que Pasaron En La Jura Que Se Hizo Al Serenísimo Principe Nuestro Señor Don Phelipe Quarto En El Monestario De San Geronymo, 1608.” *Relaciones De Actos Publicos Celebrados En Madrid (1541-1650)* Ed. Simon Diaz, José. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Marileños 1982. 54-6. Print.
- Renzi, Mateo *Tratado Del Perfecto Privado*. 1622. MS. 10633. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.
- Rivadeneira, Pedro de. “Tratado de la religion y virtudes que debe tener el príncipe cristiano para gobernar y conservar sus estados, contra lo que Nocolás Maquiavelo y los politicos deste tiempo enseñan.” *Bibleoteca de autores españoles: Obras escojidas del Padre Pedro de Rivadeneira*. Madrid: M. Rivandneyra, 1868. 349-587. Print.
- Río Barredo, María José del, and Peter Burke. *Madrid, Urbs Regia : La Capital Ceremonial De La Monarquía Católica*. Historia. Estudios. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2000. Print.
- Rizo, Juan Pablo. *Norte De Principes*. Madrid: Diego Flamenco, 1626. Print.
- Roas, David. "Lope Y La Manipulación De La Historia: Realidad, Leyenda E Invención En La Comedia De Bamba." *Anuario de Lope de Vega* (1995): 189-208. Print.
- Round, Nicholas Grenville. *The Greatest Man Uncrowned : A Study of the Fall of Don Alvaro De Luna*. London: Longwood Pub. Group, 1986. Print.
- Saavedra Fajardo, Diego. *Idea de un principe político-cristiano representada en cien empresas*. Eds. Rodrigo Fernández-Carvajal, Javier Guillamón, and Z. J. M. González.

- Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio, 1994. Print.
- Salazar, Juan. *Politica Española*. Logroño, España: Diego Mares, 1619. Print.
- Salucio del Poyo, Damián. *La Privanza Y Cayda De Don Álvaro De Luna*. R14096. Biblioteca Nacional de España. Madrid. 151-81.
- Sánchez-Arce, Nellie E. "Notas Preliminares." *Próspera Fortuna De Don Álvaro De Luna*. Ed. Sánchez-Arce, Nellie E. Mexico: Editorial JUS, 1965. 5-39. Print.
- Santillana, Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marqués de Santillana. "Doctrinal de privados." *Obras competas*. Ed. Ángel Gómez Moreno. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1988. 349-64.
- Seneca. *Moral Essays*. Trans. Basore, John W. Ed. Henderson, Jeffrey. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2003. Print.
- Sullivan, Henry W. *Tirso De Molina and the Drama of the Counter Reformation* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1981. Print.
- Thompson, I. A. A "The Institutional Background to the Rise of the Minister-Favorite." *The World of the Favourite*. Ed. Brockliss, J. H. Elliott and L. W. B. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999. 13-25. Print.
- Vaíllo, Carlos. "Gracián y la prosa de ideas." *Historia y crítica de la literature española: Siglos de oro, El barroco, primer suplemento*. Ed. Francisco Rico. Barcelona: Editorial crítica, 1992. 488-500. Print.
- Vega, Lope de. "Arte Nuevo De Hacer Comedias." Ed. Garcia Santo-Tomás, Enrique Madrid: Catedra, 2006. Print.
- . *Cartas, Documentos Y Escrituras Del Dr. Frey Lope Félix De Vega Carpio (1562-1635)*. Ed. Sliwa, Krzysztof. 2 vols. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta 2007. Print.
- . *Fuente Ovejuna*. Ed. Martín, Juan María. Madrid: Catedra 2008. Print.

- . *Inocente Sangre. Biblioteca De Autores Españoles: Comedias Escogidas De Frey Lope Felix De Vega Carpio*. Ed. Eugenio Hartzenbusch, Juan Vol. 52. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1952. Print.
- . *La Campaña De Aragón. Obras Escondidas De Lope Félix De Vega Carpio*. Ed. Robles, Frederico Carlos Sainz de. Madrid: Aguilar, 1953-58. 835-72. Print.
- . *Peribáñez Y El Comendador De Ocaña*. Ed. Martín, Juan María. Madrid: Catedra, 2008. Print.
- . "Por los últimos pasos de la vida". Oración funebre en la muerte de Don Rodrigo Calderón. 1621. MS 9306. Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid. 54-6.
- Williams, Patrick. "Un Nuevo Estilo De Grandeza: El Duque De Lerma Y La Vida Cortesana En El Reinado De Felipe III (1598-1621)." *Dramaturgia Festiva Y Cultura Nobiliaria En El Siglo De Oro*. Eds. Bernardo J. García García and María Luisa Lobato. Madrid: Iboamericana 2007. 169-202. Print.
- Wolf, Fernando José and Conrado Hofmann. *Antología De Poetas Líricos Castellanos* Ed. Pelayo, Marcelino Menendez y. Madrid: Librería de Hernando y Compañía, 1899. Print.
- Wright, Elizabeth R. *Pilgrimage to Patronage: Lope De Vega and the Court of Philip Iii, 1598-1621*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001. Print.
- Zeballos, Jerónimo de. *Sovereign (1621-1665 : Philip IV). Arte real para el buen gobierno de los reyes, y principes, y de sus vassallos en el qual se refieren las obligaciones de cada uno con los principales documentos para el buen gouierno: Con una tabla de las materias*. En Toledo: A costa de su autor, 1623. Print.
- Zurita y Castro, Jerónimo. *Anales de la corona de Aragón*. Zaragoza: Juan de Lanaja y Quartanet, 1610. Print.