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MAKING SENSE OF HER SENSES: CATHERINE OF ARAGON REVISITED
IN TUDOR HISTORY AND ON THE TRANSNATIONAL STAGE

SUSAN L. FISCHER
Bucknell University

For Charles Victor Ganelin, colleague and friend, who shines at making sense of the senses.

“‘Sense,’ we have come increasingly to appreciate, refers not only to the natural corporeal endowments that provide access to the world, but also to the meanings we attribute to the results” (Jay 307). What sense can we attribute to the passionate nature of Catherine/Katherine/Catalina of Aragon—her strength and intensity of character—as retold in history and (re)dramatized on the page and on stage? What sense can we make of the subjectivity of the Spanish Queen (1485-1536), bound as it is by the subjectivity of chroniclers, historians, playwrights,
latter-day directors and scholars; and contingent on social and political contexts? Was she “the pious victim of a cruel, selfish husband or a consummate liar hiding behind an apparently saintly exterior” (4), as Giles Tremlett queries in a new biography of the queen, published 474 years after her death? Catherine’s story will be (re)presented here in the form of reflections and projections, drawing on fresh material from Spanish archives as gleaned from Tremlett; and on early modern and (post)modern stage reenactments: Shakespeare and Fletcher in *King Henry VIII* (1613); Calderón de la Barca in *La cisma de Inglaterra* (*circa* 1627); and Ignacio García in José Gabriel López Antuñano’s performance version of Calderón’s play, *Enrique VIII y La cisma de Inglaterra*, as staged by Madrid’s Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico (CNTC) in 2015.¹ The inspiration for this reframing of history, dramaturgy, and mise en scène comes from Katherine’s death scene in *Henry VIII* (4.2), in which she exhorts her gentleman-usher Griffith to be her “honest chronicler” and then has a celestial vision, possibly derived from Charles de Sainte Marthe’s funeral oration for Marguerite of Navarre (Foakes xxxviii).

***

Kimbolton Castle, December 1535–January 1536

Kath. After my death I wish no other herald,
No other speaker of my living actions
To keep mine honour from corruption,
But such an honest chronicler as Griffith. . . .
I have not long to trouble thee. Good Griffith,
Cause the musicians play me that sad note
I nam’d my knell, whilst I sit meditating
On that celestial harmony I go to.

(Henry VIII, 4.2.69-72, 77-80)

[Following The Vision]

Kath. Spirits of peace, where are ye? are ye all gone?
And leave me here in wretchedness behind ye?

Griffith. Madam, we are here.

Kath. It is not you I call for;
Saw ye none enter since I slept?

Griffith. None, madam. . . .

Kath. Bid the music leave,
They are harsh and heavy to me. . . .

Griffith. She is going, wench; pray, pray.

(Henry VIII, 4.2.83-86, 94-95, 99)

***

“I have not long to trouble thee,” she tells the “honest chronicler” Griffith. But her mind was arguably “still troubled by whether she had been good to a country which, in the end, had been bad to her” (T-423). Would England have remained Roman Catholic had she consented to go silently into a convent (T-427)? She opted for peaceful defiance in not having her English supporters rise against their king, and in not pushing Charles into war with her husband over her marital rights—despite the rejection of papal authority, the separation of the English Church from Rome, and Henry’s titular designation
as Supreme Head of the Anglican Church. Five years after she had appealed to Rome, the cardinals declared her marriage to Henry to be “valid and canonical” (T-389); Mary was not only legitimate but the true heiress to the crown. She, the Queen, had won the arguments, even with “Henry’s supposedly encyclopaedic knowledge of canon law” (T-390). But on the day of her moral and ideological victory in Rome in March 1534, Parliament endorsed the Act of Succession, declaring her marriage “utterly void and annulled”; Mary was a bastard; Henry’s bigamous marriage, in January 1533, to that ambitious and raging Anne Boleyn with her “well-filed tongue” (T-342) was proclaimed “true, sincere and perfect ever hereafter”; Anne’s children would inherit the crown (T-390). Catherine did not fear the martyr’s death which she thought awaited Mary and herself: “martyrdom required not just rock-solid belief, obstinacy and courage but also the sort of exceptional, intensely ‘passionate’ character” that she possessed (T-394-95). After all, a woman of her belief and education knew that “there was nothing more passionate or virtuous than dying for one’s faith” (T-6). She could not slander herself by “confessing that, in effect, she had been the king’s harlot for twenty-four years”; nor could she “damn her own soul” even if Mary, whom she had not seen in four years, were kept away (T-379).

An attempt will be made to “make sense of her senses,” of her passions, as pivotal moments are re-
played from the thirty-five years that Catherine spent on English soil after her marriage to Henry VII’s son Arthur on 14 November 1501. How would she go down in history? Thoughts roam to that public first night of marriage. She had to affirm that she “had not slept in the same bed with him more than seven nights and that she remained as intact and uncorrupted as they day she left her mother’s womb” (T-289). No one could disprove what she said about her virginity (T-268). She had never been troubled about “abandoning the truth” when she deemed it necessary: she married Henry on 11 June 1509, and six months later she stated that her non-existent but public first pregnancy was due to a miscarriage (T-170). She was more than the pure and pious Catherine that history, in the name devoutly religious Spanish archivists, would aspire her to be. If she was an obedient wife, she was not a “passive onlooker” at her downfall; she had long since “found it easier to deal with men if they thought she was witless, pliable and naïve” (T-268). The other event that had spoilt that first year of marriage was Henry’s “wandering eye” (T-167), however much he adoringly embraced and kissed her in public (T-187). If she was aware that the game of courtly love often led to adultery, she still felt pangs of jealousy but mostly could “dissimulate, if not actually restrain, her natural jealousy”; her “mother’s daughter,” indeed (T-168).

She loved and defended her adopted country. During her first year of marriage, she was her
Machiavellian father’s ambassador in his Spanish negotiations with Henry; Ferdinand’s personal representative, with “all faith and credence, as if they were [herself]” (T-158). In Henry’s eyes, her role was not restricted to that of “royal childbearer”; she was, from the start, one of the king’s “most influential (if unofficial) advisers, as well as the conduit to one of the most powerful men in Europe” (T-181). Moreover, in 1513, she was Regent Governess of England, Wales, and Ireland while Henry went to fight in France. He stated that he was leaving the country in the hands of “a woman whose ‘honour, excellence, prudence, forethought and faithfulness’ could not be doubted” (T-189). If, during his absence, the English defeated the Scots at the Battle of Flodden Field, Catherine prudently avoided stressing that she “had scored a greater victory than her war-hungry husband” (T-199); Henry, in fact, was still pleased with his “warlike wife” (T-187). The real trouble started with the advent of his almoner and indispensable assistant during the French campaign, one ambitious Thomas Wolsey, who offered to assume responsibility for the kingdom’s quotidian rule. Catherine’s influence around the king began to diminish, but she could not have known then the extent to which that power-hungry butcher’s son, appointed cardinal within two years, would control her life.

Catherine always had “claws” (T-121); they shone, for example, in 1525 when Henry thrust hon-
ors and titles on Henry Fitzroy, his six-year old bastard son with Elisabeth Blout, one of the queen’s ladies. Catherine’s reaction was “explosive” (T-250), because the king was stepping on his legitimate daughter’s rights as heiress; he did not like her crossing him. She knew that any jealousy she felt—perhaps more for the child’s sex than for Henry’s philandering—had to be kept secret. In *De instituione feminae christiana*, a work about the education of a princess dedicated to the queen in 1523, Juan Luis Vives maintains that the emotion of jealousy is “a ferocious vexation and a relentless and uncontrol- lable tyranny” (2.74/Fantazzi, ed. 210). Although Vives’s book espouses traditional precepts about a woman’s “ chastity,” it is rather revolutionary in urging that “girls be educated in more than just domestic skill and dancing” (T-240). Vives even ventures that “women could often be intellectually more gifted than men” (T-241); the goal was to infuse the (married) woman with the ideals of “justice, piety, fortitude, temperance, learning, clemency, mercy and love of humankind” (2.134/Fantazzi, ed. 272).

Henry and Catherine ignored Vives’s harsh advice on educating a daughter but followed his recommendations on readings for Mary: Erasmus, More (*Utopia* of 1516, based on social equality, where all but the most learned worked and shared the fruits of labor), and the New Testament. If Vives was wary of over-stimulating the imagination, at least woman’s education was being taken seriously; knowledge was not a danger to women but a path toward virtue (T-
241). Erasmus, for his part, had praised Catherine as a “unique example in an age of true religion”; in truth, she was serious and pious, in contrast to those women “who waste[d] the greatest part of their time in painting their faces or in games of chance and similar amusements” (1381/1523, 45, Mynors et al., ed. 61).

Catherine’s claws indeed shone in her obstinate response to the king’s “secret matter” of divorce. Anne Boleyn had arrived at court toward the end of 1521. She was no beauty, but “good looking enough”; her sophisticated French style stood out more than her looks (T-259). Henry was smitten by a woman who turned his advances down—continually, for some six years. And then there was the issue of a legitimate male heir, since all of Catherine and Henry’s male children had either been stillborn or had died in infancy. Was Henry’s conscience troubled because he had married his brother’s widow? Was he bothered because Leviticus (20, 21) states: “If a man takes his brother’s wife, it is impurity; he has uncovered his brother’s nakedness, they shall be childless”? Or were Henry’s sudden “scruples” regarding the legality of their union born of his uncontrollable passion for the manipulative Anne? It hardly matters whether she was a “teasing schemer,” or one who fearlessly refused to surrender “body and soul” unless he offered marriage (T-278-79). Perhaps Wolsey, that all-powerful “butcher’s cur” (Henry VIII, 1.1.120), had thought
up the idea of challenging the validity of the marriage, so that Henry would not “compromise his standing and self-image as a virtuous Christian prince” (T-261). The king was mistaken in thinking that, “in a final act of loyalty and obedience, Catherine would understand his plight and meekly agree” (T-263). She had good spies and learnt what had been afoot in York Palace on 17 May 1527. To defeat Henry, her strategy would need Charles’s support and the pope’s acceptance that only he could overturn the decision of his predecessor Julius II; Wolsey in England could not decide the case. When the king told Catherine about the “great and secret matter” troubling him, she burst into tears, “an eloquent form of silence”; she had not opposed him, nor had she acquiesced (T-266). Henry’s request for secrecy in the matter might have meant that he already “feared the steel that lay below her pleasant, subservient façade” (T-266). She hoped he would tire of that latest royal mistress and rival; regardless, she dissimulated her feelings stoically, behaving in public with Henry as if nothing were happening.

In 1528, under the seal of confession, Catherine had a conference with Lorenzo Campeggio, cardinal protector of England, during which she strategically addressed herself indirectly to the pope. She let go of her “normally demure and cheerful disposition,” stubbornly affirming that she would not enter into a convent but “live and die in the state of matrimony.” They could “tear her ‘limb from limb,’” and she would “prefer to die over again, rather than
change.” In a word, her “obstinacy was cast out of solid iron”: if she had “to die for her beliefs and in order to maintain her honour, she was prepared to do so” (T-289). She prided herself on being able to make “such cheer as she always had done in her greatest triumph” (T-294). She smiled perversely at her ability “to thwart Henry’s moves, while maintaining outward calm,” and to enrage him with a “combination of good humour and bold blows to his strategy.” How could she continue to smile and be cheery? He, after all, was suffering. Since she had the people on her side, he intimated that she was planning to lead a rebellion and have him murdered. In short, she was being “accused of fanning the flames of treason and regicide—crimes punishable by death” (T-295). Henry did manage to “wipe the smile off her face”: if in public he was courteous, in private he made her life impossible (T-297). Though her obstinacy and skill caused the battle he expected to win in months last six years, she became increasingly exiled and abandoned: she was displaced to Enfield on 13 September 1532, to Ampthill in February 1533, to the Bishop of Lincoln’s Palace at Buckden in July 1533, and to Kimbolten Castle in May 1534.

A “mock trial” was held at Blackfriars on 21 June 1529, in which King and Queen were called into court in an unprecedented step:

> It was as if three of the principal powers of Europe, via proxy or in person, were facing one another in
the courtroom. On the right was the king of England. On the left, in the form of Catherine, was the mighty Emperor Charles himself. Stuck in between, like a man being squeezed in a slowly closing vice, was the pope—represented by Campeggio and, to a lesser extent, by Wolsey. Although his cardinals were nominally there to resolve the dilemma, the pope mainly saw himself as a victim. (T-307-08)

England’s bishops were present, along with the common people who cheered Catherine as she entered to stage her act of defiance. There was, however, some confusion about the order of events. If Henry rehashed his argument that he loved his wife, but had become troubled by his conscience about being married to his brother’s widow, Catherine’s performative response clearly penetrated the minds of those in attendance:

She rose from her chair in silence as all eyes fixed upon her. She then walked deliberately across the room and past the bishops to where her husband sat on his luxurious, cushioned chair. She knelt at his feet. It was a posture of absolute submission. No one present could doubt that this was a woman showing respect and love for her husband. In this position she began her dramatic act of defiance. (T-309)

She had stayed on her knees. Henry had tried to raise her up twice, but she had remained stubbornly down. She was his wife, her posture said, and entirely subject to his whims and decisions. Now she asked him for one last thing. Would he give his permission, as her husband and master, for her to
write directly to the pope to defend her honour and conscience? Henry raised her up and told her that, yes, she had his permission. It was a brilliant coup. She had backed an unsuspecting Henry into a corner. . . . She was capable of both lying and trickery. The power of attorney and appeal were already signed and may have been on their way to Rome already. (T-311)

She made a low curtsey to her husband. Those watching expected her to return to her seat. To their astonishment, however, she walked straight towards the door. . . . The crier tried to call her back. “Catherine, queen of England, come into the court!” he bellowed. . . . Her reply was audible to those in the hall. “On, on,” she said. “It makes no matter, for it is no impartial court for me, therefore, I will not tarry. Go on.” And so she strode out, never to return. (T-312)

It was veritable “piece of theatre”; history would surely remember her as the “leading lady, Catherine of Aragon, who stole the show” (T-305, 306). She ignored further summons to the court, revealing herself to be willfully disobedient to authority.

If the drama of her performance is heightened here, there were also moments of pathos as she beseeched England’s “head of justice” to let her have justice: “Take of me some pity and compassion, for I am a poor woman and a stranger born out of your dominion.” She went on, underscoring her submissiveness: “Alas! Sir, wherein have I offended you, or what occasion of displeasure have I deserved? I have been to you a true, humble and obedient wife,
ever conformable to your will and pleasure. . . . I never grudged in a word or countenance, or showed a visage or spark of discontent” (T-309). She included a jab against Wolsey, equally valid for Anne Boleyn: “I loved all those whom ye loved, only for your sake, whether I had cause or no, and whether they were my friends or my enemies.” Was it really her fault they had no male children to inherit the crown, inasmuch as it had “pleased God to call them out of this world”? The court was, in effect, being asked to pass judgment not just on Catherine but on the respective fathers, Ferdinand of Aragon and Henry VII, who had jointly deemed the marriage “good and lawful.” Finally, she put it to her husband’s conscience: if there were any lawful cause that could be alleged against her, she would be “well content to depart” to her great shame and dishonor; if not, she beseeched Henry to let her remain in her former estate (T-310).

Wolsey’s gentleman-usher, George Cavendish, recorded the court process for posterity in an “eye-witness” report, however much he relied on “other persons’ information” (Introduction xxxii). That court spectacle certainly provided material for future dramatic accounts of Henry VIII and the English Schism. From the English point of view, Shakespeare and Fletcher developed the scene in 1613: much of Katherine’s defense was reproduced, almost verbatim, including her grand exit after she was vexed beyond her patience (cf. Henry VIII, 2.4.11-54; 126-31). The play includes a direct ex-
change with Wolsey, accurate in spirit if not in chronicled word: she refuses him as her judge, for it is he who has stirred up this strife, “blown this coal betwixt my lord and me”; she holds him as her “most malicious foe. . . not / At all a friend to truth” (2.4.77, 81-82). She plays up her supposed simplicity:

Kath. I am a simple woman, much too weak
T’oppose your cunning. Y’are meek and humble-mouth’d.
You sign your place and calling, in full seeming,
With meekness and humility: but your heart
Is crammed with arrogancy, spleen and pride. . .
I do refuse you for my judge, and here
Before you all, appeal unto the Pope,
To bring my whole cause ’fore his holiness,
And to be judg’d by him.

(*Henry VIII*, 2.4.104-08, 116-19)

Calderón, steeped in Counter-Reformation ideology evoked Catalina as a most pious and virtuous person of “inhumanly unblemished saintliness,” if not of a “faultless disposition” (Mackenzie 34). In a monologue of some hundred verses (*Cisma*, 2.1792-1893), she proclaims truthfully, if submissively, that she never stopped loving Henry nor ceased to regard him as her husband: “Mi Enrique, mi Rey, mi dueño, / mi señor, mi dulce esposo / (que este nombre entre los dos / como a sacramento adoro)” (2.1800-03). The triumphs of an ambitious Volseo are also blamed for preventing her sustained sover-
eighty: “de tu imperio / trofeos del ambicioso / me aparten” (2.1808-10). Sea imagery captures how Enrique as England’s “pilot” is tyrannically steering the ship of state off course: “que el peregrino en el mar / fin tuviera lastimoso / si el gobierno de la nave / tiranizara el piloto” (2.1852-55). Since she does not want her nephew Carlos to harm Enrique, she decides not to invoke his aid (2.1872-77); Carlos’s sacking of Rome in 1527 is of course not mentioned. She refuses, in her married state, to retire into a convent and vows to remain in the palace (2.1884-89); everyone will know her loving feelings toward Enrique, even if she dies in the attempt: “que os estimo y reconozco / por mi dueño, y por mi bien, / por mi Rey y por mi esposo” (2.1890-93). She does not make the grand exit she made both historically and in Shakespeare but finds herself abandoned and alone: Enrique, Volseo, Ana Bolena, and Tomás Boleno all turn their back on the Spanish queen, and she is left only with her faithful companion Margarita Polo (2.1894-95).

The speeches of Henry and Catherine in that court summons contain “linguistic subtleties and signals” which those who have “lost the ability to listen might easily miss in performance,” yet which would have been discerned by a contemporary audience, and especially by an educated contingency (McKendrick 76). Nevertheless Calderón’s play, like its English counterpart, has the “capacity to generate an almost infinite series of unforeseeable inflexions” in a process of successive re-creation
denominated its “afterlife” (Miller 23, 34-35).

In the (post)modern re-creation of Calderón staged by García in 2015, the king’s speech was cut by some thirty lines and the queen’s response by some sixty; what remained of their discourse was then refashioned into a dialogue and ordered with a different logic, so as to foreground each speaker dynamically. (Figure 1) The point was to foreground Catalina’s strength of character and acute consciousness of being both a woman and a queen: “No es una reina de papel sino una reina de verdad” (López Antuñano 66). Following is this re-viewer’s chronicling of her truth of that scene, as she saw it on stage. If, at the outset, Enrique avoided mention of that “monstrous Luther” (2.1719-22) and of Catalina as a paragon of virtue (2.1742-47), he “acted” distressed and hesitant (“turbado y dudoso”) as Volseo had directed (2.1602, 1741; LA-55b, 57a), effecting a pregnant pause before declaring his marriage invalid and his obligation to put his wife aside (2.1748-56; LA-57a). The smile was wiped from Catalina’s face as she rose then and there to begin her defense—“Escucha, señor, si puedo / hablar” (2.1792-93; LA-57a)—omitting direct reference to “obeying and controlling [her] tongue” (2.1796-99). Enrique picked up where he had left off (2.1757-61; LA-47a), removing the queen’s crown and throwing it to the ground where it remained, perhaps as a charged reminder of her obstinacy.
Subsequent passages of the monologues were (re)ordered and played as follows: (1) she lamented not that she had lost the crown or had been deposed, but that she no longer had the king’s favor due to the triumph of one ambitious man (2.1804-15; LA-57a); (2) he, a “César cristiano,” lied about his love for her saintly self (2.1762-65; LA-57b); (3) holding onto him, she consented to live in a dark prison or a remote place if that meant keeping the king’s favor and her right to call him husband (2.1818-31 passim; LA-57b); (4) drawing near and holding her hand, he advised that she turn to her nephew or retire into a convent, since he was constrained to obey what the “law” decreed (2.1768-69, 1776-83; LA-57b); (5) she refused on both counts, shouting that she would remain in the palace to show how much she esteemed her husband (2.1884-93; LA-57b); (6) he stated (belatedly) that he wanted only to clear his conscience and not cause “alborotos en la cristianidad” (2.1730-39 passim; LA-58a); (7) she eschewed, most notably, addressing matters of faith and religion in verses that indirectly accused this most Christian King, whose wisdom had confounded Luther, of challenging “Apollo’s rays” or the authority of the Pope (2.1832-63) (Figure 2); (8) she grabbed him and banged the floor with her hands, vowing to appeal to the Pope’s justice (2.1864-71; LA-58a); (9) he swore to uphold María as heir-apparent (2.1770-1775; LA-58a), even as he pulled her, by the jugular, away from her mother on “mi sucesión asegura” (2.1773); (10) he dragged the
princess by the neck, shrieking threats to have the head of any disapproving subject (2.1788-91; LA-58a).

That, in García’s production, Catalina would be abandoned and alone—however much she had shown a mix of obedience and defiance, love and respect for her husband—struck home when the king removed his crown and turned his back on her; Volseo aggressively pulled María from her arms; Tomás Boleno went off, daring not to oppose the king’s unyielding spirit; Ana Bolena withdrew, ignoring a plea to persuade the king not to forsake his lawful wife; and Pasquín, who enjoyed a privileged position in court but was not scripted to be in the action just then, entered and turned his back on the queen with a look of dread that spoke volumes. This Catalina was the embodiment of human suffering as she apostrophized Enrique’s image reproduced in the stained glass window, begging Heaven to protect him and open his eyes (2.1976-77; LA-59a).

As the hour of death approached, the historical Catherine had in her head a letter addressed to her “most dear Lord, King, and Husband,” versions of which later circulated amongst Roman Catholic writers:

I cannot choose but, out of the love I bear you, to advise you of your soul’s health, which you ought to prefer before all considerations of the world or flesh whatsoever. For which yet you have cast me into many calamities, and yourself into many trou-
bles. But I forgive you all, and pray to God to do so likewise. For the rest, I commend unto you Mary, our daughter, beseeching you to be a good father to her. . . . Lastly, I want only one true thing, to make this vow: that, in this life, mine eyes desire you alone. May God protect you. (T-422)

Catherine would surely have adhered to her heartfelt feelings even if she had heard an indignant Eustace Chapuys, Charles’s ambassador, protest against Henry’s predictable reaction to her death: he “dressed in yellow, stuck a white feather in his cap and went dancing with Anne Boleyn’s ladies,” proclaiming, “Thank God, we are now free from any fear of war” (T-424). Actually, he should have thanked Catherine too, because she had opted not to promote war between England and the Holy Roman Emperor in order to reestablish her marital rights (T-427). Choosing peace over war was clearly a more important part of her legacy than whether she was a virgin when she married Henry; or whether England would have remained Catholic had she chosen to go passively into a convent. The moments before she draw her last breath have been variously (re)constructed in dramatic terms.

Shakespeare and Fletcher stage a contrived death scene in which Katherine inveighs against her arch-enemy Wolsey, “a man / Of an unbounded stomach” who “would say untruths and ever be double / Both in his words and meaning” (Henry VIII, 4.2.33-34, 38-39). But then she is conjoined by the “honest chronicler Griffith” to acknowledge the
man “Whom [she] most hated living” and do him “in his ashes honour” (4.2.73, 75), insofar as “His overthrow heap’d happiness upon him, / For then, and not till then, he felt himself, / And found the blessedness of being little” (4.2.64-66). As she lies dying in that scene, she meditates “on that celestial harmony [she goes] to” (4.2.80) and sees a vision of “spirits of peace” (4.2.83), in which she makes “(in her sleep) signs of rejoicing, and holdeth up her hands to heaven” (4.2.Vision). She commends unto her Lord a letter, whose content parallels what she wrote in actuality (4.2.131-58), and she asks to be interred “although unqueen’d, yet like / A queen, and daughter to a king” (4.2.171-72).

Calderón, from a Roman Catholic perspective, endows Catalina with the Christian virtues of forgiveness, compassion, and charity in her final appearance as she encounters that vile Volseo in “el más humilde estado” (Cisma, 3.2377). Counter to her historical self, Catalina bequeaths him the chain Reginald Pole sends to help relieve her of poverty while in exile (3.2385-87). She rejoices on receiving a letter from Enrique—¿Hay dicha, hay gloria mayor? / ¿Hay favor tan soberano? (3.2441-42)—without knowing that it has been poisoned by that rapacious Ana Bolena; hence, the irony of her expressed joy: “que hoy aqueste gusto temo / que me ha de costar la vida” (3.2450-51). (This business of poisoning was not so far-fetched: beginning in 1534, she was wont to have her food cooked in
front of her, because she worried lest someone wanted her poisoned. More than likely, she died of a malady of the heart, which appeared “black and hideous to look at” [T-392, 424]). In any case, she disappears from Calderón’s scene in a happy state without sensing the advent of her death. Her beloved María later demands justice of Enrique to vindicate the loss of her mother’s “saintly life” (3.2673-75), and the king sees the error of his ways in having repudiated Catalina.

In García’s staging of Calderón, dramaturge López Antuñano suppressed Catalina’s praise of Enrique as “mi bien, mi señor, mi esposo”; her petition for him to be told “cuánto mi pecho amoroso / estima tal alto bien”; and her allusion to an “unintentional ‘suicide’” (3.2444-51; Mackenzie, note, lines 2436-51). On the one hand, García did not have the queen indulge in an overextended expression of submissiveness and loyalty to a self-obsessed man who had repudiated and exiled his wife to satisfy an unbridled passion, subjecting her to tremendous human suffering. And, on the other, the director restrained the depiction of Catalina’s death even more than did Calderón by depriving her of a dramatically ironic last word (3.2450-51; cf. LA-65a). In the end, the Infanta María asserted herself against Enrique on stage by physically pushing him down as she sought justice for her mother’s death. (Figure 3)
On the seventh day of January 1536, at two o’clock in the afternoon, Catherine—daughter of Isabel the Catholic Queen, ruler of the greater Spanish realm of Castile—felt her last hour approaching. Her strength of character, her intensity, and her sense of Spanish pride set her apart: she was not the kind of woman to let herself be “unceremoniously dumped on the matrimonial rubbish heap” (T-3). Her strength lay “as much in what she did as in the knowledge of what may have happened as a result” (T-6), notwithstanding “murderous religious upheavals and revolutionary changes” (T-4) in her adopted country because of her obstinate, if carefully mediated, decisions. Reformation and Tudor history would not have been the same without her. Her greatest legacy was Mary, who made peace with her father and became England’s first queen regnant, even though she became known as “Bloody Mary” in her fervor to undo the Reformation and create a slew of Protestant martyrs.

Was Catherine “the pious victim of a cruel, selfish husband or a consummate liar hiding behind an apparently saintly exterior” (T-4)? Whatever the viewpoint, the complexity of her royal person has made various constituencies try to make sense of her senses or “passions” (T-426) after being laid to rest in Peterbourgh Abbey on 29 January 1536. “All is true”: here one is echoing the enigmatic title the English playwrights gave to their play on Henry
VIII when it was first performed. Their Prologue does not promise historical veracity or fidelity to chronicle accounts, but a blend of deceptive appearances to show the relativity of “chosen truth”: “Such as give / Their money out of hope they may believe, / May here find truth,” (18, 7-9, emphasis added). In the end, “we apprehend history through other people's interpretations of it,” and “we repeatedly eavesdrop on reports of events rather than witnessing the events themselves” (Rudnytsky 47). Henceforward, there will be different versions of Henry as king, and of Catherine as queen; the construction of Catherine’s selfhood has been more broadly consistent, though in recent times details of her “strong claws” have been happily foregrounded. If all is true in *All Is True*, then there is place for the orthodox and the subversive, the superficial and the ironic.

If truth be told, nineteenth-century English women also named Catherine (or its variants) in fact had the last word on her, for they raised money to put a new stone on her tomb after it was desecrated by Oliver Cromwell’s troops in 1643; a wooden plaque reads: “A queen cherished by the English people for her loyalty, piety, courage and compassion” (T-426). Perhaps that accolade might one day be supplemented by her own words being spoken on stage to voice what she would say of herself. That performance would parallel one given by Henry’s bastard daughter and Mary’s half-sister, destined to become Elizabeth I: “iconic queen of courage, pas-
The English queen was resurrected in an innovative portrait entitled *texts&beheadings/ElizabethR*, realized in 2015 by director Karin Coonrod and her international theatre collective, Compagnia de’ Colombar, at Washington DC’s Folger Theatre as part of a “Women’s Voices Theatre Festival.” Four actresses imaginatively combined poems, prayers, personal letters, and edicts with music and movement in theatrical play to reveal the voice of Elizabeth, eventually legitimized as a powerful monarch, one who shone wit and intrepidity and loved her people. There might go one day, with the grace of God, Henry’s Spanish queen, Catherine of Aragon.

NOTES

1 References to the original Calderón, cited by act and verse in Spanish and English, are to Mackenzie’s bilingual edition. Citations to López Antuñano’s (LA) performance version are provided by page and column. Quotations from Shakespeare and Fletcher, given by act and verse, are to Foakes’s Arden edition. Credits to Tremlett (T) are noted in the text by page number; see www.faber.co.uk/catherineofaragon for links to his original sources. All photographs of García’s staging follow the endnotes.

2 Cavendish’s *Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey* remained in manuscript from the time of its composition (1554-58), circulating around until its publication in a garbled edition in 1641; large portions of it had been incorporated into Holinshed’s chronicles. If Cavendish recorded an eyewitness ac-
count of Katherine’s appearance in court (80-82, 268), the modern historian A. F. Pollard measured the narrative against a “stringent standard of historical accuracy” in his biography of Wolsey (see Sylvester, Introduction to Cavendish xxxv).

3 See commentary by Allyson Currin, 20 September 2015 (http://theatrewashington.org/content/karin-coonrod-elizabeth-r-reigns-again).
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David Johnston is now widely recognized as the writer of the most innovative translations of Spanish Golden Age comedias in the twenty-first century. In *The Lady Boba: A Woman of Little Sense* (2013), his choices of versification and structure lend the play as much meaning as his word choices and turns of phrase. In *La dama boba* (1613), Lope de Vega’s polymetric scaffolding provides logic and containment to the elegant language that conveys the subtleties of this play, from the heights of refinement to the utter baseness of human experience. Johnston’s translation, awake to these turns of form, allowed the actors to inhabit that experience before the audience’s eyes (and ears) at the Ustinov Studio in Bath in 2013 (see Editorial Note to this issue).
The principal aim of this study is to show that verse-form changes in translation result in interpretive decisions that can be seen, felt, and heard in performance. Both of the “boba” plays, Lope’s *La dama* and Johnston’s *The Lady*, employ a complex dramaturgical structure that is revealed on the macro-level at the points of change in the polyrhythmic verse forms. The deployment of particular strophes, such as Lope’s use of *décimas* in this play, is transposed in function by Johnston, and the process of performance makes this work visible and embodied. Lope’s inclusion of Italianate forms such as *octavas*, *sonetos*, *endecasílabos sueltos* and *pareados*, seen alongside Johnston’s shifts in form in English, provide a perspective on how these choices enhance the creation of character in performance. Johnston, an experienced translator who also wrote *The Dog in the Manger* from Lope de Vega’s *El perro del hortelano* for the Royal Shakespeare Company to perform in 2004-05, uses strategies in both *The Lady Boba* and *The Dog in the Manger* that reveal the communicative power of form in both plays. His treatment of the verse is sometimes striking, such as translating a lengthy passage of *endecasílabos sueltos* as a breathless exchange of short, staccato bursts with lines of only three syllables each. Sometimes his transformations are less obvious, such as the substitution of Lope’s Petrarchan sonnets for a Shakespearean form in the translation. Whether bold or subtle, each and every one of Johnston’s
choices in *The Lady Boba* creates an opportunity in performance to mine the language for meaning, deftly express complex human emotions and evolving relationships on the stage, and reach a new audience in Bath in 2013.

**Structure and Form: The Writer’s Palette**

Playwrights such as Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, Miguel de Cervantes, Calderón de la Barca, and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz fascinate their readers and audiences with their ability to bring their subjects alive with the precision of poetic expression. While Johnston’s preferred style is not an imitation of the Spanish forms, a choice undertaken by Philip Osment for the Royal Shakespeare Company in his 2004 *Pedro, the Great Pretender* and by Sean O’Brien in his *Don Gil of the Green Breeches* for the Bath season, he writes with an understanding of different demands placed upon him as translator.

[... it requires a sort of thinking historically, the pursuit of an itinerary that zigzags across and over the apparently bounded sites of past and present in order to create a translation that is itself a series of encounters between the lives of the past and our experience in the present, in the way that most of us as individuals carry our past alive with us. (“Translator’s Note” 7-8)]

Sites of meaning, such as points of verse-form change, can connect these “lives of the past” with
the spectators watching the play in the moment. Sharp attention paid to those hinges of formal change offer the translator a functional logic within which to shape his new work, as Johnston’s corpus of translations from this period demonstrates.²

Focusing on The Lady Boba and La dama boba, the similarities of the plays’ structure and form are evident when viewed alongside one another with a wide angle lens. Both plays are written in three acts of approximately one thousand lines each. Rhyme is used sparingly in the translation, whereas almost every line of Lope’s play has its rhyming counterpart(s). Yet the two writers work with a similar palette when it comes to the syllable count of individual lines. The vast majority of Lope’s play is in octosyllabic forms native to Spain such as redondillas and romance, using hendecasyllabic lines like octavas and endecasílabos sueltos and pareados rarely and as a spice. There are two sonetos and two passages of décimas, one section of song (canción), and the structure and use of these passages is very tidy. Johnston’s mainstay form is the regular octosyllabic line pattern that he employs in his other translations (such as The Dog in the Manger). As in that play, here Johnston uses a Shakespearean sonnet rather than Lope’s Petrarchan form. He chooses a lengthy line with eleven to fourteen syllables where octavas and key lines from Otavio, the play’s patriarch, appear in Lope’s play, and Johnston also employs a super-short, staccato verse-form at key
points in act 2 and act 3. One speech in particular shines in Johnston’s text in terms of verse, and this is the unique mix of line-lengths he employs for Clara’s higgledy-piggledy monologue about cats in act 1. Lope’s rendering of that famous speech is in simple romance. In general, then, the structure of the work in terms of verse is elegantly designed in both plays, and the places where the form departs from octosyllables are the exception to an otherwise quite uniform line that rolls along like a fast-moving train to carry the dialogue and the action in both plays.

**Décimas: The “Little Sonnet” in Two Languages**

If we now look at individual verse choices in *La dama boba*, we notice one form that Lope uses only twice as a special twist, affectionately known as the “little sonnet,” which is the native décima, also called the espinela. Lope chooses décimas twice in the play, sparingly and deliberately, to achieve a desired effect each time. In the first passage (2.1155-1214), these lines are spoken by the unsuccessful suitor, Duardo, and are delivered at the point in the play after Nise has been ill and a month has passed since the previous act. Duardo believes himself to be an exemplary wordsmith, and he performs two décimas to paint his lady in the highest terms, with language that is epic and cosmic in theme and scale, describing her as the light, the sun
that illuminates him. His companion, Feniso, follows with another two stanzas in the same form, but his subject matter is more mixed and clichéd, such as transformations of tears to pearls and the great deeds that the joy of seeing the effects of Nise on the soul makes possible. Finally, the third set of decimas is spoken by Laurencio, the suitor who ultimately marries Nise’s sister and the play’s boba, Finea. Here Laurencio frustrates Nise because she is unhappy with the way he has switched his affections to her sister, so his verses do not appeal to her mind but only inflame her jealous heart (see Marín’s helpful description of the three suitors’ declarations of love as an “interludio lírico de tres panegíricos simétricos” 33). These three distinct attempts to woo the same lady show the differences between the suitors, as each one interprets the form in his individual style. It is a moment of formal ingenio on the part of Lope, and allows Nise to do what she does best, which is to turn up her nose in disdain.

This is one of the most intriguing moments of translation choice in Johnston’s text. Rather than have each suitor speak in the same form, but in very different terms, as Lope does, Johnston here allows each suitor his own stanzaic pattern in order to take his chance. The first speaker, Duardo, uses six- and seven-syllable lines in a consistent ABAB pattern of four stanzas. Feniso, for his part, has a pentametered line for two stanzas of ABAB, followed by a
rhyming couplet that forces the rhyme between “ill” and “well,” and concluding his not-so-perfect Shakespearean sonnet, which suits its dramatic purpose, only missing its third quatrain. Finally, Laurencio speaks four rhyming couplets of nine syllables in each line, followed by one rhyming couplet in seven syllables per line. The effect of this shortened final couplet is that it invites the listener to “lean in” to find the rest of the line; because they are shorter than their predecessors, the final couplet lines leave a sense of “wanting more” from Laurencio, which of course is part of the secret to his attempted seduction. He also takes Feniso’s concluding “ill” and “well” and uses them to conclude his own final two lines, showing himself to be quick on his feet, perhaps having composed his bit there on the spot, while the other two had spent the month preparing theirs. If the three men’s attempts are in direct competition, such a clever choice places Laurencio in the lead. Nise, however, is not impressed, and Johnston translates her retort: “It would seem your good wishes, sirs, are an excuse to joust with words” (48) (“Pienso que de oposición me dais los tres parabién”) (2.1215-16). She reminds us of a moment in Johnston’s translation of *The Dog in the Manger* when the Countess Diana listens to her prolix suitor and receives a laugh line for responding, “How could I fail to be impressed by your gifts of...phraseology?” (43).
Imported from Italy: Lope de Vega and David Johnston Use Form to Create Character

Lope’s use of Italianate forms in *La dama boba* includes one passage in *octavas*, two *sonetos*, three passages in *endecasílabos sueltos* with *pareados*, and the song. In the Spanish play, the first verse form change in the first act of the play is from *redondillas* to *octavas* at the first appearance of the play’s patriarch, Finea and Nise’s bumbling father, Otavio. He converses in lofty *octavas* alone with his friend Miseno. They discuss the marriageability of his daughters and how he needs, more than anything, to marry them off. This is also the first time in the play that Johnston changes his verse-form. Johnston compresses two stanzas into one in his version:

OTAVIO. Mis hijas son entrambas; mas yo os juro que me enfadan y cansan, cada una por su camino, cuando más procuro mostrar amor e inclinación a alguna. Si ser Finea simple es caso duro, ya lo suplen los bienes de Fortuna y algunos que le dio Naturaleza, siempre más liberal, de la belleza. Pero ver tan discreta y arrogante a Nise, más me pudre y martiriza, y que de bien hablada y elegante el vulgazo la aprueba y soleniza. Si me casara agora—y no te espante esta opinión, que alguno la autoriza—, de dos extremos: boba o bachillera, de la boba elección, sin duda, hiciera.

(1.201-16)
OCT. My daughters will always be my daugthers, Mi-
seno,
but let me tell you, in God’s truth I despair
of both.

Try as I may, I end up infuriated.
Finea’s a simpleton, no bones about it.
But God closes a door and opens a window,
and he has seen fit to give her a lovely face.
But Nise’s a prig, arrogant and erudite,
with her lickspit admirers fawning and
swooning
at every phrase she turns, at her elegant
speech.
I listen to that... that cant... and my blood
runs cold.
Mark my words, if I were to marry, I’d
choose the Boba. (17)

The number of idiomatic clichés in Johnston’s ren-
dering of Otavio’s speech is high: he says, “no
bones about it,” “God closes a door and opens a
window,” “my blood runs cold,” and “[m]ark my
words.” The reason for this, I believe, is to under-
score an effect that the octavas would have had for
their listeners in the seventeenth century, which is
to allow them instantly to identify Otavio as a typ-
cally honour-obsessed padre, like so many others in
this genre of drama and performance.

There are only two sonnets in Lope’s play,
so they adorn the work like attractive garnishes. The
first is spoken by the suitor Duardo, and is ad-
dressed to Nise. Lope gives him a beautiful Petrarch-
chan set of lines, and critics of this text have debat-
ed whether this passage is a parody of the *culto* style, or rather a more “sober” poem whose focus is the philosophical idea it lays out (43):

La calidad elementar resiste
mi amor, que a la virtud celeste aspira,
y en las mentes angelicas se mira,
donde la idea del calor consiste.
No ya como elemento el fuego viste
el alma, cuyo vuelo al sol admira;
que de inferiores mundos se retira,
adonde el serafin ardiendo asiste. (1.525-32)

Johnston’s version plays with the pretension of the suitor’s language. The translator’s intention is to present a poet whose words might sound impressive when first heard aloud, but upon reflection, they are empty:

My love elemental heat resists
And to the blue azure aspires
So love in angelic minds exists
When mortal fire itself expires.
Love, where your flames, where your sting?
Free, pure, the soul unburdened flies
From baser worlds, from everything,
To where the greatest glory lies [...] (28)

Nise, the erudite prig, replies to Duardo’s sonnet, “Ni una palabra entendí” (1.539) and the conversation turns to a debate about the relationship between form and function. Nise does not enjoy the project of teasing out the ideas, and implores him to speak
more plainly: “Yo no escucho más, / de no entender corrida. / ¡Escribe fácil!” (1.577-79). Johnston translates, “I won’t listen / to what I cannot understand. / This is wilful obfuscation” (29). In performance, it struck me that it seemed the audience laughed at the prolix speaker, but also at Nise’s unwillingness to engage with the ideas that the poem presented. The audience seemed to side with Nise in feeling that it wasn’t worth the effort to tease out the metaphysical notions contained in the lofty poem, a challenge that Duardo seemed to expect that Nise (and the audience) should have readily accepted. His disappointment in not finding a philosophical conversation partner was as evident as his unsuccessful attempt to woo.

**Instruments of Communication: The Poetic Dramaturgy of Sonnets versus Décimas**

The second sonnet is a traditional solo piece common to many comedias at this point in the first act, a moment to allow the audience to catch its breath and reflect before the rest of the action tumbles on. Here we have an aria by the play’s principal galán, so our expectations as both readers and spectators are high, and the handsome leading man does not disappoint:
Hermoso sois, sin duda, pensamiento,
y aunque honesto también, con ser hermoso,
si es calidad del bien ser provechoso,
una parte de tres que os falta siento.
Nise, con un divino entendimiento,
os enriquece de un amor dichoso;
mas sois de dueño pobre, y es forzoso
que en la necesidad falte el contento. (1.635-42)

You fly, my thought, on beautiful wings,
And beauty brings virtue in its trail,
But virtue prizes above all things
The profit love brings; there, my thought, you fail.
I am loved by a lady of grace,
To whom my thought rises and pitches,
A lady rich in thought and in face,
Rich in everything, but riches. (31-32)

Comparing Laurencio’s speech with that of Teodoro from The Dog in the Manger is instructive because it shows the difference between using the two different tools of verse. Why a sonnet for Laurencio, and décimas for Teodoro, as both men apostrophize their thoughts? A quick look at El perro del hortelano reveals similarities in the theme which are not surprising, given that a conversation addressed to one’s thoughts is seen across authors in the Comedia. What is notable here is the choice of décimas for the form in El perro del hortelano and a sonnet for the analogous moment in La dama boba. Is the effect of the passage changed by the shift of form?
TEODORO. Nuevo pensamiento mío, desvanecido en el viento, que con ser mi pensamiento de veros volar me río; parad, detened el brío, que os detengo y os provoco, porque, si el intento es loco, de los dos lo mismo escucho, aunque donde el premio es mucho el atrevimiento es poco. Y si por disculpa dais que es infinito el que espero, averigüemos primero, pensamiento, en qué os fundáis. ¿Vos a quien servís amáis? Diréis que ocasión tenéis si a vuestros ojos creéis; pues, pensamiento, decídes que sobre pajas humildes torres de diamante hacéis. (2.1278-97)

TEODORO. My beautiful thoughts, rising and pitching, you rise like a bird, and I love your flight. Yours is the madness of gulls and starlings, spinning and churning. Though I call you home I still urge you on, upwards to the sun. And I may well claim your flight’s unfounded, that the race is lost, but you rise higher, the untethered dreams of an infinite prize
beckoning you on.  
You love your mistress.  
Reason’s a blindfold,  
and you have eyes that see.  
Tell your eyes, my thoughts,  
they’re building towers of gold  
on top of beds of sand. (58-59)

In both sections the lover separates his heart from his mind, and the eyes of reason from the eyes of the imagination. Yet perhaps because of the tightly controlled rules of the sonnet, Laurencio organizes his thoughts and addresses them more coolly than the “spinning and churning” thoughts of Teodoro. Laurencio, in his sonnet, makes the opposite choice to Teodoro, in that he recognizes that he has an opportunity for the love of Nise, but he decides, in this speech, to turn his attentions to her sister Finea. By choosing the decorous sonnet, Lope gives Laurencio the impression of rationality and control over his heart (he states that he is loved by the lady of grace, not that he loves her), whereas Teodoro in his flying décimas performs self-deluded logic and a circular thought pattern (addressing the thoughts as the lover in Johnston’s “You love your mistress” or asking it as a question in the Spanish). Because of the décima’s structure, ABBAACCDDC, Teodoro is able to set forth a large circle of thought that loops back on itself and repeats the sound of its “A” line, (ABBA), followed by two little flights of thought that are much smaller in diameter with “CC” and “DD” loops. He then coasts back to roost with one final
repetition of the “C” sound, which rests the thinker not where he started at “A,” but in a middle place, indicating that his thought does not come “full circle,” but continues to spiral and dip. Laurencio, in his sonnet, has the presence of mind in the final tercet to ask his linear thoughts to be “discreto,” to “think again,” but Teodoro is flying blind and the form of his verse shows his circuitous flight path.

**The Effects of Line Length on Meaning: Breathless Sueltos Shorten to Staccato Bursts**

Turning now to the three passages in *endecasílabos sueltos* with occasional *pareados*, all three sections are in act 2 as the action is unfolding with greater and greater sense of pace. This verse-form effectively follows Otavio as he flails around determining the extent of the damage his daughters have done to his honour. In the first passage (2.1485-1540) Otavio reacts to Finea’s description of how Laurencio has declared his love and embraced her; he has learnt of the impending duel between the suitors and acts to stop it, deciding to do so in a frenzied moment alone with Turín. In the second passage (2.1581-1667) there are more *pareados* in this section, as Liseo and Laurencio posture and preen at one another but never actually draw their swords. The young men fight (or don’t) loftily, and Otavio arrives just in time to dissimulate, pretending that he has not come with the sole
purpose of putting their altercation to a stop. He cannot do that because, to his surprise, he finds the two men acting as best friends and calling each other Pílades and Orestes of Greece (or Achilles and Hector in Johnston’s translation). In the final section (2.1788-1824), Otavio gives Finea a lesson about jealousy, and teaches her that its only cure is to “desenamorarse.” Finea resigns herself to “undo love” and tells Laurencio that it is over; his response, quite the opposite of what Otavio is hoping will happen, is to offer her the idea that marriage is the swiftest of cures for jealousy.

The three sections in endecasílabos sueltos are connected by the presence of Otavio and Finea (though Finea does not appear in the second passage, she is the principal concern as the subject of the [non-]duel). Lope uses a lengthened line to signify the presence of the patriarch here, but Johnston connects two of these three passages using a unique staccato line to show Otavio’s breathless desperation. While it may seem difficult to communicate haste and panic in stately octavas in the first section, Lope manages it in this quick, plot-packed exchange:

TURÍN. En tu busca vengo.

OTAVIO. ¿De qué es la prisa tanta?

TURÍN. De que al campo
van a matarse mi señor Liseo
y Laurencio, ese hidalgo marquesote,
que desvanece a Nise con sonetos.

OT. (¿Qué importa que los padres sean discretos,
si les falta a los hijos la obediencia?)
Liseo habrá entendido la imprudencia
deste Laurencio atrevidillo y loco,
y que sirve a su esposa.) ¡Caso extraño!
¿Por dónde fueron?

TURÍN. Van, si no me engaño,
hacia los Recoletos Agustinos.

OTAVIO. Pues ven tras mí. ¡Qué extraños desatinos!

(Váyanse OTAVIO y TURÍN.) (2.1528-40)

This passage is the continuation of the verse-form that starts in the Spanish with Otavio’s conversation with Finea about the extent to which Laurencio has touched her. Johnston translates that portion, up to the start of the passage quoted above, in his regular octosyllabic lines. So, it is at this exchange, beginning with the entrance of Turín, where the verse-form shifts for Johnston. In addition to the innovation of the shortened form, he also eliminates Turín’s line at the end of the exchange quoted above. These decisions of line length and attribution add up to a re-imagined exchange:

TURIN. Sir!
Thank goodness!

OTAVIO. What!
You’re panting!

TURIN. Now!
My master!
A duel!
Behind the convent!
With that fop
what’s his name...

OTAVIO. (Aside.) God!
All my life
with these girls
policing,
watching them
shepherding...
Like cats.
Liseo.
Laurencio...
What’s going on?
God, it’s him.
Laurencio.
That letter!
They’re both fools.
Liseo’s
shirked too long.
Laurencio!
I’d kill him
myself.

(To TURIN.) This is madness.
Come with me!
We must try
to stop this.

OTAVIO and TURIN leave together. (58-59)

The effect of this line length is to allow Turín, in
performance, to stand with his hands on his knees,
doubled over and breathing heavily after running to
find Otavio (a literal, dramatic interpretation of the
“prisa” that Otavio comments upon in Lope’s text
when he first sees the messenger). The lines literally
breathe with meaning, as they embody running,
panic, and the addled thoughts of the paranoid fa-
ther who “polices” his daughters. The effect of cut-
ting Turín’s informative line about the location of
the duel is to keep the action hurtling forward as
Otavio makes his decision, pivots, and only needs nine words to express what will happen next: “Come with me! / We must try / to stop this” rather than retard the action with the name of the “Recolletos Agustinos.” In this way, Johnston writes for the actors he knows will portray this scene, and spares them a pronunciation hurdle right at the point of Otavio’s decision to run to stop the duel.

The second passage in Lope’s play that appears in *endecasilabos* (and in this case with more *pareados*) is the scene that chronologically follows the one we have just examined, in which Liseo and Laurencio threaten to fight but then discover that they have nothing to fight about, and vow to operate as loyal friends (2.1581-1667). What happens in Johnston’s translation is parallel in form to the first section in that he keeps his octosyllabic lines through the first part of the *endecasilabos* in the Spanish, returning to his short form when Otavio and Turín enter the fray. Rather than fighting, Otavio finds them out for a...

**LAURENCIO.** Breath of air.

**LISEO.** Clear the head.

**OTAVIO.** So you’re friends?
   I’m delighted.
   I was...passing.
   On my way.
   To a friend’s.
   He asked me.
To see his garden.
Stroll with me.

LISEO. Delighted.

LAURENCIO. An honour.
After you. (62-63)

This scene is remarkably different from the hendecasyllabic lines in the Spanish, but also remarkably similar in dramatic effect. A look at this moment in Lope’s play bears this out:

LISEO. Venímonos a ver el campo solos,
tratando nuestras cosas igualmente.

OTAVIO. De esa amistad me huelgo extrañamente.
Aquí vine a un jardín de un grande amigo,
y me holgaré de que volváis conmigo.

LISEO. Será para los dos merced notable.

LAURENCIO. Vamos [a] acompañaros y serviros.
(2.1654-60)

At this point in the play, well into the second act, the action is driving forward, and a brief pause for a very tense walk through an imaginary friend’s garden is absolutely hilarious. Each of the young men is dying for love of his lady, and the father is irate with feelings of protectiveness for his own reputation, yet all three of them are supposedly now going for a relaxing stroll. The comedy in Johnston’s punctuation of Otavio’s sentence with periods in
between his thoughts shows how he constructs his excuse with an extreme lack of subtlety: “I was...passing. / On my way. / To a friend’s. / He asked me.” The repetition of the word “delighted,” first spoken by Otavio and picked up by Liseo, is perfect: the young men are indeed both delighted that they have not a rival but an ally in the other, but Otavio’s confusion and rage equal the opposite of delight. The comedy in the contrast is underscored and given as an aid to the actors with the choice of verse form.

Johnston does not limit his use of this staccato form to the two places where Lope uses endecasílabos. In fact, it is a strategy that he also employs at other key moments of the action. These include several points in act 3. First, Finea decides that she can attain her desires by pretending to be a fool: “Life’s what’s learnt. / I can go back, / like a blind-woman, / to that familiar feel” (88). Then, in one of the tenderest exchanges in the play between Laurencio and Finea, when Finea invites him to:

Talk to me now.
Of subtle worlds,
and fragile things,
clean this senselessness,
from my mind
for good.
NISE and CELIA enter.

NISE. Always together, our turtle doves.
CELIA. Turtle vultures.

NISE. Let’s listen to them squawk.

LAURENCIO. No exercise
of the soul,
nor simple words
have the power
to conjure
or to reveal
a force equal
to my desire. (92-93)

Johnston’s decision to use his short lines here, where romance and redondillas appear in the Spanish, allows the intimacy of the scene to contrast lyrically with the shared, lengthened line of their antagonists, Celia and Nise. The “turtle vultures” speak of “a springtime forest, / our senses yielding,” and Laurencio’s words draw in Finea’s mind and body. The short lines allow him to breathe through the speech, with half rhymes, consonances and assonances as his final lines wash over her: reveal/equal, senses/senses/possess. The ends of the lines seduce the listener with the images they depict, “the scent of flowers, / the sound of water, / as my senses yield” (93). Returning to the octosyllabic line for the voyeur’s response from Nise adds to the comedy of her jealous reaction: “Very suggestive compliments / from a future brother-in-law” (93).

The final section in this staccato form is the famous desván speech, Clara’s bit about the attic
(104). It makes sense to single this passage out as special because it is critical to the work’s main theme: “Nobody’s what they seem, / don’t you think?” She compares the private space of the mind to the physical space of the attic. In the Spanish, the passage is in redondillas and uses the poetic device of repetition, starting each of the six stanzas with “En el desván....” Johnston repeats a question instead, and as Clara delivers the monologue she interrupts herself periodically by asking, “Don’t you think?” and “Don’t you see?” The poem’s aims are the same, to show that “the attic, / the place behind their eyes, / my lady, / there’s no poetry there, [...] Our love’s real / when it doesn’t dress up” (105). The end of the poem is structurally similar in both the English and the Spanish because Clara’s “lofty” speech is interrupted by the entrance of the men, whose grounded discourse brings both the tone and subject matter back down to earth. What’s interesting about the transition between the monologue and the noisy arrival of the denouement is that in the English, but not the Spanish, we have a change of verse form.

CLARA. En el desván, el que escribe
versos legos y donados,
y el que, por vanos cuidados,
sujeto a peligros vive.
Finalmente...

FINEA. Espera un poco;
que viene mi padre aquí. (3.2983-2988)
CLARA. Our love’s real
when it doesn’t dress up.
When it hides in the loft
but then comes back downstairs.
Don’t you think?
That’s what I think.
Anyway.

FINEA. Sssh now, father’s coming. (105)

The constant vacillation between high ideals, poetry, lofty expressions and forms, and basic human interaction and comedy is a strength of both La dama boba and The Lady Boba. Inherent to the theme of intelligence vs. baseness is a conflict that rages across the hearts of the sisters, and it is reflected in their experiences of both education and love. The play is attractive to contemporary audiences because this theme is very real to anyone who has both to think and eat, read and fall in love; anyone who lives in society must balance the rational mind with the desires of the id. The play shows the characters’ unsuccessful navigation of these extremes in the form of comedy, and the ultimate reestablishment of balance in its happy ending. Little moments such as Clara’s concluding “Anyway” mirror the theme that, at the end of the day, all the pontificating in the world won’t bring about practical solutions to her problems, showing a groundedness to
her character that makes her relatable to the audience. It is a structural and thematic choice that Johnston subtly translates by using a syllabic count appropriate to each line, and one that upholds the structure of Lope’s study of this aspect of the human experience.

**Dramaturgy, Poetic Communication, Immediacy, and Kittens**

One of the most memorable moments in *The Lady Boba* is another one of Clara’s delightful monologues. Our introduction to this character is through her relationship to her lady, Finea, for whom at the beginning of the play she functions as nursemaid as much as friend, given Finea’s state of total dependency on others. In Boswell’s production at the Ustinov Studio, this particular Clara showed her audiences a moving portrayal of the kindness shown to the mentally unstable by those who look after them. An early example of her dedication to Finea can be seen in this speech about the birth of the new kittens, a moment that Clara knows will be a major life event for Finea. She describes the arrival of another “mamma” cat who helps their pregnant Tabby to birth her kittens:

*CLARA.* Vino una gata viuda,  
con blanco y negro vestido  
—sospecho que era su agüela—,  
gorda y compuesta de hocico;
y, si lo que arrastra honra,
como dicen los antiguos,
tan honrada es por la cola
como otros por sus oficios.
Trújole cierta manteca,
desayunóse y previno
en qué recibir el parto.
Hubo temerarios gritos;
no es burla, parió seis gatos (1.445-57)

CLARA. Anyway.
A big mamma cat came, black and white,
fat and snub-nosed,
so she might have been her granny,
her lovely tail
pointing up behind her, like a snake,
so proud and
lovely and wavey,
and her big belly rubbing on the floor.
She took over.
She got her greased up, had breakfast,
then just sat down;
within minutes screechings and shrieks
like you’ve not heard.
Having kittens isn’t funny,
and she had six! (26)

This passage rolls along in romance in the Spanish, as if telling the actress that it can be delivered smoothly, quickly, perhaps almost in the style of a well-known folk tale or favorite children’s story. Yet in Johnston’s translation, the monologue became a piece of expressive, choreographed physical theatre because of the gift of the language and the spacing of the verse. The actress physicalized
the story in telling it not like a sit-down-and-listen **relación**, but as a fully-alive enactment of the events for the benefit of one particular listener with particular needs: Finea. The speech is positioned just before the halfway point of the first act, meaning that the audience is still getting acquainted with the leading lady’s mental state, perhaps asking themselves, is she disabled? Does she have Asperger’s Syndrome or is she autistic? The beauty of Clara’s speech in helping us to encounter Finea’s particularities is that it opened doors of interpretation rather than answering any of those questions with one answer. Clara as care giver and as storyteller who meets the needs of her charge introduced us better to the inside of Finea’s mind than any other moment in the play’s exposition: we see through the enactment of the birth of Tabby’s kittens the range of Finea’s imagination, and we experience this directly through her need for immediacy, materiality, literal communication and removal of any veneer of pretension, and her innocent but not quite childlike perception. Johnston’s verse form, almost **silva**-like with its alternating long and shorter lines, but never going above the syllable count of eight or nine, allowed the actresses to live in the spaces left after the lines of only four syllables, and in those spaces were born not only kittens but the audience’s understanding of the inner complexity of Finea.
Conclusion: Translating Function via Form

Dialogue reveals action, and the characters’ desires can also be seen, felt, and heard in the form and pattern of the language as much as in its content and the words themselves. The décima, employed twice by Lope in the Boba to show three pointed attempts by gentlemen to woo their ladies, was adapted by Johnston to three distinct metrical forms, each suited to the would-be lover’s particular style. Lope’s use of Italianate forms, rich in a variety of dramatic effects, including isolating the patriarch and confounding a lady with a prolix sonnet, serves to show that heightened poetic expression, when convoluted or amateur, can be unflattering to its well-meaning speaker, painting him as pompous when he would prefer to be lauded for his efforts. In a play in which language and poetry are subjects which are actively explored (especially by the sisters, as Finea learns the alphabet while Nise is renowned for her high-level vocabulary), the function of the Italianate verses is to allow the actors a verbal playground on which to spar and flex their poetic muscles. The result is an aurally aerobic experience for the listener/spectator, who must participate in the push-and-pull of the prosody if it is not to flow over them like so much empty air. When forms such as endecasílabos sueltos and pareados are used in Lope’s play to ramp up the action, conveying confusion, an almost-altercation, and a father’s para-
noia, Johnston transmits that function over a telegraph wire with short bursts that form a concatenation of meanings. When taken together, these passages imitate not the form, but the athleticism and dramatic function of Lope’s well-wrought text.

Johnston’s *The Lady Boba: A Woman of Little Sense* was in step with the new translations curated by Boswell in the Bath season, with each text coming out as fresh and modern without being flung headlong into the realm of adaptation. The role of verse, and crucially the translator’s treatment of the points of verse change, has profound implications for the visibility of the dramatic tapestry woven by the playwright. Johnston hides the stitches and the seams, but the human figures, their thoughts, and their activities are displayed with clarity in sharp relief. Johnston’s particular innovations and detailed choices in translating a play for an audience are geared for a particular place: Bath, England, and a particular time: 2013. This translation is, as Johnston writes in his Translator’s Note, “neither of then or now” (8). The result of Johnston’s attentiveness to the “big structure” of the work as well as the micro-meanings of the words and lines lends actors working with this text a verbal palette capable of more depth than if his focus had not been as expansive as it was. Painting with broad brushstrokes in terms of structure as well as the finer lines of expression allows the actor to portray specificity in character that the audience can read as a source of
multiple sites of meaning. As a translation choice in this polymetric medium, that makes a lot of sense.

Notes

1 Johnston’s work is situated within the landscape of Golden Age drama, which is replete with recent translations. In the 2004-05 Royal Shakespeare Company season of full productions, four translators took five very different approaches, and the same can be said of this 2013-14 season at the Ustinov Studio. From the strategy of matching the Spanish verse forms with English equivalents used by Philip Osment for Pedro, the Great Pretender and Sean O’Brien in Don Gil, to a very free form of blank verse used by James Fenton in Tamar’s Revenge and the unpatterned verses of Catherine Boyle in House of Desires, every option is available to the contemporary translator. Meredith Oakes’s Punishment without Revenge, while not rhymed or matched to the Spanish verses, uses regular line lengths that roughly follow the structure of the Spanish lines (octosyllables being the norm, with some extended lines where lengthier Italianate verses appear).

2 In addition to The Lady Boba and The Dog in the Manger, he has translated Madness in Valencia, The Great Pretenders, The Gentleman from Olmedo, The Painter of Dishonour, among other plays; see www.outofthewings.org for details and text samples.
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RECASTING THE COLLECTIVE PROTAGONIST: A BALLET ADAPTATION OF LOPE DE VEGA’S *FUENTEOVEJUNA*

JONATHAN WADE
Meredith College

Dancer and choreographer Antonio Gades (1936-2004) concluded his career with perhaps his greatest achievement: a ballet adaptation of Lope de Vega’s *Fuenteovejuna*. This was not Gades’s first attempt at adapting a theatrical work to performance dance, having successfully done so with Federico García Lorca’s *Bodas de sangre* as well as Prosper Mérimée’s *Carmen*, which debuted in 1974 and 1983, respectively. *Fuenteovejuna* featured on many stages throughout the world following its 1994 premier.¹ It would take nearly twenty years, however, for a production of this acclaimed work to be made available to a non-attending public. The Compañía Antonio Gades’s 2011 performance at Madrid’s Teatro Real, in fact, was recorded and re-
leased on DVD, thereby expanding the reach of this intriguing adaptation of Lope’s classic.

Gades’s adaptation is a clear departure from the *comedia* performance norm; which is not to say that the norm is entirely homogenous, only that Gades’s adaptation changes the rules entirely as it transforms the means of expression. The ballet’s greatest achievement is its ability to capture the essence of Lope’s *comedia* despite the absence of his actual words. It would be misguided to automatically assume that such an adaptation wrests Lope’s play when, in reality, what has taken place is a compelling transformation from one artistic medium to another; words have become steps and movements infused with Lope’s work—the textual body incorporated by the dancing body. This is possible because, as Gades explains, “el bailarín es también un actor” (“Antonio Gades”). The adaptation in general and the Compañía Antonio Gades’s performance in particular, demonstrate how an innovative approach can both defamiliarize Lope’s well-known play and still reinforce one of its most fundamental characteristics: the collective protagonism of Fuente Ovejuna. Indeed it would be difficult to find any production of the work that brings greater clarity, force, and eloquence to its expression. Gades’s adaptation demonstrates the unique ways in which dance, in general, and flamenco, in particular, can re-inscribe the major themes of *Fuenteovejuna*. What is more, the ballet adaptation expounds upon the relationship between literature
and the performing arts, which Gades explored, in one way or another, throughout his career. Overall, this article constructs an approach to Gades’s work that at once evaluates and values its contribution to comedia studies and performance.

A multiplicity of readings

There is no shortage of critical views of Fuenteovejuna. It is, after all, one of Lope’s most well-known works and one that fuels divergent readings and interpretations. As many scholars have pointed out, however, it was not an immediate success. After initially surfacing during the first decades of the seventeenth century, the play slipped into oblivion for more than two centuries. Renewed interest in Lope and Fuenteovejuna began outside of Spain among philologists in France, Germany, and Russia as early as the 1820s. Decades later, Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch and then, especially, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo would thrust both the playwright and what would become his most recognized work into the critical spotlight. With Menéndez Pelayo’s reading and interpretation of the play came also an act of ideological imposition on the text that has come to characterize much of the criticism and performances since (Kirschner 14-16; Larson).

As Jason Parker observes, “influences and contexts external to the text lead Fuenteovejuna to remain a highly contested and controversial work
that offers a plurality of conflicting readings” (123). This is due, in part, to the fact that “most of the interpretations of Lope de Vega’s drama, in one way or another, speak to its politics” (Blue 295). The politicization of the play is nothing new. One could argue, in fact, that in dramatizing and politicizing an historical event for his own purposes, Lope gives license to others to do the same for theirs. While studies by critics such as Claude Anibal and Karl Vossler have focused on uncovering the politico-historical texts and contexts surrounding the original event, others such as Robin Carter, Antonio Gómez-Moriana, and Charlotte Stern have read and interpreted—or evaluated those who have read and interpreted—the work through the lens of a specific political ideology. By this I do not mean to suggest that these approaches are mutually exclusive. William Blue, for example, situates his study, “The Politics of Lope’s Fuenteovejuna,” at the intersection of politics, history, and ideology. In his examination of the agrarian struggle within Fuenteovejuna, Chad Gasta makes an important observation regarding the relationship between the historical account and the play: “Lope’s drama faithfully represents the social values and political and philosophical ideologies of his own epoch, more so than the supposed time of dramatic action” (10). In the same way that the late fifteenth-century historical record acts as a backdrop to Lope’s early seventeenth-century play, many modern productions of Fuenteovejuna have deliberately taken the work out of its context in or-
der to have the drama speak to their own more contemporary milieus. This was certainly true during the Spanish Civil War, when Nationalists and Republicans interpreted the work according to the national narratives they espoused, the most celebrated example being the work of Federico García Lorca and his traveling theater company, La Barraca. In detailing the production history of *Fuenteovejuna* over the past century, chapter two of Duncan Wheeler’s *Golden Age Drama in Contemporary Spain* (2012) reminds readers that the politicization of the play is as inextricably linked to performance as it is to literary criticism.5

In her seminal study, *El protagonista colectivo en Fuenteovejuna* (1979), Teresa Kirschner distances her work from the two historically dominant camps of *Fuenteovejuna* criticism: (1) those whose primary aim is the historical reconstruction of the events upon which Lope based his works through the recovery and analysis of source texts; and (2) those whose main focus is the linking of the play to the politics of its time or virtually any since. She sees the latter, in fact, as a response to the former: “La interpretación política de *Fuenteovejuna* parece querer compensar la aridez creada por la discusión de problemas de fuentes y de fidelidad histórica” (30). Rather than entrenching her work in these well-visited critical spaces, she privileges the dramatic text itself and not the contexts from which it emerged in unpacking the process by which the collective protagonist comes into being. This is not
done with a specific historical or political end in mind. From beginning to end, in fact, the play overtly showcases its most prominent feature:

[A] través del análisis estructural de la comedia, mostraremos cómo la trama misma de Fuenteovejuna gira en torno de la creación, presencia y desarrollo del protagonista colectivo en un movimiento que va de la no existencia a la existencia de una voluntad colectiva, de la división a la unión total en un ideal común; movimiento que Lope logra plasmar dramáticamente por medio del uso de una serie de técnicas con las que da vida, voz, pensamiento y emoción a su héroe múltiple. (10)

In Lope’s work, the collective protagonist develops from frequent pronouncements of individuality in the first act to an emerging collectivity in the second, followed by a coalescing of all the townspeople in the third. In “En torno a Fuente Ovejuna y su personaje colectivo,” Jesús Cañas Murillo analyzes this gradual characterization further, contrasting the specific comedia roles the characters assume at the beginning with the collective protagonism that emerges thereafter. The women of Fuente Ovejuna are the lifeblood of this growing collectivity, as evidenced in the call to arms that occurs early in act 3
and concludes by giving voice, for the first time, to a new character—Todos.\footnote{6} The centrality of the collective protagonist is evident, however, from the title. With no contemporary examples and perhaps Gil Vicente’s \textit{Lusitânia} as its only precedent, Lope gave his play the singular title, \textit{Fuenteovejuna}. Even when rendered as two words (i.e., \textit{Fuente Ovejuna}), the meaning is the same. It is not, after all, \textit{El alcalde de Fuenteovejuna} or \textit{El comendador de Fuenteovejuna}, but simply \textit{Fuenteovejuna}; a place, a people, an identity. As we will see in what follows, even though Gades openly acknowledged the ideological impulses that inform his reading of \textit{Fuenteovejuna}, the central feature of Lope’s original—Fuente Ovejuna’s protagonism—remains fundamental to everything Gades does in his adaptation.

\section*{The man and his muse}

Understanding and appreciating the connections between the play and the ballet necessitates some knowledge of flamenco, the primary means of expression in the adaptation, and of its creator, Antonio Gades.\footnote{7} Infusing the ballet with the constant sounds of music heightens what Catherine Swietlicki describes as “a sound-based sense of community,” which predominates in “orally based cultures” (37). Flamenco, in one form or another, has been a part of Spain since at least the nineteenth century (Hayes 50). While this divorces it from any
historical connection to the *comedia*, flamenco maintains its relevance to Lope’s play in many other ways. Part of what makes the marriage between flamenco and *Fuenteovejuna* work is that the two share many of the same themes, including “love, death, fate, morality, religion, social status, humor, people, honor, the stars and supernatural powers” (Schreiner 24). What is more, there is a “storytelling register” (D’Lugo 213) embedded within flamenco that is also intrinsic to *comedia* performance. This was, in fact, one of Gades’s greatest virtues as a dancer and choreographer: “Antonio era un gran contador de historias. Él sabia perfectamente cómo contar una historia bailando” (Núñez).

The performance that results from the telling and hearing of the flamenco narrative is, by nature, a communal experience, even if “pure flamenco dances were originally performed solo” (Claus 94). Marcellus describes it in similar terms: “A flamenco dance, like the Flamencos’ general way of life, is a communal experience, so there is no division between ‘entertainer’ and audience. It is traditionally a solo, usually introverted, dance” (88). Therefore, there are at least two ways to think of the relationship between the individual and the collective when it comes to flamenco. On the one hand, there’s the side of the performer, which, even with a conglomerate of *bailaores*, *tocaores*, and *cantaores*, was and is primarily an individual expression; on the other, there’s the side of the audience, who are pulled into a communal struggle or celebration by means of
direct interaction with the performers, who are not unaware of the collectivity that is born of their individual expression. Marion Papenbrook captures the relationship between audience and performer in this way: “In its purest form flamenco is a dramatic collective event, based on centuries of individual but shared experiences. The interpreter’s power in expressing his emotions draws his audience into a common experience” (“Spiritual” 54). That many do not identify specifically with the historic consciousness of the gypsies does not undermine the formation of a collective because flamenco “also deals with common human experiences and sentiments not linked to any specific culture” (“Spiritual” 55). Accordingly, flamenco is at once solitary and personal as well as communal and shared. This speaks to a larger reality, even a tension within flamenco that allows it to simultaneously embody a number of binary oppositions, including center/periphery, individual/collective, and presence/absence. These contrasting pairs likewise take center stage in *Fuenteovejuna*, wherein Gades engages a communal art form in order to recast a dramatic text founded upon a collective protagonism and united sense of political revolution.

Perhaps nobody captures what Gades became over the course of his career and what he means to flamenco and the rest of Spanish dance better than Faustino Núñez:
Yo creo que el papel de Antonio Gades en la danza española es el gran renovador. El que supo actualizar y poner al día el lenguaje coreográfico y el baile español... Si Paco de Lucía renovó el toque y Camarón renovó el cante, Antonio renovó el baile. Era un conocedor profundo de cada uno de los pasos del folklore y supo renovarlos, actualizarlos, ponerlos al día en esta obra maravillosa que es *Fuenteovejuna.* (Núñez)

Within the world of flamenco, no greater complement could be given to a bailaor than to call him the Paco de Lucía and Camarón of dance. A survey of his life and work reveals the central place of the corpus in the renewal he brought to Spanish dance. The intersection of textual and dancing bodies would be the source of his greatest innovations. A brief sketch of the role of flamenco within his career, as well as the developing relationship between literature and dance therein, illuminates the analysis of Compañía Antonio Gades’s production of *Fuenteovejuna* that follows.

Gades was born in Elda, Alicante, Spain in 1936. His father was absent at the time of his birth, choosing instead to support the Republican cause in Madrid at the outset of the Civil War. His class consciousness was, as he explains, a birthright: “Mi posición política es clara. Nacido de padre republi-
cano, habiendo recibido una educación republicana, he luchado, lucho por las ideas socialistas. Yo no pienso que sea necesario considerar la política como un asunto de profesionales. Yo quiero defender los derechos del hombre y los derechos del trabajador. Quiero una sociedad más justa” (“Entre Altea”). His work with the Spanish choreographer Pilar López from 1952-1961 set in motion what would become a life dedicated to exploring and expanding Spanish dance, particularly flamenco. One of the most decisive moments of Gades’s career came in 1974 with the debut of his ballet adaptation of García Lorca’s *Bodas de sangre*. In collaboration with Spanish filmmaker, Carlos Saura, Gades saw his flamenco adaptation of García Lorca’s play transformed into a critically acclaimed film of the same name (1981). In the case of *Carmen* (1983), however, the movie preceded Gades’s ballet adaptation (which he would complete during the same year). The third of the famed flamenco trilogy, *El amor brujo* (1986)—based on Manuel de Falla’s 1925 ballet—was adapted by Gades in 1989 and retitled *Fuego*.

If the 1980s marked Gades’s ascension to the top of Spanish dance, the first years of the 1990s would be a time of rest and replenishment. It would not be long, however, before Gades would find himself returning to an idea planted fifteen years previous by his friend, José Manuel Caballero Bonald: that his approach to *Bodas de sangre, Carmen,* and *El amor brujo* could also be applied to *Fuenteovejuna.* As Gades once explained, adapting
literary works just made sense: “Siempre me ha gustado apoyarme en una obra literaria, ¿Para qué me voy a poner a inventar una, si existen muchas historias maravillosas en la literatura?” (“Vuelta al ruedo 1994/1999”). Gades had revealed with his previous selections that his choice of text was personal; with Fuenteovejuna it would be the same: “me interesó sobre todo el acto solidario de los perdedores. La solidaridad frente al poder. En estos momentos de feroz individualismo, creo que Fuenteovejuna está o debería estar de actualidad” (“Fuenteovejuna 1994”). It might be said, therefore, that the values with which he was raised, at least as he defined them, prefigured his reading and reimag-ination of Fuenteovejuna.

Although an adaptation of Lope’s work, it might be said that Fuenteovejuna is Gades’s second attempt at adapting the work of García Lorca. The various performances of Fuenteovejuna by Lorca’s traveling theater company, La Barraca, anticipate much of what Gades would do in his adaptation half a century later:

De todo el repertorio de la compañía, ésta será la obra que más veces se represente y que más repercusiones tenga para Lorca y para la historial de la compañía. La música es original de Ernesto Haffèr para bandurria, guitarra y laúd con la integración de canciones y motivos folklóricos que
tanto gustaban a Federico. En una de las escenas se cantaba y bailaba las agachadas y la canción de ‘Al val de Fuenteovejuna…’ era al ritmo de sevillanas. Los bailes eran de gran colorido y La Argentinita y su hermana Pilar López ayudaron en la escenografía. (Kirschner 21)

La Barraca infused Lope’s work with not only traditional song and dance, but also the sounds and steps of Andalucía. Not to be missed is the fact that Gades’s birth as a professional dancer came under the tutelage of Pilar López, a member of La Barraca and a major contributor to its adaptation of *Fuenteovejuna*. It should not come as a surprise, therefore, that Gades was considering his own adaptation of the play well before it premiered in 1994 (Domínguez 15). Besides introducing dance to Lope’s work, Lorca’s adaptation speaks to the broader relationship between society and the stage; the latter a space for exploring the former rather than escaping from it.

La Barraca’s integration of dance and music into a dramatic performance is a completely different proposition than converting an entire theatrical work into a ballet.10 As Rosalía Gómez suggests, there is nothing easy about this transformation: “Como si fuera lo más fácil del mundo, el artista ha logrado que el ballet *Fuenteovejuna* no sea simplemente una traducción o una imitación de las pala-
bras del Fénix de los Ingenios sino una historia contada por entero a través de la música y de la danza” (4). Gades’s aim in the ballet is to retell the social narrative that dominates *Fuenteovejuna*, but not necessarily to reengage the political frame within which the primary story is told. Many characters and details, therefore, are suppressed in order to maintain the integrity of the tale Gades elects to emphasize. Some of these omissions are deliberate while others are the inevitable result of moving from theater to dance. Many of the observations that scholars have made regarding his earlier adaptations, therefore, are relevant to his final work. The entire adaptation process, as Wendy Rolph explains in reference to Gades’s *Bodas de sangre*, for example, relies heavily upon metaphor in order to account for at least some of what has gone missing: “In adapting Lorca’s tragic drama to the gestures and rhythms of the kinetic medium of the dance, Gades had adopted an essentially metaphorical procedure in working out the inevitable transformations and condensations of his source material” (199). Rolph goes on to say that in dance “the modes of ‘show’ and ‘tell’ have been collapsed. Dramatization, narration, and the all-important activation of the viewer’s imagination are accomplished through movement, through music, and through mime” (199). What results from this process is a relatively short, highly compressed work that willingly casts aside any aspect of the original that detracts from
the central theme, as interpreted by Gades (Rolph 199-200).

The ballet adaptation

Gades’s *Fuenteovejuna* premiered on December 20, 1994, at the Teatro Carlo Felice in Genoa, Italy. The cast of thirty includes eleven female dancers, eight male dancers, one female flamenco singer, four male flamenco singers, and two guitarists. These cast members, none of whom play a specific part—such as Mengo or Pascuala—reinforce the collective characterization of Fuente Ovejuna that is central to Gades’s adaptation and Lope’s original. That said there are still four main characters: Laurencia, Frondoso, the Mayor, and the Comendador. Both the *comedia* and the ballet count on an extensive list of characters. In the former, however, they are “personas que hablan,” while in the latter they are “personas que bailan, cantan y tocan.” Other than the four characters previously mentioned, we could very well classify most of the remaining characters of Gades’s ballet according to Lope’s categories of “Labradores y Labradoras” and “Músicos”—which is not to say that all of the other roles disappear in Gades’s work, only that they are interpreted by the group as a whole. The function of most of these characters, therefore, is not lost, even if their specificity is, with some notable exceptions. Mengo, for example, is completely absent, as are the Catholic Monarchs.
The ballet opens with a slow-motion snapshot of the people of Fuente Ovejuna at work in their fields during threshing season. A single, solitary flamenco voice, along with the bird’s song and other sounds of nature, accompanies their daily labors until the group gradually adds their voices to the canción de trilla and falls into regular motion. The accompaniment is well-suited for the scene: “conocidos como cantes camperos de ara y de siega, los cantes de trilla antiguos, sencillos y claros, surgen al cumplimentarse la faena. El cante de trilla no tiene apoyo de compás con la guitarra y las voces arrieras animan y estimulan el trabajo de las bestias” (Domínguez 24). Rather than animating the animals in their labors, here the canción de trilla serves to set in motion the dramatic work that is to be performed. That the play will eventually end with this same scene makes this the first of many cyclical structures found in the adaptation. The words to this song and the others that follow do not come directly from the comedia, but rather from traditional Spanish folk music. In fact, part of what makes this adaptation unique, when compared to Gades’s flamenco trilogy, for example, is that it incorporates Spanish dance and music in its entirety rather than focusing exclusively on one particular genre, such as flamenco. Faustino Núñez, who coordinated the musical selection and arrangements, describes the music as “[un] homenaje al folclore español… [con] músicas de Asturias, músicas castellanas, músicas extremeñas, músicas andaluzas, mú-
sicas gallegas” (Gades, *Fuenteovejuna*). Carefully woven together, these musical traditions become a brilliant fabric capable of representing something much larger than any one of them alone: “Todo ello forma un continuo musical que narra por sí mismo la historia, identifica a los personajes, ilustra las labores del pueblo y sus tradiciones a la vez que describe el enfrentamiento entre los diferentes estamentos sociales” (Domínguez 11). In this way, and by engaging the highly collective aspects of traditional Spanish folk music, the ballet expands the collectivity to all of Spain.

Following “La trilla,” the group bursts into song and dance with “Los labradores” and “La molinera.” The centrality of the community cannot be missed in these early numbers: “As can be readily noted by their mere enumeration, these traditional numbers, involving the dance ensemble as community, reaffirm the cyclical pattern of collective renewal and communal solidarity” (D’Lugo 218-19). Even though he speaks of the flamenco trilogy, the values described here by D’Lugo are characteristic of Gades’s adaptations in general. The musical choice for “La molinera” is a bulería, which is unique given “su ritmo rápido y redoblado compás, que admite, mejor que ningún otro estilo, gritos de alegría y expresivas voces de jaleo” (Domínguez 25). This is important because it establishes a festive tone among the townspeople, who we initially encounter in a state of happiness. Their joy will eventually turn to sorrow, however, as the Comendador
takes his place as ruler of Fuente Ovejuna. “La mo-linerera” also stands out as the first number in which Laurencia and Frondoso appear. Unlike the unrequited love that persists between the two characters during the first act of Lope’s work, the two dance with a mutual affection for one another from the outset, although their desire lacks paternal approba-tion. The arc of Gades’s narrative begins with love, since the primary story he tells is that of a group of people who come together to overcome an oppressive regime. The first three numbers of the ballet serve to characterize, above all, the unity and harmony within the village and the budding relationship between Laurencia and Frondoso. Unlike other parts of the adaptation, which depict very specific moments of the play, the first few numbers only vaguely remind viewers of Lope’s first act. According to Jesús Cañas Murillo’s observation, this is a departure from the comedia: “El protagonista de Fuente Ovejuna no es siempre colectivo en el argu-mento. Es un personaje que se colectiviza” (48). In the play, individuality gradually gives way to collectivity, whereas in the ballet collectivity is a given from the outset, although in both cases we see an important progression occur within the collective protagonist.

Following the announcement of the Comen-dador’s arrival the following day, the ballet shifts to a three-minute piece called “El olivito.” The apparent purpose of this number is not to advance the narrative per se, but rather to highlight Laurencia’s
central place within the work and prefigure the triangulated complexity of her relationships with her father, Frondoso, and the Comendador. “El olivito” almost acts as a trailer for the rest of the work. It highlights the tenderness of the father/daughter relationship, the sweet promise of an amorous future with Frondoso, and the threat of the Comendador. Of particular importance here are the arms and hands of each character. With his hands, Frondoso initially expresses his solitary longing for Lauren-cia; later they reach out to each other; and finally, he lovingly takes her left hand with both of his, resting it on his cheek. The Mayor, on the other hand, uses his arms and hands to hold and protect his daughter, caressing her face just as the Comendador emerges from the darkness and forcefully gropes her chest from behind. This final image, which the characters hold for more than a minute, together with the foreboding drum and melancholy voice that sound, foreshadow the conflicts that remain ahead and give the audience a clear sense of what motivates each character.

As darkness falls upon the previous scene, a lively flute announces that it is now a day later and the townspeople are holding a celebration in honor of “Don Fernán, el comendador.” The popular dances that follow create a joyous scene not unlike the ones that open the play, except now the people no longer labor in the fields with tools in hand. Considered as a whole, it could be said that the purpose of the initial three numbers together with the
three that follow “El olivito” is to give birth to the collective, similar to the way that Kirschner describes the festive atmosphere of the Comendador’s arrival midway through the first act of the play: “Es la primera vez que experimentamos el impacto de la masa en las tablas y la única en este acto que vemos al pueblo todo ante nosotros. La importancia visual de la congregación campesina no puede escapársele al espectador… Podemos sentir su presencia física y su importancia numérica, aspectos importantísimos de su ser, pero aún le falta adquirir o expresar su personalidad y su alma” (97). Before the Comendador actually appears in the ballet, they dance “La botella,” “La serrana del caldero,” “La vaquilla,” and “La jota de tres,” emphasizing in each number el baile comunal. Originating from Extremadura, Castilla y León, and Castilla la Mancha, these dances give expression to the collectivity both within the work and without (Domínguez 27). What is more, they characterize Fuente Ovejuna as a space of playfulness, spontaneity, and unity. This is crucial to the adaptation because it brings the Comendador’s persona into sharp relief with the townspeople. His arrival interrupts the festive scene in every way imaginable; which is ironic considering the occasion for the celebration is him. The Comendador’s dress, regal and dark, stands in contrast to the simple appearance of everyone else. The strict movements of his body match the accompanying music, which has shifted away from traditional folk to something much more academic—early
modern German composer, Melchior Franck’s fanfare, “Intrada II”—the levity of strings overpowered by the gravity of brass. All of this recalls Robert Fiore’s observation regarding the chain of events instigated by the Comendador: “He is the agent who initiates the chain of causality, the destruction of harmony which in the end turns back on him in the form of poetic violence” (105).

After the townspeople reverently acknowledge his arrival, the Mayor approaches, staff in hand, to pay his respects to the Comendador. Their dress, steps, and demeanor evidence the honor and dignity of their characters. The staff is of particular importance to the Mayor, a symbol of his power, honor, and position in Fuente Ovejuna. He wields the staff with his confident hands in the same way that he holds his honor with his resolute words in the play. The Comendador’s nobility and conceit are on full display from the outset, but the audience does not discover the real object of his desire until after they have danced the “Bolero de Algodre.” He stands and walks through the crowd of women, sizing up each one with his gaze as if to say “¿Mías no sois?” (1.12.45). This “Acoso,” as titled in the ballet, ends as his eyes (and hands) fall upon Laurencia, whose attempt to retreat is not as successful as the other female dancers. This incites a reaction from the Mayor who literally goes toe to toe with the Comendador much like the verbal jousting that takes place in act 2, scene 4 of the comedia. Ultimately, however, the Mayor is humiliat-
ed by the Comendador, who takes his proud staff from him, sizes it up, and condescendingly offers it back, only to drop it on the ground. Although a literal departure from the comedia—wherein the staff if used to beat its owner, Esteban (2.1631.152), eventually breaking it across his head (1694)—the symbolic value of the staff remains unaltered. It might be said, in fact, that in a production devoid of excess props the Mayor’s staff carries even more weight. Overall, the episode echoes the many instances in the play where the Comendador calls into question, and even mocks, the honor of the villanos. As the Comendador and his two accompanying soldiers leave the scene, the Mayor is visibly shaken by his encounter with the Comendador and his attempt on Laurencia. When the townspeople quietly gather around the Mayor as both an act of solidarity as well as an acknowledgement of the affront, it is Frondoso who picks up his staff and returns it to him.

Although the arrival of the Comendador compromises Fuente Ovejuna’s natural harmony, the next number, “El lavadero,” not only restores but heightens the coherence of the collective. It is a beautifully rendered number that features all of the female characters. It is significant that “El lavadero,” positioned at the heart of the adaptation, would only include women, considering the central place they play in the development of the collective protagonist in the comedia. It is not by accident that “El lavadero,” the fourteenth of twenty-eight pieces,
is the centerpiece of the ballet: “En la dramaturgia de José Manuel Caballero Bonald, ‘El Lavadero’ tiene una función de clímax por el lugar central que ocupa dentro de la obra. Esta pieza, la de mayor elaboración y duración del ballet, es la primera de *Fuenteovejuna* que Gades decide armar” (Domínguez 31). Hence, even though his adaptation departs from Lope’s work in many ways, the essence of the original is not lost in Gades’s ballet; in both works the female characters are responsible for giving life to a unified and vigorous collective identity. While it is true that this fact may be lost upon those whose knowledge of *Fuenteovejuna* begins and ends with the ballet, it cannot be missed by those who understand how the collective protagonist emerges over the course of the *comedia*.

The white sheets that serve as the primary prop for “El lavadero” symbolize the honor and virtue of the women of Fuente Ovejuna, which is particularly evident in the number that follows, wherein Laurencia and Frondoso dance a playful, give and take duet titled “La sábana.” While she does avert some of his advances, Laurencia does so in a much more flirtatious way than we see early on in Lope’s original. The tenderness and care with which Frondoso handles her sheet stands in stark contrast to the Comendador’s forcefulness and aggression that follow. Following their amorous dance Laurencia finds herself alone on the stage, vulnerable to the unwanted advances of the Comendador, whose imminence is announced by the cello: “El oscuro
tema del violonchelo, de Faustino Núñez, leitmotiv de la obra relacionado con el deseo del Comendador, anuncia la proximidad de éste” (Domínguez 33). Everything that ensues is reminiscent of the final scenes of act one. Frondoso bursts onto the scene before the Comendador can have his way with Laurencia, taking him on in a dueling “zapateado por seguiriya” (33) that ends not with a crossbow, but with a knife. The choice of a seguiriya for this encounter is significant, as it is a form of flamenco that expresses strength, depth, power, and pride (33). Frondoso’s knife saves Laurencia and himself in the short term, but the Comendador’s threatening, outstretched finger prefigures the hell he plans to unleash upon Fuente Ovejuna thereafter. Frondoso’s actions have consequences, both good and bad. As he looks to the townspeople for support, he realizes that his affront has cost him his place among them. The Mayor then places a blanket on his shoulders, a cloak of honor as well as a reminder that he will need to seek refuge elsewhere. Before he departs, however, Laurencia appears and they dance once again, only this time in perfect love and harmony, bound by “La manta” (the title given to this particular piece) that holds them together.

The Comendador’s vengeance does not take immediate effect due to Frondoso’s disappearance and his own military duties, which require his presence elsewhere. The dressing of the Comendador in his battle attire and subsequent departure, in fact, are the only clear references to the military subplot
that figures so prominently in Lope’s original. Although the “Vestimenta Comendador” results from an official call to arms that takes him away from Fuente Ovejuna, it also foreshadows the violence that will envelop the town upon his return. The less-than-enthusiastic send-off the townspeople give him stands in contrast to the joyous reception given Frondoso, whose amorous embrace of Laurencia does not go unnoticed by the Mayor. Frondoso, however, must first prove himself worthy of Laurencia before the Mayor will agree to their marriage. “Prueba a Frondoso” is choreographed for this very purpose: “Frondoso demuestra con su baile por farruca, por alegrías con su zapateado, por bulería y por soleá, acompañados de las palmas y jaleos o bien del cante, que merece la confianza del Mayor y la aprobación de todo el pueblo” (Domínguez 36). The variety of dances and the passion with which he performs them, both with and for the Mayor, speak to his fitness to be Laurencia’s spouse. Frondoso passes the test, the Mayor offers his hand of agreement, and then joins Laurencia’s hands with Frondoso’s: “Los invitados celebran el próximo enlace interpretando en corro unos tangos extremeños que guardan las costumbres de las fiestas flamencas. Los tangos son muy alegres, constituyendo la esencia de la fiesta” (36). The townspeople appear fortified by this new union, around whom they gather in preparation for the marriage ceremony. Whereas previous scenes involving all of Fuente Ovejuna served to establish the group’s
identity, Frondoso and Laurencia’s wedding reveals the ways in which the collectivity is nourished by the individual; how the micro relates to the macro.

In order to emphasize the central importance of the female characters within the town’s emerging protagonism, Gades carves out a privileged place for them within this ceremonial space:

Gades presenta la escena del velo como un homenaje a la novia, un ritual de bodas extremeño que el coreógrafo engrandece imprimiendo una dimensión más teatral. Una coreografía minuciosa preserva la versión tradicional conservando toda su autenticidad: las mujeres cubren a la novia con un velo blanco bailando a su alrededor una danza de corte medieval, sosegada y elegante. (37)

The wedding festivities eventually move into other traditional dance numbers, including the “Jota de la flor” and the “Bolero de Orellana.” In the former, male dancers pay tribute to the bride through a series of challenging leaps and steps: “La coreografía, repleta de variaciones de jotas castellano-manchegas y extremeñas, realizadas por los ejecutantes en solitario y en conjunto, precisa bailarines con una depurada preparación debido a la dificultad de las evoluciones requeridas” (Domínguez 38). The latter of the two includes the ceremonial hand-
ing off of Laurencia to Frondoso by her father and their “Danza prima” (39). This celebrated union reflects the continuation of the collective, an identity conceived and perpetuated from one generation to the next. The threat to that continuity will ultimately prove whether Fuente Ovejuna is greater than the sum of its parts; whether the collective protagonist can overcome the antagonism of Fernán Gómez.

The minutes of ritual and celebration are eventually interrupted by the vindictive Comendador, whose arrival brings a sudden end to the song and dance of “El galán de esta villa.” The slow, scheming steps of the Comendador break from the joyous spontaneity that dominated the stage during the previous twenty-five minutes. Following Frondoso’s swift arrest, the Comendador fixes his gaze upon the female characters, only to be called out by the Mayor. With outstretched hand, he proudly wields his staff: the symbol of his honor and authority. Rather than beating him with it, the Comendador seizes it from him, breaks it in two, and scornfully tosses it to the ground as if to say, “You have no authority here.” While the details are different and the final words of the Mayor, Mengo, Barrildo, Pascuala, and Juan Rojo are absent, the adaptation does well to capture the concluding events of act two of the play. Lost in the interaction between the Comendador and the Mayor is the back-and-forth that occurs in the *comedia*. What begins as an appeal to reason escalates to civil disobedience (2.1607-30.152), resulting in the Comen-
The next piece, titled “Cónclave” juxtaposes the men’s disquieted gathering with Laurencia’s abuse at the hands of the Comendador. The stage is spatially divided between the men at center stage right, Laurencia and the Comendador at center stage left, and an incarcerated Frondoso at upstage center. While dim lights constantly fall upon Frondoso, the other two scenes alternate from one to the other until everything eventually merges. Three different men raise their flamenco voices in anguish and protest, echoing the sentiments expressed by the Regidor, Barrildo, and Juan Rojo at the beginning of act three before Laurencia bursts in with her monologue (3.1674-1711). It is not the lyric but the distinct style of each cante (e.g., seguiriyas, soleá) that allows the male singers to communicate their shared distress as well as their individual view of what should happen next. The split stage makes this part particularly effective, as it paints a painful contrast
between the men’s words and the Comendador’s actions. Only after Laurencia escapes and, together with all of the other women, performs a number titled “El dolor de las mujeres,” do the men and the women finally come together to take action against the Comendador.

At first it seems surprising that Laurencia’s monologue in the play would not lead to a solo performance by the corresponding dancer in the ballet. Instead, Gades opts to bring all of the women on stage in an effort to communicate the collective pain they have suffered at the hands of the Comendador. The hands of the female dancers play a particularly important role in communicating some of what we hear from Laurencia in the comedia. Throughout “El dolor de las mujeres,” in fact, the hands of each female dancer constantly reach in two directions: center stage left where the sin of commission was perpetrated and center stage right where the sin of omission persists. The first noteworthy gesture comes as they extend their hands (at first open, then clinched) in the direction of the men as if to communicate their general hurt as well as the acute anger they feel toward the townsmen and their inaction. As the women are seen clutching their bodies and their dresses, the source of their grief is unmistakable. At one point Laurencia points accusingly in the direction of the Comendador’s quarters and back at the men, signaling how unjust it is that they just sit there and do nothing. As the dance continues, the band of women seems bent on action, with
or without the men, recalling Laurencia’s words: “¡Dadme unas armas a mi! ... he de trazar / que solas mujeres cobren / la honra destos tiranos / la sangre destos traidores” (3.1760, 1774-77). By the end of the number we see the women again using their hands to send one final message to the men of Fuente Ovejuna. Rather than a fist, however, an open, outstretched hand petitions them to join them as one, unified whole.

While Laurencia’s monologue appears early in the third act of the comedia, the end of the ballet follows shortly after the townspeople respond en masse to the female characters’ collective expression of suffering. The adaptation closes, in fact, less than ten minutes after “El dolor de las mujeres.” With field tools in hand, the townspeople first swarm the jail, killing the guards and liberating Frondoso. Next, the townspeople converge on the Comendador’s quarters, surrounding him as he helplessly attempts to escape his inevitable death. All of this takes place during a two-minute piece called “La revuelta.” The uprising in the ballet both reflects “the outburst of violence” in the play and “results in the restoration of harmony and unity [therein]” (Fiore 107). While this is not the first piece in which the people of Fuente Ovejuna move as a unified whole, this is the first instance in which the consequence of their (in)actions is so significant. The price to be paid in this instance is life, or, as Kirschner puts it, “el desafío a muerte es entre el personaje ‘Todos’ y el ‘Comendador’” (127).
At the moment of the Comendador’s demise, this ruckus scene immediately gives way to an inquisition. Although he never appears onstage, the voice of the Juez-Pesquisidor sounds in the ears of cast and audience alike: “En nombre de la justicia mayor, y el poder que me ha sido otorgado, emplazo a todos los vecinos para que confiesen quién es el culpable de la muerte del comendador. ¿Quién mató al comendador? Repito, ¿quién mató al comendador?” What, as an audience, is known all along, finds its most perfect expression in the cast’s response. After three thunderous steps, the Mayor proclaims “yo,” as he beats his chest with his right hand; in unison, the rest of the townspeople follow in three successive waves, tools raised high, voices echoing the victory of the collective self. The inquisition ends with all of Fuente Ovejuna raising their voices one last time with a triumphant “yo.” The use of the first person singular reminds spectators that what they are seeing and hearing is a collective protagonist. This “yo,” therefore, functions in the same way that we see “¡Fuenteovejuna lo hizo!” (2106, 2208, 2235) operate within the play. In both cases the first person plural has taken refuge in the first- and third-person singular.

Despite the culminating force with which the collective “yo” is pronounced by the townspeople, the ballet does not conclude with shovels, pitchforks, and rakes held high.\textsuperscript{12} Their tools are brought down once again to the earth that is theirs to till. The ballet ends by returning full circle to the begin-
ning: the townspeople sing and dance once again in a brief reprisal of “Los labradores,” set in motion by the same resounding “Vámonos” that is heard at the beginning of the work. The cycle completes as the thunderous song and dance of “Los labradores” fades into the hum of the bird’s song as the tranquil harvest (“La trilla”) of Fuente Ovejuna resumes. The cyclical nature of the ballet infuses its external structure with the same harmony that we observe within the play. That is, both thematically and structurally the ballet moves from stability to instability and then back to stability once again. By structuring his adaptation in this way, Gades introduces a circularity to the *comedia* that is not necessarily in step with Lope’s work; at least not to the same degree. This is especially true if you consider that the play “ends with a ‘resolution’ that is a postponement or deferral of a resolution” (Blue 296) and the ballet seemingly ties off every loose end. Overall, the play captures the development of the collective self from its inception, whereas the ballet begins with an already established collectivity. In both works there is an emergent sense of group identity and shared destiny, but the adaptation takes the collective protagonist as a starting point rather than exploring its life cycle from the beginning as Lope does.

**Conclusion**

As Laura Vidler observes, *Fuenteovejuna* is “one of hundreds of Golden Age plays that weave
popular dance into the body of the performance” (214). In her analysis of “the dislocation of the habitus of dance” (216), she explores the relationship between characterization, theme, conflict, and kinesthetic movement. Rather than explore the potential for dance within the play, Gades’s ballet reinterprets the latter through the former; the play transformed entirely into dance. This is done with particular effect and to communicate a specific reading of the play, but the potential influence of Gades’s Fuenteovejuna transcends the adaptation itself. Even if more ballet adaptations of comedias do not appear in the coming years, the capacity of dance not only to entertain but to inform audiences and highlight certain themes cannot be missed. This is actually true of Gades’s ballet and potentially true of any comedia production that infuses dance.

In the following summation of flamenco, Ricardo Molina offers a fitting description of both the comedia and the ballet: “Es universal, a la vez que español y andaluz, en virtud de su inspiración profundamente humana y por la fuerza elemental con que directamente expresa problemas radicales del hombre, sentimientos y preocupaciones, deseos y experiencias comunes a todos los hombres” (11). What Gades offers in his ballet is an adaptation worthy of the original; not because it faithfully renders both the military and the plebeian strands of the work, but because it animates and explores the collective protagonist in ways heretofore unseen. It would be unfair, therefore, to brand Gades’s work
as merely another pro-revolutionary reading/production of the play. His ability to choreograph movement and coordinate music that evinces Lope’s words is nothing short of brilliant and inspiring; yet another demonstration of the mastery of this masterpiece. After all, it is the literary criticism related to the play, to which I would add its production history, “that has made Fuente Ovejuna a masterpiece” (Larson 288).

Not to be lost in this assessment of Gades’s ballet are the merits of the play itself: “Fuente Ovejuna may have been staged so frequently because of its amenability to different ideological agendas, but it would have had little or no propagandistic worth if it were not for its theatrical virtues which clearly have the capacity to stir audiences in a unique way” (Wheeler 103). This is one of the reasons why we return to this work in our research and our teaching; why we do not miss the chance to see it performed again on stage. While nothing short of a flamenco dance company can even conceive of staging Gades’s ballet, the 2011 performance at the Teatro Real is widely available. It makes for an excellent companion to the study of Lope’s original; one that both reinforces and challenges our reading and teaching of the text. Neither the play nor the adaptation can be separated from their Andalusian roots; both have universal significance and appeal.
Notes

1 Following its premier in Italy, *Fuenteovejuna* toured consistently for the next five years, including performances in Europe, Asia, South America, and the Caribbean. After a long absence from the stage, the Compañía Antonio Gades revived the work in 2008 and has performed it regularly in the years since.

2 For sake of clarity, references to the town will be rendered Fuente Ovejuna, while references to the play and ballet will appear as *Fuenteovejuna*. In citations, the name of the play will be left as it appears in the original.

3 A more comprehensive view of extant criticism on the intersection of politics and *Fuenteovejuna* can be found in articles by Bernal Herrera Montero, William Blue, and Paul Larson, among others.

4 Blue (296), Gómez-Moriana (“Volviendo” 72), and Fiore (103) make similar statements in their respective articles.

5 Wheeler organizes his overview of twentieth-century performances of *Fuenteovejuna* in Spain politically, with “productions from the Republican, dictatorial and democratic periods” (76). This serves both a temporal and a thematic purpose, since most of the chapter explores the intersection of politics and the play in recent productions. This includes analysis of a late twentieth-century staging by Emilio Hernández (93-98), as well as eight productions from 1999-2008, a period he interprets as “the repoliticization of *Fuente Ovejuna*” (98). Susan Fischer, on the other hand, focuses on the carnivalesque in her monograph dedicated to Adolfo Marsillach’s 1993 production of the play with Spain’s Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico (CNTC). Still other studies pursue the politicization of *Fuenteovejuna* in productions outside of Spain (e.g., Domènech, Weimer).

6 Todos initially speaks in the aftermath of Laurencia’s indictment early in the third act (1723-93). The nine lines attributed to Todos are as follows: “Vivan muchos años” (1812); “Tiranos traídos, mueran” (1814); “Agravios nunca esperan”
Wade

(1879); “¡Fuenteovejuna! ¡Viva el rey Fernando! / ¡Mueran malos cristianos y traidores!” (1882-83); “Nuestros señores / son los reyes católicos” (1885-86); “¡Fuenteovejuna, y Fernán Gómez muera!” (1887); and “Sí” (2096). The feminine collectivity, Todas, speaks in much the same way as Todos: “¡Fuenteovejuna! ¡Viva el rey Fernando! (1919).
7 The music and dance of the adaptation do not belong exclusively to flamenco. As covered in some detail below, many different traditional songs and dances are incorporated into the work.
8 While these specific passages refer to baile, the same could be said of toque and cante, all of which combine to communicate the full flamenco experience. It should be stated that the three primary divisions of flamenco have various subcategories as well. The purpose here is only to summarize those features of flamenco that are most relevant to Gades’s adaptation and not to attempt a comprehensive treatment thereof.
9 It is worth noting that this same year saw the tragic end to Federico García Lorca’s life and the beginning of the Spanish Civil War—two events that would have a profound impact on Gades.
10 During the 1990-91 season, Berkeley Repertory Theatre put on a music- and dance-infused adaptation of the comedia based on Adrian Mitchell’s translation and adaptation. The production was directed by Sharon Ott and featured original music by Stephen LeGrand, choreography by Adela Clara, and traditional guitar arrangements by Agustín Quintero (Villarreal 522). Berkeley Repertory’s production coincides with what we know of García Lorca’s adaptation more than it does Gades’s since the latter is essentially ballet and not theater. I am not familiar with another production of the play that integrates dance and music so fully into the performance.
11 The conversation between Esteban, Leonelo, the Regidor, and the Comendador early in the second act, in which he questions “¿Vosotros honor tenéis?” (2.987.129), is one of the clearest examples. Other instances include the following:
“¿Éstos se igualan conmigo?” (2.1027.131); “No ensuziéis / las armas que habéis de honrar / en otro mejor lugar” (2.1241-43.139); and “¿Es mejor un labrador / que un hombre de mi valor?” (2.1254-55.139).

12 Gades, similar to many of his predecessors—including García Lorca—has done away with the Catholic Monarchs in his adaptation of Fuenteovejuna. Caballero Bonaldo explains why this omission is permissible: “Algunos piensan que esa eliminación escamotea un final ‘políticamente correcto’, pero Antonio Gades—y yo con él—también suponíamos que ese epílogo del tribunal real no parecía asociarse a la pura significación ideológica del drama” (12). Given Gades’s focus on Fuente Ovejuna as a collectivity, it makes sense, in fact, to eliminate the king and queen as well as other characters whose specificity is not vital to the scope of what he hopes to accomplish with his adaptation. Does this impact the socio-political richness of the adaptation? Without a doubt. But it does not, as Juan María Marín suggests, render such an interpretation meaningless (64). What Kirschner says about the ending of Lope’s work in general also applies to Gades’s adaptation: “si se argumenta el final desde nuestro enfoque, el de la creación de un espíritu colectivo, entonces la solución final representa el triunfo de la colectividad, porque precisamente lo que han logrado es imponer su voluntad” (139). While Kirschner is describing the ending as it plays out in the comedia and not Gades’s adaptation, her emphasis on the collective triumph of Fuente Ovejuna is true in both cases with or without Catholic Monarchs.
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EL DEMONIO DEL TEATRO DEL SIGLO DE ORO EN LA ESCENA CONTEMPORÁNEA: LA DIFICULTAD DE MONTAR EL CONDENADO POR DESCONFIADO

SIMON BREDEN
University of Nottingham

El acometido de este artículo es examinar las estrategias de montaje que han desplegado profesionales del teatro a la hora de escenificar la figura sobrenatural del Demonio en la obra atribuida a Tirso de Molina, *El condenado por desconfiado*. Reduciéndolo a términos más sencillos, el demonio en el teatro del Siglo de Oro tiene la función de desatar el conflicto y mostrarle a los protagonistas y por consiguiente al público, aquello que está prohibido. Sin embargo, debemos de tratar de llegar a una conclusión de cómo exactamente se escenifica prácticamente tal conflicto, y cómo interpretamos al demonio en escena. Sigmund Méndez, hablando de *El mágico prodigioso* con conclusiones extensibles a *El condenado por desconfiado*, nos avisa que "no puede olvidarse que ... en la ortodoxia cristiana el demonio posee una realidad metafísica más allá de los hombres, y el teatro de Calderón es, en última instancia, más teológico que psicológico" (267); también debemos recordar que un actor en
escena no puede crear un personaje a base de conceptos teológicos, o por lo menos no en un presente tan marcado por la metodología de actuación psicológica creada por Stanislavski. De hecho, el programa de mano de Damned by Despair —montaje británico de El condenado por desconfiado, representado en el National Theatre londinense— incluye un artículo escrito por Robin Anderson analizando a Paulo y Enrico desde la perspectiva del psicoanálisis, aproximación que, indudablemente, ayudó a los dos actores a encarnar sus respectivos personajes. El mismo Méndez concede que "lo que contemplamos en el drama es una psychomachia, una batalla que se gesta en el alma de los hombres ... no puede dejar de atenderse el carácter psicológico que ésta posee, junto con sus propios significados morales y religiosos" (270). Vale la pena insistir en las resoluciones prácticas sobre la escena al reto que supone este personaje ya que el montaje teatral requiere una clara toma de decisiones por parte del equipo creativo para ayudar a clarificar la vía de comunicación entre actor y espectador. A través de estas decisiones, entendemos mejor no sólo la obra, sino qué pueden significar estas obras —a veces percibidas como tan lejanas de nuestra realidad cotidiana del siglo XXI— para el público moderno.

Para ello, el análisis se centra en la obra de Tirso y en tres montajes claves de principios del siglo XXI a cargo de la compañía Morboria (2001), Zampanó Teatro (2001) y la Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico (2010). Dada la ubicuidad del De-
monio en el teatro del Siglo de Oro, se hará referencia a otras obras en las que aparece, como la anteriormente citada obra de Calderón de la Barca, *El mágico prodigioso*, y a algunos montajes modernos de esta obra. La figura del Demonio ha sido ya ampliamente estudiada en numerosos libros y artículos, y además este trabajo se plantea como una segunda parte a una contextualización que he realizado ya en otro artículo estableciendo los puntos en común que comparten los distintos Demonios que aparecen en el Siglo de Oro. En él, examiné el carácter bufonesco del Demonio, dirigiendo la atención a las estrategias que despliegan los dramaturgos a la hora de ridiculizar a una figura que inspira más risa que terror. El próximo paso lógico era ver de qué modo los profesionales del teatro habían respondido a estos estímulos, sobre la página, a la hora de llevar a un personaje tan llamativo a la escena.

Quizás el primer Demonio que aparece en una Comedia del Siglo de Oro es en la obra de Ruiz de Alarcón, *Quien mal anda en mal acaba*, que Sigmund Méndez fecha en 1602: "el demonio de Alarcón, que podría ser uno de los primeros en aparecer en la escena castellana, resulta un tanto tieso, sin un sello particular" (150). Sin embargo, su función en la obra encaja con la de demonios posteriores, que es desencadenar el conflicto de la obra a través de habilitar los deseos sexuales del protagonista. El analista jungiano Andrew Samuels define al diablo en los siguientes términos: "The devil is the place where you put things you’d rather forget
about" (citado en Hamilton). En cierto modo, se puede argumentar que los personajes de las obras del Siglo de Oro tratan de tapar los impulsos que el Demonio les anima a explorar activamente. Everett Hesse ha analizado elementos subyacentes en los textos del Siglo de Oro para tratar de clarificar tanto los avances dramatúrgicos como el papel del demonio, en este caso con referencia a *El mágico prodigioso*. Postulando una lectura puramente psicológica de la obra, nos propone la siguiente aproximación:

Viewed psychologically, the Devil is an archetype. According to Jung, the archetype of the Devil is more commonly called a "shadow", that is, that dark other self that exists in every human being. [...] The different elements that constitute the shadow are detested by the conscious mind, and this posits a profound archetypal center around which they linger (39).

El demonio, por lo tanto, es el doble del individuo, la sombra, y expresa los deseos reprimidos de la mente inconsciente. Joseph L. Henderson nos explica el funcionamiento de la sombra según Jung: "the shadow cast by the conscious mind of the individual contains the hidden, repressed and unfavorable (or nefarious) aspects of the personality. But this darkness ... has good qualities —normal instincts and creative impulses" (citado en Jung). De algún modo, según Freud, el demonio es la antítesis de Dios y por lo tanto su sombra, quedando dividido a partir del Medioevo: "In the earliest ages of religion God
himself still possessed all the terrifying features which were afterwards combined to form a counterpart of him" (400). Desde esta perspectiva, Hesse concluye, por tanto, que:

The Devil serves as the exteriorization of Cipriano's mental conflict over the Christian concept of God as contrasted with that of the pagan. Satan exteriorizes the jealousy that exists in the minds of the two suitors for Justina's hand, Lelio and Floro. Finally he represents Justina's hidden thoughts and secret desires concerning sex, and instinctual drives arising from the unconscious (xiv).

Como análisis de la obra, puede alejarse bastante del planteamiento de Calderón, pero lo que es innegable es que el diablo solamente aparece cuando el protagonista se da de bruces con los aspectos de su ser que no resultan aceptables al orden social de su día. Por ejemplo, don Gil en El esclavo del demonio, mantiene una conversación en sueños con el diablo a través de Domingo, "¿Quién ha de ser sino el diablo?" (79), que le anima a gozar de Lisarda; el pensamiento de aprovechar la escala que ha dejado don Diego se le ocurre a él solito, sin la intercesión de ningún demonio: "Aquí se queda la escala / manifestando su intento. / ¡Oh, qué extraño pensamiento!" (75). En este caso el demonio, de nuevo, sirve para animar al protagonista a cumplir deseos e impulsos que ya siente —el demonio no obliga a don Gil a desear a Lisarda—, así convirtiéndose en la expresión de su sombra. Incluso si no aceptamos
esta perspectiva, no dista mucho de la visión de Elaine Pagels que nos anima a interpretar a Satán como "a reflection of how we perceive ourselves and those we call 'others'" (xviii). Satán es 'el otro' en estas obras y distintas montajes se plantean distintas estrategias para escenificarlo.

En el caso del demonio de El condenado por desconfiado, comienza dejando muy claro por qué ha podido ascender del infierno para ponerle a Paulo a prueba:

Demonio: Diez años ha que persigo a este monje en el desierto,
... Hoy duda en su fe, que es duda de la fe lo que hoy ha hecho,
porque es la fe, en el cristiano,
que sirviendo a Dios y haciendo buenas obras, ha de ir
da gozar de Él, en muriendo.
... duda de la fe, pues vemos que quiere del mismo Dios,
estando en duda, saberlo.
En la soberbia también ha pecado, caso es cierto.
Nadie como yo lo sabe,
pues por soberbio padezco (150-51)

Hay varios datos llamativos en este monólogo. En primer lugar, el demonio deja claro que llevaba diez años tratando de obtener el alma de Paulo, pero "siempre le he hallado firme / como un gran peñasco opuesto" (150). Esto implica que han existido intentos anteriores de quebrantar la fe de Paulo, pero han fracasado. Todo esto cambia no por un
impulso externo, sino a causa de un sueño que tiene Paulo sobre su propia condena al infierno, por la cual el demonio no puede jactarse de haber intervenido: "Un sueño la causa ha sido" (151). Entendiendo el sueño como una expresión del subconsciente, estamos claramente ante una inquietud de la 'sombra' de Paulo, sobre la que el demonio oportunista se abalanza. El punto de inflexión se acentúa pidiéndole a Dios explicaciones, poniendo a prueba a Dios en un alarde de soberbia: "Vos, Dios santo, / me declarad la causa de este espanto" (149). Expresa un deseo, imposible de saciar, de conocer con certeza su destino.

Entendiendo esta función del diablo como sombra del deseo de los protagonistas, debemos en primer lugar examinar las dificultades específicas que plantea el texto en relación con poner el Demonio en escena. Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez ya dedicó una amplia proporción de su introducción a la obra para Cátedra a postular cómo se hubiera montado en el Siglo de Oro lo que él denomina "una típica comedia de tramoya" (47), un montaje dependiente de la maquinaria escénica para generar efectos especiales que maravillarían al público. Tirso nos indica, en las acotaciones, que la primera aparición del demonio es "en lo alto" (150) y su transformación en Ángel para engañar a Paulo parece bastante sencilla: "Quitase EL DEMONIO la túnica y queda de ángel" (152). Esta versión del diablo emplea un lenguaje de la santidad para embauzar, tal y como ilustra Agustín de la Granja: "Su
aparición tiene lugar en sentido vertical, pero no ascendiendo rápidamente "desde el infierno" por la consabida trampilla, según los viejos cánones, sino bajando majestuosamente desde el nivel más alto del tablado ... la artimaña tiene su razón de ser en tanto que el diablo pretende, con ello, crear la confusión" (87). Evidentemente la primera aparición del demonio y su subsecuente transformación se pueden aderezar de un modo más o menos espectacular empleando apariencias o pescantes, pero la obra se ajusta, sin duda, a la noción de la obra de tramoya en el sentido de, en palabras de Caro Baroja, "un enredo bien urdido" (Teatro popular 34). Cabría recordar que el Diccionario de Autoridades nos ofrece una segunda acepción del término tramoya que nos ayuda a entender el uso del término para los dramaturgos del Siglo de Oro: "metaphóricamente vale enredo hecho con ardid, y maña, o apariencia de bondad" (DA). El Demonio en estas obras siempre complica el enredo y su intervención aquí en forma de Ángel, engañando a Paulo con su majestuosa aparición desde lo alto en vez de aparecer a través del escotillón, es el primer paso de un enredo que termina con la vida y condena de Paulo. Ya en cuestiones de tramoya escénica, la obra incluye un espacio tras una cortina permitiendo la aparición y desaparición de Anareto, padre de Enrico, durante el segundo acto (207, 216). Ya en el tercer acto, el diablo hace aparecer una puerta de la nada en la prisión: "A una señal del Demonio se abre un postigo en la pared" (276); para que lle-
gando al momento culminante de la obra comiencen los efectos más espectaculares: "Con la música suben dos ángeles al alma de Enrico por una apariencia" (299). En este caso, no solamente se desvela el cuadro empleando una apariencia, sino que tres figuras se remontan en dirección al cielo en pescante. La potencia de la imagen supera, con creces, al Demonio de esta obra, en general poco vistoso. Incluso el último efecto de la obra con la aparición del alma atormentada de Paulo, es el resultado de intervención divina a pesar de su aspecto infernal, ya que aparece en escena para descubrir los engaños del Demonio: "Descúbrese fuego, y Paulo lleno de llamas ... Húndese, y sale fuego de la tierra" (309-10). Evidentemente entra y sale de escena por medio del escotillón y vemos como el autor recurre a la pirotecnia para mayor impacto visual y dramático. Toda la maquinaria técnica asociada con estas obras tiene la función prioritaria de dar al espectáculo mayor impacto visual.

El efecto de esta técnica escénica nos distanciaba de la obra y nos convierte en observadores críticos, riéndonos del Demonio y de sus engaños, incrédulos ante los errores de los protagonistas, y planteándonos nuestra posición en relación a las tramas fantásticas ante nuestros ojos. Por lo tanto, la obra plantea una dificultad, creciente desde su composición, y que Elma Dassbach resume de la siguiente forma: "Para el espectador de hoy, sin embargo, lo sobrenatural en escena puede representar cierto problema por la reticencia de este a aceptar la
intervención divina en asuntos humanos" (citado en Mújica 34). Veamos ahora los problemas que presenta para la escena contemporánea dentro de una cultura mucho menos dogmatizada por la religión, y con evidentes problemas a la hora de procesar el mensaje teológico. El 10 de Octubre del 2012 se estrenó en el Royal National Theatre (Olivier Theatre) *Damned by Despair*, una nueva versión de *El condenado por desconfiado* de Tirso en versión del dramaturgo irlandés Frank McGuinness y dirigido por Bijan Sheibani. En general la crítica reconoció el hecho de que nos encontrábamos ante una obra maestra que el montaje no había sabido transmitir del todo, aunque no necesariamente por culpa del equipo: "It is a challenging work" (Billington). La crítica teatral señaló varios problemas, como nos indica Michael Billington, mientras que Dominic Cavendish explica que la experiencia nos puede parecer "almost ludicrous, bordering on insane and defiantly out of keeping with time and place". Por fin concluye que "The result remains, four centuries on, both easy to follow and hard to swallow". Más crítico aún, *Time Out* atacó duramente la obra, refiriéndose al intento de resituar la acción en el mundo moderno: "the contemporary setting just serves to underscore how irrelevant to modern values Molina's play is" (Anon *Damned*). Lauren Paxman coincide en que la modernización sirve para distanciar-nos aún más de la obra, explicando que estas estrategias "only serve to alienate audiences even further from a dated plot with a damaging message about
redemption and fanaticism". En 2014 pude entrevistar a Bijan Sheibani, director del montaje, acerca de su experiencia trabajando con el texto, y su visión parece coincidir con la de los críticos: "I have to confess, I don't believe the play really works, or at least, I couldn't find a way of making it cohere, and I wish that we had done something much more radical with the original story". De algún modo este ejemplo sirve para indicar la dificultad a la que se refería Elma Dassbach, llevando a críticos y espectadores a rechazar o bien el montaje, o bien la misma obra, por lo menos en el caso del Reino Unido en el 2012.8 Por lo tanto, debemos ver las estrategias desplegadas en montajes modernos para interpretar estos textos y contrarrestar, en su caso, las posibles reticencias del público al oír mensajes que se puedan considerar arcaicos.

En España, El condenado por desconfiado es quizás la aparición escénica del Demonio que mayor repercusión ha tenido en la escena del siglo XX. En 1924 tenemos noticia en ABC de un montaje en versión de Manuel y Antonio Machado, loanando su respeto por el texto: "los ilustres poetas tuvieron el buen gusto de respetar casi íntegramente [el texto], suprimiendo no más que redundancias y prolijidades de concepto y de forma" (Anon Teatro Español). Indagando en el aspecto religioso de la obra, concluye que "no haya temor de que en la actualidad pierda su representativo carácter porque la forma dramática le ampara de tal suerte, que en todo momento, antes, como ahora, la obra de Tirso con-
serva lozana su belleza". La obra reaparece en 1940 en el *ABC de Sevilla*, en un montaje a cargo del Teatro Español Universitario, enfatizando de nuevo la calidad de obra maestra del texto: "La obra de anoche es una de las más representativas del teatro nacional" (Anon *Condenado*). Unos años más tarde, en 1949, reaparece un montaje de la obra a cargo de nuevo del Teatro Universitario Español, comentado en el *Noticiero Universal*. La función, preparada para el III centenario de la muerte de Tirso nos aporta algo más de información acerca de las condiciones de la compañía: "Séanos permitido este breve resumen en gracia a lo meritísimo de la interpretación, dado lo difícil que es aun para expertos profesionales. Y el cuadro escénico del T.E.U. realizó una labor excelente dentro de la condición de aficionados de sus elementos" (Cala). De nuevo el crítico incide en la importancia de la obra: "una de las mejores obras dramáticas de aquel sabio religioso de la Orden de la Merced", comentando el aspecto religioso de la obra: "El genio creador de Tirso de Molina tuvo la majestuosa grandeza de la divina inspiración al rendir en ‘El condenado por desconfiado’ fervoroso y sublime homenaje a la redención de las almas pecadoras, por la fe, en humilde acto de contrición". En efecto estos montajes establecen la lectura más canónica de la obra, además de la importancia de su dramaturgo, generando una tradición escénica que empieza a verse cuestionada en el último tercio del siglo XX.
El siguiente montaje del que tenemos noticia, es de nuevo en el Teatro Español y bajo la dirección de Miguel Narros en 1970, retomando la versión de los hermanos Machado. Ángel Laborda nos cuenta que "hace ya muchos años que no se representa en España y que está considerada como una de las tragedias más importantes de la escena universal". Sin embargo, Narros claramente dirige la entrevista de Laborda a alejarse de las lecturas puramente religiosas de la obra:

- ¿Cree usted que el teatro, de verdad religioso, está acabado por ahora?
- El teatro religioso no está acabado. Lo que es necesario que encuentre es el problema vigente.

Con esto en mente, el montaje de Narros trataba de definir un nuevo concepto de la universalidad del texto: "Creo que el problema planteado ... es un problema eterno, ya que se trata de la lucha interior establecida en el ser humano. ... Creo que la inseguridad de Paulo, el no saber encontrarse a sí mismo, la falta de seguridad en sus propias ideas, está muy cerca del público de estos años". En cuanto al montaje en sí, Narros indica su intención de "darle un ritmo al espectáculo", lo cual reconoce Laborda en su apreciación del ensayo general presenciado: "asombrado ante la manera tan rápida de resolverse las mutaciones". Aparentemente, nos encontramos ante dos innovaciones en este montaje, frente a los anteriores montajes del siglo XX. En primer lugar,
el apartarnos de una lectura puramente dogmática de la obra, y segundo, imprimir ritmo en un escenario que queda descrito como cambiante y dependiente de transformaciones ágiles. Estas son dos líneas de las que no se apartarían los siguientes montajes más recientes de la obra. En ningún caso hay menciones de cómo se eligió escenificar al demonio de la obra —este silencio alrededor del personaje, a priori, más llamativo del texto, resulta curioso.

**El condenado por desconfiado** parece volver a desaparecer de la cartelera hasta el año 2001, en el que se llevan a escena sendos montajes de las compañías Morboria y Zampanó. Bajo la dirección de Eva del Palacio, el video del montaje de Morboria documenta la función del día 21 de julio 2001 en el Patio de Fúcares como parte del Festival de Almagro, montaje que se estrenó en el Teatro Pradillo de Madrid, el 31 de enero del 2001. En él vemos un claro intento de acercamiento al público, alejando al espectador de un denso drama religioso e imprimiendo un ritmo vertiginoso. Pedro Manuel Víllora reconoce en el *ABC*, este intento por parte de la compañía de ilusionar al público: "el teatro como juego, como diversión nada intelectualizada, nada sofisticada, sino inocente, acaso ingenua; el teatro como ámbito en el que sentirse aún niño, soñador, imaginativo ... Y lo curioso es que ... han conseguido este efecto no con una comedia jacarandosa, sino con un drama moral". Concluye el crítico que la escenificación "es de las que hacen afición, de las que saben entretener, de las que un profesor puede re-
comendar a sus alumnos. Su falta de pretensiones es su mayor virtud, porque nos habla de un tiempo en que al teatro también se acudía para disfrutar”. José Ramón Díaz Sande en Reseña adopta una postura más crítica, limitándose a decir que "se consigue una puesta en escena aceptable y un despliegue de diversas calidades interpretativas". Se detiene más en el relieve temático de la obra, ya no con la misma apreciación por la obra que los críticos de principios del siglo XX: "La pregunta es por qué la elección de este texto, con resabios de enseñanza en un tema, la predestinación, que hoy, en una sociedad interesada por el día a día, no la preocupa". Evidentemente la apuesta escénica levanta ciertas dudas, a pesar de sus intentos de acercar el texto al espectador moderno.

En cuanto a la intervención del diablo, vemos a un demonio antropomórfico que observa a Paulo desde la galería superior del Patio de Fúcares. Viste un largo atuendo de color rojo y negro, y un impactante maquillaje dándole aspecto de fauno —Morboria, como compañía, se ha popularizado por sus caracterizaciones espectaculares, como apunta Díaz Sande: "ellos realizan todo: vestuario, atrezzo, maquillaje, escenografía". El resultado es digno del cine de efectos especiales y este demonio sorprende con su larga cornamenta, ojos negros hundidos, piel color ceniza y largas garras. El primer discurso del demonio, dirigiéndose al público, transcurre desde el piso superior del Patio de Fúcares, recordando al engaño demoniaco de confundir apareciendo desde
arriba, no desde abajo como sería de suponer. Después la transformación en ángel toma lugar en lo más cercano a un bofetón\(^9\) en el siglo XX. Suena una tormenta al pie de texto de Paulo, las luces parpadean y se aprecia un chorro creado por una máquina de humo. En esta confusión, vemos aparecer una figura desde el lateral derecho de la escena, pero se hace el oscuro. Cuando vuelve la luz vemos una figura, aparentemente una escultura, de un ángel encima de un pedestal. En realidad es un actor, creando la ilusión de una estatua animada con una máscara que le tapa la cara por completo. Mientras tanto, el demonio sigue en la galería, sin ser apreciado por Paulo, y aporta la voz del "ángel" mientras éste gesticula con los brazos. Para la desaparición del ángel, se vuelve a hacer un oscuro acompañado de efectos sonoros tormentosos. Como vemos, el espacio escénico sigue requiriendo de la agilidad y de la transformación tal y como nos sugería el texto sobre la página. En este caso Morboria ha elegido emplear el lenguaje del cine de horror para subrayar la escena —en primer lugar el demonio terrorífico, observando amenazante, desde arriba, con un pequeño halo de humo a sus espaldas. Este signo conecta claramente con el fuerte chorro de humo con el que aparece el ángel, que también inspira miedo o por lo menos impresiona con su aspecto de escultura de iglesia que ha cobrado vida, pero con el efecto de generar grima por su cara plastificada e impávida, combinado de sus movimientos mecánicos. Por último, su aparición y desaparición, con tormenta,
humo y oscuros sorpresivos también conduce al sobresalto. No es un ángel convincente, resulta más bien un engaño ingeniosamente creado. Todo nos lleva, como espectadores, a una dinámica de rechazo, pero siempre impresionados por la teatralidad con la que trabaja el demonio. En realidad, presenciamos la conversión del diablo en director de escena, aspecto del personaje analizado en los autos sacramentales de Calderón por Juan Carlos Garrot Zambrana (2010) y por Javier Espejo Surós que nos habla de un Satán instigador de juego escénico (2010). Los prodigios del demonio, en la práctica teatral del siglo XX, siguen la línea del Siglo de Oro y parecen enfatizar al diablo como figura teatral, dirigiendo la atención hacia su rol meta-teatral y su relación con el público.

La teatralidad del mal sigue su curso con la puerta de la prisión del tercer acto. En este caso aparece una bailaora que parece interpretar una sombra, con coreografías desarrolladas tanto en la escena de las dudas de Enrico en la celda como en la última escena y muerte de Paulo. Ambos se debatien entre la fe y la desconfianza en sus respectivas escenas y la sombra simboliza el pecado. En el caso de Enrico solamente puede bailar alrededor de un personaje hundido en el suelo, que se niega a salir por la puerta creada por el demonio-fauno —en este caso, se ha instalado en escena una sección de pared con unas rejas, pero no aparece ninguna puerta, salvo en la imaginación del espectador y en el cambio hacia luz general rojiza que acompaña la aparición
del diablo. Creemos en la apertura porque Enrico cree en ella con su cambio de actitud. Sin embargo, la coreografía de la bailaora con Paulo transcurre con un fuerte contacto físico, culminando con la bailaora aprisionándole lentamente con una larga tela negra, como su vestido. Mientras tanto, la apariencia de Enrico dirigiéndose al cielo se resuelve con un lento paseo del actor a lo largo de los sopor tales al fondo del escenario, con una suave luz azulada que contrasta con el tono rojizo que adopta el escenario. Mientras que Enrico resiste la tentación, Paulo sucumbe a ella, muriendo envuelto en la tela. Acto seguido, Pedrisco llora sobre su cuerpo mientras la compañía vuelve a entrar convertidos en demonios deformes y liderados por Satanás. En términos dramatúrgicos, la compañía ha elegido suprimir la presencia del juez y la resolución de la obra con Paulo declamando su discurso de condena (310) directamente al público, mientras los demonios le sujetan, para terminar arrastrándole fuera del escenario. La sorpresa final la proporciona el diablo, que ya solo en escena, avanza hacia el público. Se quita los guantes de garras, la larga túnica y la máscara de fauno, convirtiéndose en hombre moderno trajeado. Una versión reducida del discurso final de Pedrisco le ha sido re-asignado, mientras fuma y mira expectante al público. Al dar la frase final al demonio, ya llegando a nuestros tiempos y consultando la hora en su reloj, mientras dice "El cielo os guarde mil años" (312), Morboria apuesta fuertemente por emplear esta obra para comentar sobre la actualidad.
No es el gracioso quien amablemente nos despide, sino un sinuoso demonio que podría pasar por cualquiera de nosotros. La sugerencia es abrumadora: el demonio director de escena revela su juego de apariencias desplegado a lo largo de la obra, pero esto implica que lo único que cambia es su estrategia ya que acaba la obra adjudicándose las apariencias sociales del presente como su nueva arma. De algún modo, con este juego meta-teatral, la vida real del público se acaba de convertir siniestramente en un teatro del demonio.

A pesar de la potente adaptación dramatúrgica y conceptual, habría que añadir que el montaje en general no carece de fallos. Víllora, con cierta ilusión, nos habla de una interpretación "donde los personajes se caracterizan de golpe y sin sutilezas; así, el malo es malísimo y arrogante, al estilo de un pirata en technicolor [sic]; el diablo tiene cuernos y una mueca retorcida, el ángel está nimbado de luz... Todo, exactamente, como lo haría un niño en sus juegos o un adulto que añorase el cine de aventuras en sesión doble". Ciertamente el código actoral tiende a dibujarse a grandes rasgos, evitando los profundos debates teológicos de la obra, los cuales quedan hábilmente plasmados en elementos plásticos como la bailaora. Sin embargo, el resultado actoral, como nos dice Díaz Sande, no pasa de "aceptable". Aunque el efecto global de la obra es potente, no deja de estar sostenida sobre golpes visuales o conceptuales en los que los actores brillan más por su capacidad de transformación que por sus calida-
des interpretativas. Por otro lado, el montaje de la compañía Zampanó de El condenado por desconfiado ofrece una apuesta arriesgada que enriquece nuestra lectura de la obra: "siempre nos han encantado los riesgos" (Anon Teatro Pavón) señala la propia compañía.

La compañía Zampanó estrenó su versión de la obra de Tirso en el Teatro Pavón de Madrid el día 1 de Noviembre de 2001 según nos cuenta Susana Moreno Pachón: "el teatro clásico, en el que es especialista el grupo Zampanó, dispone, desde ayer, de un templo para hacer adeptos durante el siglo XXI". En general, el estreno del montaje atrajo mucha atención por la reapertura del Teatro Pavón tras años de abandono.11 Los artífices del rescate del espacio fueron José Maya, director de la compañía, y Amaya Curieses, encargada de la versión, ambos también actores en el espectáculo interpretando a Enrico y el Demonio respectivamente. En todas las entrevistas en prensa, enfatizan sus deseos de acercar los clásicos al público y específicamente rescatar la figura y obra de Tirso: "La gente de Zampanó ha renovado esta 'comedia moral con cierto contenido teológico' para despedazar el tópico de que el teatro clásico español es aburrido, 'cuando en realidad es uno de los más vibrantes y actuales', dicen" (Moreno Pachón); "Llevamos más de veinte años montando a nuestros clásicos y queríamos abrir el teatro con un título y un autor que hoy se encuentran un poco olvidados. La obra ha sido tachada de drama teológico y de poco interés actual. Lleva
treinta años sin representarse porque hay gente que piensa que está pasado. Nada más lejos de la realidad. Es una obra que trata conceptos como el bien, el mal o la eternidad, temas que no creo que se pasen de moda" (Caruana); "Una obra que se ha calificado de esperpento-teológico-místico-artística en la que no faltan duelos, persecuciones, apariciones, demonios, así como un fino humor y que por desgracia lleva un buen tiempo sin representarse: ‘Una obra divertida que plantea cuestiones serias de una forma peculiar y no un drama serio con disquisiciones obsoletas de hoy en día’" (Torres). Resulta curioso que esta compañía se enfrentara a problemas que montajes anteriores no se habían planteado —las dificultades del texto tal y como había planteado Bijan Sheibani— cuando los críticos de principios de siglo XX únicamente enfatizaban la calidad de obra maestra del texto. Eduardo Pérez-Rasilla, por ejemplo, llega a decir que Tirso "parece supeditar la trama y la construcción de los personajes a una tesis previa que desea demostrar", mientras que Sheibani sugiere que sin una adaptación radical, la obra no puede ir más allá de su mensaje dogmático: "What I tried to do, and, had we changed the story more radically this might have been more successful, is to turn it into a story about forgiveness, atonement, guilt, and to try and give it a non-religious resonance. But the play wasn't actually structured to explore the complexity of those issues. It is instead structured to take Enrico to heaven at the very last minute, and Paulo to hell". El texto ya no es un tótem
canónico ante el cual debemos inclinarnos, sino un lugar de debate que emplea el texto como punto de partida para proponer un diálogo al público. Pese a los grandes problemas a los que se enfrentó el montaje del National Theatre londinense, contaron con un asesor en teología, el Dr. Giles Fraser, quién en un vídeo publicitario para el espectáculo, junto al adaptador de la obra y célebre dramaturgo Frank McGuinness, trató de indicar el potencial universal de la obra: "This is not a play that is just there simply for religious people, not at all. For me what it explores, even for people who think that the underlying theology is something they just don’t share and don’t get, it explores the vulnerability of the human condition, and it’s a play that will speak to people of faith and of no faith". El planteamiento del montaje desde un principio fue tratar de hablar de la condición humana como la esencia del texto. Frank McGuinness explica que "it is a deeply unsettling and troubled play masquerading as a conventional meditation on the nature of goodness and the nature of evil ... [the play] utterly illuminates that there is no such thing as the nature of goodness and the nature of evil, there is only this war raging in the human psyche and the human soul between them and that whatever peace you may acquire is an illusion". De nuevo Giles Fraser trata de llevar esto a una conclusión que pueda apelar a cualquier público: "what this play gets you to do is to look in the mirror and see yourself not just simply as the good person but as actually much more morally ambiva-
lent ... recognising one’s own moral ambivalence, having that self-critical vigilance is essential for our ... moral framework". La obra, por lo tanto, no pierde su dimensión religiosa, sino que suma una reflexión activa para el público acerca de su propia naturaleza que la compañía Zampanó también trató de activar.

En el 2001, la compañía Zampanó defendió la obra de estos ataques como una obra maestra y trataron de redefinir ciertos conceptos de la misma manera que hizo Narros en la década de los 70 y después Sheibani en el 2012. En el programa de mano, José María Ruano de la Haza propone un marco académico para la labor práctica de Zampanó:

se dispone en este innovador montaje de la obra de Tirso a desmitificar este mito, tal como aconseja Francisco Ruiz Ramón que se haga con los muchos mitos bajo los cuales sufre y languidece nuestro teatro clásico español ... El condenado por desconfiado es ante todo y sobre todo una pieza teatral. Despojándola de su atavío posttridentino se revela como un drama psicológico de acción de una modernidad alucinante (citado en Zampanó).

Sin embargo, esta provocación tuvo su respuesta en la crítica, que se polarizó a favor y en contra. Alberto de la Hera respondió directamente a Ruano de la
Haza con "No hay que desmitificar los mitos", argumentando que "Si nos ponemos a desmitificar un mito, lo normal es que al dejar de ser mito se quede en nada", aseveración, a todas luces, absurda. La crítica en el fondo se debate entre lo que considera fidelidad absoluta al autor, lo cual en realidad se traduce a una noción decimonónica y puramente textual de la obra, y una apreciación nula de la contribución creativa de la compañía. Incluso de la He-ra concluye: "Luces y sombras de un espectáculo interesante". Enrique Centeno, ‘crítico’ de posturas inflexibles, sigue en su línea, poco constructiva, al calificar el montaje como "Un clásico sin fuerza": "No había nada allí —la luz, tal vez— que mereciera la pena: sería cruel afirmar que lo mejor del montaje es que tenga entreacto, porque de esa manera puede uno ganar la salida y abandonar el precioso edificio, para hacer cosas más estimulantes; pero lo cierto es que fue así". Dejaré para otra ocasión, preguntar de qué modo publicar tales descalificaciones supone un acto de crítica teatral, escondiendo opiniones y prejuicios personales extremas bajo el manto de la supuesta objetividad artística del crítico. Lo cierto es que esta visión del espectáculo es muy limitada.

Al otro extremo, Núñez Ladévéze indicó que José Maya había dirigido la obra con "perspicacia ... Le ha dado un ritmo discutible, alternando el verso clásico con la música moderna, simplificando el decorado hasta el límite. Puede que a algunos les
parezca que ha habido excesos, pero si lo que hay que juzgar es el efecto que causa en el espectador se puede concluir que Maya ha salido bien librado de la peripecia". Juan Antonio Vizcaíno apunta los fuertes de la compañía: "Zampanó pone en pie su espectáculo con las buenas artes que se le conocen ...: cuidado extremo de la dicción del verso, desnudez escénica para acentuar el valor de los actores". Otros críticos se sitúan entre ambos campos, como Eduardo Pérez-Rasilla que concluye que "Aunque no pueden negarse interesantes logros en el montaje, el resultado es un tanto desigual, con momentos brillantes y novedosos, pero con otras fases en las que se deja sentir la pesadez de un drama muy poco sugestivo teatralmente y muy difícil de levantar sobre las tablas ... las escenas más interesantes me parecen aquellas en las que el grupo se ha mostrado más audaz". La audacia del grupo se vislumbra en su actitud respetuosa hacia el texto pero irreverente hacia el montaje, una propuesta para nada incompatible. En la primera escena, el elenco entero aparece vestido de negro y rodea a Paulo sobre un escenario vacío pero recubierto de tierra, de algún modo convirtiendo al mismo actor en elemento escenográfico. Cuando habla el Demonio, sustituye a Paulo en el centro de este corrillo, después apoyándose de espaldas sobre otro actor inclinado hacia adelante y sugiriendo en la imaginación del espectador una especie de figura de Jesús crucificado. A partir de este momento el Demonio adopta un protagonismo en la obra como maestro de ceremonias silencioso,
llevando un paso más lejos la presencia infernal en el montaje de Morboria. En este caso, cada transición entre escenas incorpora coreografías de movimiento acompañado por una alegre música moderna y festiva: "la música esa del este, tiene una alegría de la vida. Está asumiendo todo el caos de la vida pero en un sentido festivo" (Maya). Sin embargo, lo más importante de estas transiciones es la importancia que cobra el Demonio como director de escena, ya que vemos a los actores abiertamente cambiarse de vestuario; del negro neutro de la primera escena hacia sus respectivos personajes; la aparición de burras con vestuarios sobre ruedas movidos de lado a lado de la escena; incluso con los actores llegando a esperar a una señal del Demonio para poder comenzar la escena. De este modo el espectador entra en un diálogo meta-teatral con la obra en la que se predispone a adoptar una postura crítica con las ilusiones que va levantando el Demonio en escena y con el objetivo de potenciar "el distanciamiento y aproximan la obra a nuestros días" (Vizcáíno). Creo que la apuesta va más allá, y la desnudez del escenario aproxima el espectador al aspecto psicológico que la compañía enfatiza en su programa de mano: en este montaje volvemos a ver al Demonio como la sombra de Jung que monta escenas para enseñar al personaje lo que quiere ver pero se niega a confrontar. A parte de su breve aparición como ángel en la primera escena, es un Demonio que siempre resulta invisible a los personajes en escena —solamente se hace visible e interactúa en las transiciones en las
que construye las escenas a interpretar y en las que los personajes se vuelven a convertir en actores. Además, al tratarse de un Demonio femenino, existe una apuesta seductora a través de la cual sus interlocutores, Paulo y Enrico, responden físicamente a sus aproximaciones. Por ejemplo, el primer discurso del Demonio transcurre abrazado a Paulo —quien no parece percatarse conscientemente de estar en brazos del Demonio, y la tentación de huir que el Demonio le propone a Enrico transcurre con una actitud física sinuosa que atrae a un Enrico ansioso que ni siquiera puede verla, llegando a colocarse espalda contra espalda con las rejas de la celda de por medio. En esta versión, la obra concluye tras la muerte de Paulo, al igual que Morboria, suprimiendo la escena de resolución final y con un texto modificado en boca de Pedrisco: "Lleno de desconfianza / quedó muerto el desdichado / las suertes fueron cambiadas / ¿quién fue bueno y quién fue malo?"

Poco después, Paulo se vuelve a alzar con la música festiva y baila con el Demonio, bañado en una tenue luz. En realidad, presenciamos nuestro baile diario con los deseos reprimidos, que representa la sombra del demonio, retando el código binario del bien contra el mal y sugiriendo una relación más compleja entre pecador y pecado, tal y como proponía Shebani y Fraser en el montaje inglés. La música festiva y el baile, al concluir la tragedia, conectan el mundo de la obra con el mundo de la cultura popular como parte de la estrategia de acercamiento de la compañía. Representa una conjetura de que en la
realidad existe un amplio abanico de claroscuros entre el bien y el mal al que la nueva pregunta final de Pedrisko nos remite.

Esta sombra del deseo sexual es una constante en los montajes modernos del Siglo de Oro en las que aparece el Demonio. Zampanó introdujo a una mujer, Amaya Curieses; también empleó esta estrategia Juan Carlos Pérez de la Fuente en su montaje de El mágico prodigioso (2006) en la que escenifica una relación abiertamente sexual entre Cipriano y el Demonio, trabajando con la actriz Beatriz Argüello.13 Bijan Sheibani también habla de su decisión de que el Demonio fuera una mujer en su versión de El condenado por desconfiado: "I cast Amanda Lawrence, who is a very fine actress, especially with comedy. I wanted the audience to like the devil, and to be seduced by her if you like. There was something quite ambiguous about her sexually too in the performance". Aunque pueda parecer novedoso que el demonio sea interpretado por una mujer, la conexión entre la mujer y el demonio tiene una larguísimas trayectoria, empezando con la predecesora de Eva en el jardín de Edén, Lilit. Según Andrew Samuels, Lilit ha sido considerada "Eve’s predecessor and got slung out of the garden because she challenged the gender arrangements and who had the power" (citado en Hamilton). Richard Cavendish elabora sobre la ascendencia del personaje:
Lilith ... in Jewish tradition [is a demoness] who throttled new-born babies and seduced men in their sleep, sucking their blood. ... Lilith was probably the lilitu originally, an Assyrian demoness who had wings and long, dishevelled hair. ... legend says that she was Adam’s first wife, created by God out of filth and mud. From Adam’s union with her sprang Asmodeus and hosts of other demons. Eve was not created until later. This story does not appear in the Bible. (265)

A pesar de que Lilit no aparezca en la Biblia, está claro que ejerció una influencia en la visión de la mujer y en particular su relación con el diablo a través de la historia. Tomás de Aquino, por ejemplo, establece la clara inferioridad de la mujer ante el hombre: "Este es el sometimiento con el que la mujer, por naturaleza, fue puesta bajo el marido; porque la misma naturaleza dio al hombre más discernimiento" (824). Quizás por esta falta de discernimiento, según Julio Caro Baroja en Las brujas y su mundo, el diablo normalmente ataca a las mujeres: "Porque la mujer está predestinada al mal más que el hombre, según los textos bíblicos, lo mismo que según los autores paganos y los padres de la iglesia" (Brujas 99), dibuyendo la conexión al hecho evidente de que la inmensa mayoría de las brujas son mujeres.14 Everett Hesse insiste en las asociaciones del maligno con la mujer: "Traditionally, woman has been associated with evil, and almost all Christian literature of the Middle Ages emphasizes the close collaboration between the Devil and woman. She is
often regarded as the snare with which Satan tries to bait men’s souls with carnal desires. She has been held to be the supreme caterer of human lust" (48). Por lo tanto, no es de sorprender que la principal diferencia entre el mito fáustico según Marlowe y el teatro del Siglo de Oro recaiga sobre el papel de la mujer: "La mujer es casi siempre la meta, o la desviación intelectual de los ‘Faustos’ españoles. El pacto diabólico se hace por la posesión de una belleza concreta" (206), postura que también recalca Sigmund Méndez: "Las tentaciones demoniácas sufridas por los personajes fáusticos hispánicos se dan, sobre todo, a través del deseo sexual" (306).

Natalia Fernández también incide en la estrategia de atacar a las mujeres para lograr el alma marcada como objetivo: "Con el propósito constante de propiciar la caída del hombre, el maligno procurará influir en la trayectoria de quienes, en la gran mayoría de los casos, se perfilan como responsables últimas de su perdición, esto es, los caracteres femeninos" (100). Zampanó incluso sutilmente añade una relación sexualmente estimulante para Paulo, como decía Valbuena Prat "el único ‘Fausto’ español ... que no tiene la atenuante de una figura de mujer" (206). Tiene, por lo tanto, sentido que los montajes modernos empleen a la mujer como instrumento del mal al distraer a los protagonistas de su camino, como vemos en los demonios de Amaya Curieses, Beatriz Argüello y Amanda Lawrence. En mi propio montaje del Doctor Faustus de Marlowe, estrenado en los Teatros del Canal el 23 de febrero 2012,
exploré la sexualidad del protagonista a través de su relación con un Mefistófeles desdoblado. Fue elaborado siempre desde el tono de comedia carnavalesca evocada en el texto e interpretado por todos los actores de la compañía. Tratamos de que en los momentos de mayor duda de Faustus ante su pacto, fuera una de las actrices (Ana María Montero y Alicia Garau) o bien en forma de Mefistófeles o bien con nuestra Lucifer femenina (interpretada por Alicia Garau), la que viniera a convencerle. Marlowe escribe explícitamente sobre el sexo en dos ocasiones. La primera, cuando Faustus pide una mujer y Mefistófeles le trae una ramera infernal (92), escena que resolvimos con tres actores componiendo un maniquí que está ataviado de la forma más ordinaria posible. La segunda, y más impactante, es la petición a Mefistófeles de acostarse con el espíritu de Helena de Troya (139-40). En este caso, la resolución fue que al realizar la petición, una de las Mefistófeles femeninas, ésta se dirigiera al fondo, realizara un cambio rápido de vestuario y se convirtiera en Helena de Troya, volviendo a Faustus para su célebre discurso: "¿Este fue el rostro que fletó mil naves, / por el que ardieron las torres de Ilión?". Con esto quisimos dejar claro el hecho de que sea lo que sea lo que aparece ante Faustus, no es la verdadera Helena de Troya, sino un espíritu, una sombra, o en el peor de los casos, un demonio: 'The spirit in the form of Helen is a succuba, and Faustus' celebrated address to her is not an invocation of ideal beauty so much as an expression of frenzied des-
De algún modo, los montajes más recientes emplean a la mujer, no como símbolo de debilidad, sino para vislumbrar las debilidades del hombre. Intención que marca el demonio femenino de Zampanó, según José Maya: "La mujer siempre tiene la culpa de todo. Qué difícil es ser mujer. En ellas recae la honra en el siglo XVII. La parte femenina es la más inteligente, no sé por qué, a mí me lo parece. El hombre cumple una función. Luego también una parte muy negativa, porque el hombre es el bárbaro. Yo he conocido muy pocas historias en que las mujeres hayan ido a invadir, a matar, a masacrar". Es un claro ejemplo de la influencia de los cambios de la sociedad sobre el desarrollo no solo de la figura del demonio en el teatro, sino también el papel de la mujer en el teatro del Siglo de Oro.

En 2010, *El condenado por desconfiado* volvió al escenario del Teatro Pavón, pero esta vez en una producción de la Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico y bajo la dirección de Carlos Aladro, en el primer montaje de esta obra realizado por la CNTC. Al igual que en el estreno de Zampanó, 9 años antes, los críticos enfatizaron la dificultad del texto ante todo: "¡En menudo berenjenal metió Eduardo Vasco a Carlos Aladro al ofrecerle esta comedia teológica de bandoleros desalmados, santos descreídos y demonios travestidos de ángel!" (Vallejo); "Carlos Aladro dirige uno de los títulos más sonados (que no más conocidos ni más repre-
sentados) del teatro clásico español" (Bravo). De algún modo respondiendo a esta perspectiva de la obra como un ejercicio dogmático, Aladro me explicó en una entrevista cómo quiso aproximarse a la obra:

... se podía mirar desde una perspectiva más esencialmente humana. En los términos en que toda vez que aceptamos el valor trascendente de la existencia del hombre, incluso independientemente de la fe religiosa que se profese, o no, siempre existirá un debate o conflicto sobre la relación del hombre y el más allá, del hombre y la idea o imagen de Dios ... considero que finalmente su mayor preocupación es la de trasladar a través en este caso del artificio del teatro, la idea de un Dios que es Amor, que es Humanidad, entrega, generosidad, y la posibilidad de que siempre existe la redención, la capacidad del hombre de reconocerse profundamente, y buscar el camino de su salvación, sino en la Tierra en el cielo. El teatro así planteado es filosófico en su manera de plantear al público cuestiones esenciales, y eso es lo que a mí me interesa del abordaje de esos textos hoy, la cuestión filosófica desde un punto de partida esencialmente humanista a través de la metáfora del teatro, de su doble condición de ficción y realidad.

Ciertamente se percibe esta aproximación en el claro juego meta-teatral, que también reconoció Javier Vallejo: "Aladro, que podría haberla trufado de levitaciones, ha orquestado una magia más sutil, de juego y encantamiento". En cuanto al Demonio, su primera aparición es tras una enorme cortina/gasa...
que se vuelve transparente, con la iluminación, para revelarle en su persecución de Paulo, un claro juego teatral remitiéndose al clásico telón. Al igual que otros demonios, inicia la escena desde lo alto de una escalera que desciende por el espacio escénico transversalmente, ya en forma de ángel del engaño —al final de la escena sus alas blancas se han vuelto negras y ha perdido la celestial túnica que viste en un principio, jugando con las transformaciones que ya hemos visto que la obra requiere. Más adelante, en su intento de engañar al Enrico preso, aparece de nuevo vestido elegantemente de negro y rojo y con una media máscara de carnero negro con largos cuernos, pero más evidentemente teatral que la prostética de estilo realista del demonio de Morbología. Por clara que resultase la apuesta, el resultado no era necesariamente redondo, tal y como indica García Garzón: "Carlos Aladro aborda una puesta en escena algo confusa, desequilibrada en el trenzado de las peripecias aventureras y los conflictos de la fe, y con alguna opción, como la de presentar un diablo grotesco y con componentes cómicos, que desorienta a los espectadores" (Destinos). Ciertamente, el Demonio resultaba algo estridente, riéndose constantemente e interrumpiendo su primer monólogo durante más de medio minuto al decir "a gozar de Él, en muriendo" (151). A pesar de también ser un Demonio omnipresente y burlón que iba tirando de los hilos del juego meta-teatral, no resultaba nunca ni atractivo ni seductor, distanciando al espectador de la posibilidad de verse involucrado en
el engaño. Según Aladro, su interpretación del personaje buscaba esta distancia brechtiana:

...tanto Dios como el Demonio, son figuras omnipresentes, que conducen, guían o interfieren en la acción de los personajes, que permanentemente están entre el más acá y el más allá, entre la realidad y la ficción, entre el teatro y la vida, lo que para el propio discurso del teatro dentro del teatro, que para mí siempre ha de estar presente, desvelando la naturaleza eminentemente artificiosa del hecho escénico, pues genera juegos muy ricos llenos de significación, y si hay suerte, de poesía y diversión lúdica y a ser posible lúcida. Y dan al actor una posibilidad de interpretación más contemporánea, más brechtiana por así decir, haciendo posible lo profundo en la ficción y desvelando el carácter eminentemente mítico, sin caer en lo arquetípico o solemne, siempre desde el juego.

En realidad, se trata de otra óptica desde la cual se observa la figura del demonio, en la que en vez de revelar al final el engaño del mal, se vislumbra desde un primer momento. En este montaje no había seducción, sino burla hasta el último corte de mangas del Demonio con el que concluye la obra tras la silenciosa y resignada marcha al infierno de Paulo. El demonio bufón no puede quedar más claro que en este montaje.

Hemos visto a ese demonio en proceso de constante transformación, engañando en forma de ángel y luego convertido en bestia horrenda. Pero Aparicio Maydeu subraya, con referencia a Las ca-
denas del demonio de Calderón, también "el público se ha reído ... por un momento se han sentido espectadores de una escena de entremés o de comedia burlesca, y el caso es que han visto todos que el Demonio no es tan fiero como lo pintan" (citado en Domínguez Matito 498-9). Algo parecido hemos visto en los montajes modernos de las obras, aunque Morboria se haya apoyado en el terror por el auge de este género en el cine del siglo XX y XXI. Sin embargo, sí hemos visto a un demonio más aparentemente amable en el montaje de Zampanó, e incluso bufonesco en los montajes de Aladro o mi propio Dr. Faustus. Todos los montajes sí comparten, de cualquier modo, la intención de sorprender al espectador con una cierta espectacularidad: "Los dramaturgos tampoco pasaron por alto las virtualidades de espectacularidad que residían en el rito satánico y, de una forma u otra, intentaron que la inquietud se apoderase del auditorio ante la presencia demoniaca y su insidiosa influencia en un ser tan humano como ellos" (146). Ya hemos visto que, como textos, todos se pueden encapsular como teatro de tramoya y que exige del equipo de montaje una respuesta ante los retos que proponen. De algún modo, se convierten en las películas de efectos especiales de su momento, tal y como enfatiza Luis González Fernández ya que los mismos autores creaban principalmente para la escena, y el Demonio era una herramienta escénica particularmente útil: "The Devil of the comedia is, for the dramatist, one of the most useful characters, together with magicians, saints,
angels and God, for the presentation of spectacle, since they are characters with partial or complete control over the supernatural" (49). Pero el espectáculo no sirve solamente para la sorpresa sensorial, sino para provocar un efecto reflexivo sobre el público. Ronald Hutton concluye hablando del Demonio diciendo que "I think the devil will always be with us [...] because he’s so good to think with. You can use the devil as a metaphor, as a personal bogey, as a joke" (citado en Hamilton). Al final, sea expresado con terror, humor o distanciamiento crítico, el demonio en escena sirve para confrontarnos a nosotros mismos y a nuestros deseos reprimidos e impulsos irrefrenables.

Analizar la práctica teatral, tanto del Siglo de Oro como contemporánea, nos permite vislumbrar las obras como entes vivos y en proceso de constante desarrollo. Llama, por ejemplo, la atención el hecho de que los tres montajes del siglo XXI de El condenado por desconfiado hayan cortado el final y reenfocado la conclusión de la obra. Se apartan, por tanto, de una lectura dogmática y en su lugar, reflexionan sobre las formas que adopta el mal en nuestro mundo y emplean técnicas prácticamente brechtianas de distanciamiento en su vía de comunicación con el público. Todos los montajes modernos, a pesar de sus evidentes fallos, identifican a un demonio que se acerca a nuestro territorio y nos sigue hablando de nuestros fallos y precaria condición humana. En realidad, nos cuesta concebir al demonio como loco o bufonesco a causa de las in-
fluencias del héroe caído de Milton o la visión Romántica que se articula a través de Goethe y efectivamente algunos montajes prescinden del humor asociado con el personaje. El Demonio ha evolucionado en la práctica del teatro moderno hasta convertirse en un maestro de ceremonias carnavalesco y un director en escena que aprovecha la complicidad del bufón con el público para hacerle un partícipe activo en los engaños de las obras.

"Este trabajo ha sido elaborado en la Universidad de Salamanca durante una estancia financiada por la Cátedra de Altos Estudios del Español, adscrita al Campus de Excelencia Internacional /StudiiSalamantini/".

**Notes**

1 Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez ha estudiado el caso de la autoría de *El condenado por desconfiado* y *El burlador de Sevilla*, ambas obras atribuidas a Tirso, en sus ediciones para Cátedra.

2 Véase Cilveti (1977); Méndez (2000); Fernández Rodríguez (2007)


4 En vías de publicación en INTI: Revista de Literatura hispánica.
Véase Huerta Calvo (1996)

En general el Demonio aparece anteriormente en Autos Sacramentales y Comedias de Santos.


Cabe resaltar que el propio National Theatre colgó un video en su página de YouTube con comentarios positivos de espectadores de la función, varios incidiendo en la gran calidad actoral. Esto debe actuar como aviso ante la posible poca fiabilidad de la crítica al tratarse, igualmente que las opiniones expresadas en este vídeo, de respuestas subjetivas ante un producto artístico que puede inspirar mil opiniones.

"maquinaria giratoria para que los personajes aparezcan y desaparezcan súbitamente" (Díez Borque 74).

De algún modo, vemos en este montaje el cambio histórico-cultural del Demonio antropomórfico del Medievo hacia el Demonio Galán o elegante que nace en el Renacimiento y que prevalece hasta nuestros días.

Véase los titulares en El País, "El nuevo escaparate de los clásicos" (Moreno Pachón); La Razón, "El Pavón reabre sus puertas, catorce años después, con una obra de Tirso de Molina" (Caruana); Guía del Ocio, "Un espacio para el teatro clásico" (Torres); y Diario 16, "El Teatro Pavón vuelve a la escena tras permanecer 12 años cerrado" (Anon Teatro Pavón).

'Las intenciones del dramaturgo' es un término a menudo empleado para defender distintas visiones de la obra. Creo que es importante establecer que es imposible saber qué podría tener en la cabeza un dramaturgo, y más en el Siglo de Oro, y solamente podemos proponer conjeturas más o menos acertadas.

La crítica enfatizó esta decisión: "Pérez de la Fuente ha convertido el diablo en diablesa, lo cual eleva la temperatura de ese erotismo que recorre la obra" (Villán); "Como en la vieja película de Von Sternberg, con Marlene como tentadora
suprema [...] el diablo es una mujer, una seductora mente andrógina" (García Garzón El diablo).

14 Incluso se ha llegado a argumentar que el pacto de Faustus en la obra de Marlowe le convierte en bruja y que Marlowe despliega una serie de estrategias para feminizar a su protagonista acorde mente (Hopkins 81).
BLOOD PURITY IN RECENT PRODUCTIONS OF *EL RETABLO DE LAS MARAVILLAS*

CHARLES PATTERSON
Western Washington University

“The literal act of reading the words of a script does not constitute a performance.”
(Miller 34)

*El retablo de las maravillas* is among the theatrical works that, having failed to find “pájaros en los nidos de antaño,” Cervantes decided to have published without prior performance (Cervantes 28). Typically, in the Golden Age, plays only reached publication after they had had their run in the *corral de comedias*. As a result of his side-stepping this process, Cervantes’s “plays had not been influenced by the process of interpretation and revision by actors and directors which accompanies any theatrical production” (Reed *The Novelist* 7). It has been up to more contemporary companies to
interpret *El retablo* without the benefit of this early modern refining process.\(^2\) Generally speaking, it has worked very well on stage. Many critics attribute this success to its modern appeal. For Jesús Maestro, Cervantine theater does not even belong entirely to its own time: “Hay que salir de la literatura española—y del dorado y famélico siglo XVII hispánico—para interpretar la dramaturgia cervantina, del mismo modo que hay que salir de la literatura para interpretar la realidad” (10). The sheer number of performances of Cervantes’s works today is evidence of their contemporary appeal. As Susan Fischer argues, “… the theatre, whether classical or modern, functions as a barometer of society, and directors will not select a text for performance until they perceive its connections with the movement of the times” (276).\(^3\) Cory Reed posits that it is the open-ended nature of Cervantes’s *entremeses* that makes them successful today: “What may have been perceived as ‘bad theatre’ in the 1600s due to its unconventional open-endedness is quite acceptable by today’s standards, which encourage indeterminacy as a method of inspiring critical reflection in the audience” (*The Novelist* 36). *El retablo*, in particular, with its breaking down of the fourth wall has much in common with recent tendencies in theater. As Richard Schechner has observed, in the late twentieth century, “Paratheatrical events dissolve the audience-performer opposition, while a whole branch of performance art is aimed at eliminating the ‘art-life’ distinction,” making *El retablo*
right at home among more modern works (122). Other themes that transcend the passage of time include concerns of legitimate birth (one of the conditions set forth for being able to see the retablo), and of gender identity (as reflected in character names such as “Juan Castrado” and “Juana Macha,” among other things).

Although I agree that there are elements in El retablo that motivate theater companies to take it up, it is important to keep in mind, as Jonathan Miller points out in the epigraph to this article, that there is more to performing a work than merely transmitting the words on the page. Schechner identifies four elements of theatrical creation:

... the drama is what the writer writes; the script is the interior map of a particular production; the theater is the specific set of gestures performed by the performers in any given performance; the performance is the whole event, including audience and performers (technicians, too, anyone who is there). (85)

Employing this terminology, Cervantes only produced one of these four elements: the drama, which he titled El retablo de las maravillas and published in 1615. For any given production of this play, it is up to the director to produce the script by mapping out the blocking and other major elements. The individual actors, through rehearsals, and with the director’s coaching, produce the theater. The performance is an unduplicatable event that depends upon the audience’s response and other unforeseen occur-
rences. If audiences and reviewers find *El retablo* to be modern, therefore, this may be because the script, theater, and performance elements are all the products of modern theater practitioners who have inherited a fairly recent performance tradition for this particular work. It is necessary, therefore, to study a production as a work of art separate from the drama produced by the playwright because the two may reflect different intentions. For example, in her analysis of contemporary productions of Cervantes’s theatrical works, Ma. Francisca Vilches de Frutos observes a number of themes that Cervantes may or may not have intended:

> El análisis de estas obras . . . permite apreciar el interés tanto de los gestores y directores de teatros públicos como de los profesionales más progresistas de este medio por transmitir a la sociedad española mensajes muy definidos en defensa de la libertad y en contra de los sistemas dictatoriales, en favor de la tolerancia frente a otras culturas, razas y religiones, de rechazo a la mentira y al entramado de intereses creados en la vida política, y en demanda de la igualdad de oportunidades entre hombres y mujeres. (413)

I would argue that theater companies have a great number of challenges in the process of making *El retablo*’s drama into a workable performance. Such is generally the case with older plays, according to Jonathan Miller:

> Confronted by classical works, some of which have survived for several hundred years, it is easy to forget
that the author did not write them for posterity. Plays, like any other art form, are created for the artist’s contemporaries, which means, to some extent at least, that certain things are understood without having to be explained. When he writes for a community that shares many of his own values the author can reasonably assume that the performers will intuitively recognize many of the attitudes, which he intends to be expressed in and by speeches he wrote. (48)

Among the values that Cervantes took to be “understood without having to be explained” in El retablo is the obsession with blood purity, which was crucial to social dynamics in early modern Spain, but a rather foreign concept to today’s audiences. When the Catholic Monarchs gave Jews the ultimatum in 1492 to either convert to Christianity or be expelled, they created a “historical reality, which contended that there were two kinds of Christians: the qualified, who could be trusted with public office, the so-called Old Christians; and the disqualified, who could not be trusted with public office, the so-called New Christians” (Wardropper 32). This division mainly caused strife among the lower classes, since it had practically no effect on the aristocracy:

Clearly, purity of blood appeals to an extra-rational essence to organize a different order of exclusions; it is also a factor that is most difficult to prove, and is thus always contingent on public opinion. However, by accepting the essential, though absolutely empty and unprovable, value of blood lineage as something
asserting a virtually magical power in society, those who formed the bottom estates, and had to pay many taxes, tacitly accepted their exclusion from the very real system of privileges that organized their society.\(^8\) (Egginton and Castillo 449)

Cervantes lampoons this artificial sense of pride about blood purity in *El retablo*, as several scholars have noted.\(^9\) The play opens with two con artists, Chirinos and Chanfalla, and their hired musician, Rabelín, discussing their next hoax as they arrive in a new town. There they meet the town’s leaders, the Gobernador Gomecillos, the alcalde Benito Repollo, the regidor Juan Castrado, and the escribano Pedro Capacho. The tricksters convince them that they are a theater troupe en route to Madrid to remedy an entertainment shortage with their *retablo*, or puppet show, titled “El retablo de las maravillas.” Chanfalla lays out two conditions for being able to see this puppet show,

\[ \ldots \text{ninguno puede ver las cosas que en él se muestran, que tenga alguna raza de confeso, o no sea habido y procreado de sus padres de legítimo matrimonio; y el que fuere contagiado destas dos tan usadas enfermedades, despídase de ver las cosas, jamás vistas ni oídas, de mi retablo.}^{10} \ (147) \]

The town leaders express their confidence in meeting these two conditions, blood purity and legitimacy of birth, by arranging a viewing of the puppet show for that night in Juan Castrado’s home. Benito Capacho is particularly adamant about his qualifica-
tions: “. . . cuatro dedos de enjundia de cristiano viejo rancioso tengo sobre los cuatro costados de mi linaje: ¡miren si veré el tal retablo!” (149). That this confidence may be all for show, however, is revealed by a more private conversation between Repollo and Castrado’s daughters, Juana Castrada and Teresa Repolla. Juana says, “pues sabes las condiciones que han de tener los miradores del retablo, no te descuides, que sería una gran desgracia” (152). In other words, she warns her cousin that, although there is a chance that they may not see the figures in the puppet show, it will be important to keep up appearances in order to avoid social disgrace.

In reality, all of the townspeople find it necessary to pretend to see the figures in Chirinos and Chanfalla’s retablo because there is in fact nothing to see. After conjuring up the fictitious author of the puppet show, Tontonelo, the con artists successively announce a series of figures appearing in it: Sampson, a famous bull, mice descended from the ones on Noah’s ark, water from the same source as the Jordan River, heraldic bears and lions, and Herodias. Although none of these things actually appear, the retablo audience responds as if they could see and even interact with them. The one exception is the Gobernador, who at first admits to himself in an aside “así veo yo a Sansón ahora, como el Gran Turco” (155). His failure to see the puppet show while others apparently do surprises him: “pues en verdad que me tengo por legítimo y cristiano viejo”
Later, he decides to pretend to see for the sake of his reputation: “Basta: que todos ven lo que yo no veo; pero al fin habré de decir que lo veo, por la negra honrilla” (156).

Eventually a furrier interrupts the puppet show to demand lodging for the troops about to enter town. Up to this point, the retablo audience has pretended to see things that are not really there, but now they take the very real furrier to be one of the figures sent by Tontonelo. The furrier is unfamiliar with the conditions for seeing the figures, so when he fails to see Herodias, the townspeople accuse him of blood impurity by chanting “ex illis es” (162). When he threatens them with violence if they continue, Benito Repollo replies, ‘Nunca los confe-sos ni bastardos fueron valientes; y por eso no podemos dejar de decir: ¡dellos es, dellos es!’” (162). The furrier then attacks them, although Cervantes’s stage directions here are ambiguous enough to leave the outcome of this struggle up to the director. The play ends with Chirinos and Chanfalla celebrating the success of their deception—the way things have turned out means that they will be able to pull it off again the next day.

The motor driving the action of this play is the townspeople’s dual concern with blood purity and legitimacy, both of which were an obsession in Cervantes’s own time. It is what motivates the characters to behave in a bizarre and ridiculous manner in order to, ironically, protect their public image. As is evident in their interaction with the furrier, they
are even willing to risk their lives to prove that they meet qualifications that they themselves know that they do not meet. This, of course, is the very critique that Cervantes makes of a society obsessed with such intangible and irrelevant qualities. While a preoccupation with legitimacy is at least a familiar concept to today’s audience, blood purity is completely foreign. Neither seems like reason enough to justify the townspeople’s behavior.

Given today’s unfamiliarity with the driving force behind *El retablo de las maravillas*, there is a risk that contemporary productions of it can appear to be empty farce, lacking the satirical bite that it might have had if it had been performed in the seventeenth century. Theater companies hoping to avoid this face a unique challenge and opportunity. In recent performances of this work, I have identified three main approaches to the theme of blood purity. The first two are primarily efforts to clarify the theme for spectators: one is to educate the audience about the theme beforehand, and the other is to incorporate props that can be used to clarify the spoken lines. The third approach, however, does not seek to clarify the theme of blood purity, but rather to transform it through acting and choreography into something more relevant to contemporary audiences.

An example of the first approach, audience preparation, is a 1997 production by a student group at Bates College, under the direction of Pithamber Polsani. They educate their audience about blood
purity before the start of the show by playing a voice recording of Ferdinand and Isabel’s order expelling the Jews, and then of Phillip III’s order expelling the Moriscos. Having prepared the audience in this way, the group then incorporates certain gestures and stage properties to emphasize this theme. For example, when Chanfalla lays out the conditions for seeing the puppet show, there is an appropriate gasp from the town leaders after hearing the phrase “que tenga alguna raza de confeso.” The group also incorporates cross imagery that highlights the Old Christian identity that the characters claim. When Benito proclaims his lineage by saying, “cuatro dedos de enjundia de cristiano viejo rancioso tengo sobre los cuatro costados de mi linaje” (149), he touches his torso in four places in a manner reminiscent of crossing oneself. His blasphemous use of this gesture to exalt his lineage rather than to worship God emphasizes an aspect of El retablo perceived by Bruce Wardropper: “The fact that, in its concern for purity of blood, the Spanish state has institutionalized the Christian religion has led to its perversion, which is a blasphemy, the fundamental denial and betrayal of the God in whose name the religion exists” (33). As another example, Chanfalla and Chirinos set up their retablo immediately beneath a cross hanging on the wall, evoking another meaning of “retablo”: “tabla en que esta pintada alguna historia de devoción” (Covarrubias 1263). The town leaders’ ridiculous behavior as
they view this *retablo*, all to prove their blood purity, also emphasizes the blasphemy motif.

Although the Bates College group’s decision to contextualize their play by reading the two expulsion orders is helpful, theater should be an art of showing, not explaining. A 2013 production by Stamp’a’2 makes the blood purity theme accessible to viewers through its performance alone, without the need for preliminary explanations. Stamp’a’2 is a theater group associated with the Instituto de Educación Secundaria Valle del Saja located in Cantabria, Spain. Although affiliated with a high school, it is not a student group. It is made up of faculty and parents who perform for the students. Their production of *El retablo*, directed by José M. Liaño, reveals an effort to clarify the theme of blood purity through visual cues incorporated into its props and actors’ gestures.

The main prop that Stamp’a’2 uses to convey the theme is a cross-like object that Rabelín carries upon entering alone at the start of the play. Chirinos and Chanfalla soon follow with a brightly colored wagon full of theater props and costumes, but it is clear that the cross will be essential to their plan. Rabelín stands it up in a prominent place and hangs two painted portraits from it, one of a red-headed man, the other of a dark-haired man holding a red-headed child. When Chanfalla announces the conditions for seeing the *retablo*, he points to the red-headed man when referring to *confesos*. This can be explained by the traditional association of Jews
with red hair, based on the legend that Judas Iscariot, the ultimate symbol of betrayal, was a redhead (Wardropper 29). When he refers to illegitimate birth, he points to the portrait of the man and child, whose differing hair colors identify the man as a *cornudo*. The specific choice of red hair for the child ties the two themes together: a New Christian is the product of a married woman’s betrayal of her husband and adulterous relationship with a man of Jewish descent. These portraits become a recurring focal point throughout the rest of the play. Immediately after hearing Chanfalla’s conditions, the Gobernador goes over to examine the two portraits, indicating his own uncertainty about meeting the standards. Each and every time the con artists remind the town leaders of the conditions, they turn and point again to the portraits. During the chanting of “ex illis es” when the furrier fails to see Herodias, they all point again to the portraits.

The fact that portraits of these two types of social outcasts have been hung, Christ-like, from a cross ironically casts these two traditional symbols of betrayal as the victims of societal betrayal. As Wardropper argues, “Through and beyond the cases of betrayal presented in the *entremés* . . . Cervantes points to the officially sanctioned blasphemy against God, betrayed by the Spanish state and the Spanish people” (32). The Stampa’2 version emphasizes this interpretation. The *conversos*, who were typically persecuted because of their association with Judas, are now put in the place of Christ.
While Bates College and Stampa’2 attempt to clarify and make accessible the theme of blood purity, the professional company Teatro del Duende ingeniously transforms it into a theme with more contemporary relevance. Their 2006 performance of *El retablo*, under the direction of Jesús Salgado, is actually the second part of a larger production titled *Cervantes entre palos*, which includes performances of *El juez de los divorcios* and *El retablo*, and incorporates flamenco music and dancing to create an impressive spectacle.  

This was by far the most professional, and, in my opinion, most creative production of the performances analyzed for this study.  

Like Bates College and Stampa’2, Teatro del Duende uses the Cervantine drama with only minimal adaptation. Its directorial and acting choices contribute to a different interpretation, however. They turn the commentaries on blood purity into a broader critique of religious extremism and authoritarianism.  

Here it is worthwhile to review what psychologists have observed about the interrelated phenomena of religious fundamentalism and authoritarianism. Eunike Jonathan defines religious fundamentalism as “restrictive religious ideologies” and authoritarianism as “beliefs that others should submit to authority” (318). Bob Altemeyer and Bruce Hunsberger view the two as linked (115). They describe authoritarianism as the “covariation of authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism” (114). They explain that authori-
tarian people “report . . . that their religious training taught them to submit to authority more, led them to be more hostile toward ‘outsiders’ and ‘sinners,’ and imposed stricter rules about ‘proper behavior,’ than do less authoritarian persons” (115). These issues were certainly in the air in Spain at the time of this production: its debut was on March 25, 2004, only two weeks after the 11-M terrorist attacks perpetrated by Islamic fundamentalists. It was also shortly after the election of President José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, whose platform included a pro-gay marriage plank that mobilized Catholic opposition. While there are no overt references in the production to either of these current events, there are several artistic choices that contribute to a general critique of religious fundamentalism and authoritarianism.

First, there is a reverential solemnity in the way the town’s elite respond to and talk about blood purity, which causes the audience to understand it in more religious than racial terms. For example, upon hearing the conditions for seeing the figures, Repollo, Castrado, and Capacho stand at attention, with facial expressions simultaneously indicating reverence and discomfort. This sense of reverence returns when Repollo affirms his own qualifications by declaring, “tengo el padre alcalde; cuatro dedos de enjundia de cristiano viejo rancioso tengo sobre los cuatro costados de mi linaje” (149). While saying these lines, he casts his eyes upwards and his
voice begins to crack with emotion, as if he were discussing something sacred or spiritual.

Having demonstrated that the town elite view blood purity and legitimacy with a religious zeal, the Teatro de Duende production then establishes their reliance on authority. Up to this point, the Gobernador is depicted as a clownish and foolish figure who takes short, hopping steps, wears a red vest nearly reaching the floor and a Napoleon-style hat, and has a comically high voice. There is nothing about him that inspires respect, yet the other townspeople treat him with deference. For example, the retablo audience arrives a few minutes before Chirinos and Chanfalla, sets up chairs directly facing the real audience, and then stands in front of them. They wait until the Gobernador begins to sit before taking their own seats, but then he immediately stands up again. They all rush to stand up also, and do not sit until he does. The Gobernador then stares intently, which the rest imitate. Suddenly, he breaks into laughter for no reason, causing the rest to obediently and nervously laugh at nothing. These artistic decisions convey an uncritical respect for authority on the part of the townspeople, which is characteristic of adherents of fundamentalist ideologies.

The way that Chirinos and Chanfalla present the retablo connects religious fundamentalism and violence. Before conjuring Tontonelo, Chirinos ritually clothes Chanfalla in a dark robe reminiscent of clerical vestments, and a pointed wizard hat, after
which he seems to immediately enter a trance. He makes chanting sounds, and then they both sit cross-legged in a manner that calls to mind Asian meditation. They briefly converse using mostly nonsense words to imitate glossolalia, and then shriek and stomp their feet as if under the influence of supernatural forces. While Chanfalla begins speaking the words to conjure Tontonelo, Chirinos is on the floor convulsing as if possessed, so Chanfalla places his hands on his head like an exorcist or faith healer. Chirinos leaps up and, after a moment, takes over the lines of the conjuring. In doing so, he adopts the animated tone and style of a televangelist, while Chanfalla punctuates his words with regular shouts of “hallelujah!” Soon the hallelujah’s turn into a gospel-style song sung to the tune of “Oh When the Saints,” which the retablo audience enthusiastically joins like a church congregation. It is clear from all of this that they have come to view the retablo they are about to see as a religious experience.

The first figure that appears, as in Cervantes’s drama, is the Old Testament strongman Sampson. Once Chanfalla claims to see him, he and Chirinos immediately arm themselves with swords to do battle against this Jewish hero. The retablo audience remains largely passive throughout the mock fight, but, having come to view the retablo as a religious experience, their zeal is now directed towards violence. Their participation in the violence increases with each figure in the retablo. When
Chirinos introduces the bull, the retablo audience cheers and gasps as Chanfalla pretends to fight it in typical torero fashion, and then they participate more directly by touching the nonexistent dead bull. When the mice appear, they all swat and stomp at them.

Although the waters from the River Jordan scene does not necessarily lend itself to a violent reaction, here the company makes one of its few modifications to the Cervantine drama: instead of saying that “a los hombres se les volverán las barbas como de oro,” Chanfalla says, “a los hombres les quitará la hombría” (157). This change has three consequences: first, it eliminates a cultural reference that is likely to be unfamiliar to modern audiences (the traditional association of Jews with red hair). Second, it diminishes the emphasis on blood purity, allowing the play to focus on other themes. Third, it introduces an element of violence, the threat of castration, to an otherwise nonviolent scene. The men all react by screaming and running about out of fear of this threat, and then hiding under the women’s skirts.

Up to this point in the action, members of the retablo audience have participated in the violent situations created by Chirinos and Chanfalla, but now they begin to create some of their own. After Chanfalla successfully wrangles the lions and bears and seems ready to move on to the next figure, Juan Castrado, without any enticement, runs forward and
appears to have his own struggle with one of these animals.

The dance of Herodias and the Nephew, who is played by a professional flamenco dancer, provides a brief interlude from violence before the retablo audience commits its most autonomous violent act. As in the Cervantine drama, the furrier arrives to interrupt the dance, and the retablo audience takes him for another of Tontonelo’s figures, which Chanfalla denies. When the furrier returns, and cannot see Herodias, the retablo spectators begin chanting their “de ex illis es” line while making a cross with their two index fingers, clearly indicating the religious basis for their discrimination. When the furrier draws his sword to attack them, the ensuing struggle happens in slow motion as the lights dim and flamenco dancers enter the stage, pounding the stage rhythmically with both canes and feet. Their tempo increases as the fight between the retablo audience and the furrier intensifies. Finally, the furrier falls to the floor face down with his arms outstretched, as if dead. The dancing pauses, and the retablo audience can be heard quietly chanting “de ex illis es” as they begin to bury the furrier with chairs. The lights dim, and the dancers dance a moment longer as the townspeople finish burying him, after which they shout once more “de ex illis es.”

In every other performance of this work that I am familiar with, the ending is a comical squabble between the townspeople and the furrier in which
no one dies. The decision for the *furrier* to die in this dramatic and violent manner is the crowning element in this production’s critique of religious fundamentalism and authoritarianism. The *retablo* audience is depicted as overly obedient to authority, which Chirinos and Chanfalla take advantage of by imitating the style of charismatic preachers, and then encourage violence against the Jewish Other, represented by Sampson. The villagers take this lesson so much to heart that, upon encountering the flimsiest of evidence of Jewishness in the *furrier*, they do not hesitate to murder him.

When faced with performances that reinterpret an early modern play’s central theme, it is common for literary scholars to cry foul. This reaction, however, fails to take into account Schechner’s four elements of performance, which make it clear that the playwright’s own words and intentions are only one part of a more complex creative process that also involves directors, actors, and spectators. The fact that a contemporary company comes up with a particularly engaging performance that emphasizes different themes then a seventeenth-century company would have is not a betrayal of the drama, but rather a testament to its greatness: “one of the measures of a great play is that it has the capacity to generate an almost infinite series of unforeseeable inflexions” (Miller 34-35). As this analysis demonstrates, *El retablo* is capable of generating a variety of inflexions. By educating its audience beforehand, the Bates College group allowed
its spectators to have some idea of the concerns that a seventeenth-century audience might have had. Stampa’2 achieved this in a more organic way by orienting the audience throughout the performance using visual cues. While these two productions effectively brought the audience closer to the seventeenth-century way of thinking, Teatro del Duende brought the work to the twenty-first century by reinterpreting Cervantes’s critique of the blood purity obsession as a critique of the religious fundamentalism and authoritarianism that plagues our society today.

NOTES

1 This project was completed with the support of the Summer Research Grant at Western Washington University. A preliminary version was presented at the XVII Congreso de AIT-ENSO in 2015.
2 It only began to receive attention in the nineteenth century, according to Reed (The Novelist 2).
3 See also Vidler 16.
4 It should be noted, however, that the metatheatrical elements in El retablo are directed towards deconstructing the conventions of the comedia nueva made popular by Lope de Vega: “Implicit in the analogy of the retablo and its fictional spectators to the theatrical performance of the comedia is the conclusion that the audience of the comedia is as much manipulated and deceived by the new style of dramatic performance as is the fictional audience in Cervantes’s interlude” (Reed The Novelist 167). See also the studies by Childers and Gerli.
For more on the question of legitimacy, see Reed *The Novelist* 154 and Reed “Dirty Dancing” 13. For an analysis of Cervantes’s deconstruction of gender identity in *El retablo*, see Cartagena-Calderón.

An example of this is Laboratorio Escénico Univalle’s production of *Coloquio de los perros* at the 2015 Siglo de Oro Festival at Chamizal National Park in El Paso, Texas. During a scene in which a group of shepherds heard the sound of wolves howling from offstage, a man in the audience suddenly began screaming. I, along with several other audience members, at first thought that this was part of the show, but then realized that the man was likely having a panic attack. When park officials removed the man from the auditorium for medical treatment, it became clear that this was indeed an unplanned event, but it nevertheless has been locked in my memory as an integral element in that particular performance.

See also Schechner 77 and McGaha 86.

See also Ascensión Saénz 594.

See Larson 61; Reed *The Novelist* 67-68, 155-57; Reed “Dirty Dancing” 15; Wardropper 32-33.

Covarrubias defines “confeso” as “el q[ue] deciende de padres ludios” (502).

The production debuted in 2004, but the video recording used for this study is dated as 2006 in the Association for Hispanic Classical Theatre’s video library.

It is beyond the scope of this study to do a complete review of this production’s quality, for which I will refer the reader to Frye.

The company itself articulates its interpretation of Cervantes’s work in this way: “Cervantes critica en estos entremeses la ignorancia, la vanidad y la falsa moral con un humor inteligente que se ceba en los defectos de la justicia y el poder” (“Cervantes entre palos”).
Works Cited


Ehrlicher, Hanno. “Refuncionalizaciones de un entremés cervantino: nuevos retablos de las maravillas en el teatro español del siglo XX.” *El Siglo de Oro en la España contemporánea*. Ed. Hanno Ehrlicher and Stefan Sch-


Interview


JORGE ABRIL SÁNCHEZ
University of New Hampshire-Durham

“Don Quixote is a renowned classical ballet masterpiece, performed on world stages since 1869. Working on and performing a full-length classical ballet entails a process of continuous learning, exploration and dedication to the art of dance. I aspire for our students to have the opportunity of experiencing this magical process and share it with the audience.” (Assaf Benchetrit, “Program of the ballet performance Don Quixote”)

Two thousand fifteen has already been a year full of festivities for siglodeoristas around the world. Not only have we commemorated the 450th anniversary of the arrival of Spaniards to the United States and the Philippines and their foundation of the oldest European settlements in those distant lands, namely in Saint Augustine of Florida and Cebú respectively, but we have also celebrated the 400th anniversary of the publication
of the second part of Miguel de Cervantes’s *Don Quixote de la Mancha*, the first modern novel.

At the University of New Hampshire-Durham, these three anniversaries provided the impetus for the organization of two panels on the age of the discoveries for the 2016 RSA annual convention in Boston and the celebration of an international symposium, titled “Identifying *Don Quixote* through the Senses,” on April 23rd, 2015 on our campus. Apart from these academic presentations, two other events were designed to educate UNH students on the importance and legacy of the *alcaláino’s* narrative. The first of these was a book exhibit of rare and original copies of Cervantes’s *opus magnum* at the Dimond Library, prepared by Associate Professor of Spanish Carmen Garcia de la Rasilla. This exhibit included one of the first *Quixotes* ever published in New Hampshire, by J. & B. Williams of Exeter in 1828. The other event was a student production of Marius Petipa’s ballet *Don Quixote*, directed and choreographed by new Assistant Professor of Dance and Theater Assaf Benchetrit.

This spectacle originated from Miguel de Cervantes’s novel, but Petipa developed his own storyline by focusing his interest on the life of an old country gentleman in Barcelona, who goes mad and believes that the books that he constantly reads are reality. The ballet, premiered in 1869, presents the story of Don Quixote, but also tells the love affair between Kitri and Basilio. The young and spirited lady is in love and sets to marry with the lowly barber. Her father Lorenzo, however, has arranged for her to marry the wealthy Gamache. As this conflict develops and their relationship faces some twists
and turns, Don Quixote provides his help while continuing to chase his books’ illusions. The plot of the ballet is inspired by one of the side stories of the novel, found in chapters XIX, XX and XXI of the second part: namely the failed plans of rich Camacho to wed Quiteria, who happens to be in love with peasant Basilio.

UNH dancers began rehearsing for the 2015 annual spring dance company concert in the autumn of 2014, taking on a big challenge, said professor of ballet Assaf Benchetrit: the “huge masterpiece” classical ballet *Don Quixote*. The show ran at the Johnson Theatre for four days, from April 1st to April 4th, 2015, with daily shows at 7:00 pm and two matinées for school groups on Friday and on Saturday at 10:00 am and at 2:00 pm, respectively. The cast was formed by forty-one actors and dancers, who in some cases shared with another member of the troupe the roles of the main characters, such as Kitri, Basilio and the gypsy Mercedes.

This interview was recorded in the Language Resource Center in Murkland Hall G15 on April 7th, 2015 from 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm. In this informal conversation, Assaf Benchetrit reflects on his transition as an artist from his years as a lead ballet dancer to his new role as a professor of dance and theater, and the impact of his professional experience on his teaching. He comments on the process of creating his own version of the ballet *Don Quixote* and shares with us some anecdotes about the adaptation of the dance routines to the skill and talent of his students, who were ready for the challenge.

**JAS:** First of all, I would like to thank you for your fast response and collaboration over these days in which you
have been very busy with the rehearsals and the preparations for the show. Second, I would like to applaud you for a job well done. You did such a great job. As you know, I attended the performance on Thursday [April 2\textsuperscript{nd}] and I liked it a lot. I thought the students did great. Some students had a higher level of dancing than others.

**AB:** Exactly, we should never forget that it is a student production. They do what they can and they also have to manage with other classes, so they did great.

**JAS:** It is nice to have the privilege of enjoying this kind of show at our institution of higher education. I would also want to congratulate you for your recent hiring at the University of New Hampshire. You are an assistant professor now [at the Department of Dance and Theater] at UNH, so congratulations and welcome to our community! I have read about you these last days, and I would like to know a bit about your road towards New Hampshire. Could you please tell me a bit about your early years as a ballet dancer? How did you become a dancer?

**AB:** I started when I was sixteen. Before that, I played a lot of soccer. Basically, I was a musician first. And then at the school, I studied at a school that offered both music and dance. At this wonderful academy, I saw people dancing. Somehow I started visiting the dancing studio and giving it a try. I have been dancing since then pretty much. And then in Israel I used to serve in the military. I was eighteen and I served in the military for three years.

**JAS:** That is mandatory, I guess.
**AB:** Oh, yes. It is mandatory, but actually one of the things that I did in Israel before I started to serve… There is a competition that is called “Excellent Dancer,” and that is run by the government. I did that competition and I won. Because of that, I was given the opportunity to continue dancing while I was serving in the military, so it kind of helped me to continue. Otherwise, probably, I would have stopped at some point.

**JAS:** As for the military, my question is about how the training in the military in Israel helped you to become a better performer, to grow your strength in your body, and vice versa. Do you think that it helped you?

**AB:** Actually, one of the things that is so interesting, that connects sports and arts, is that you always must have discipline. You need to have discipline. You need to take responsibility for your progression. You need to work after you finish with classes. You work by yourself. So one of the things that was interesting when I went to the military was that I came with a very strong discipline, dance discipline. It was very easy for me to get into the military. One of the things that they usually say in Israel is that when you start in the military, you start to learn about discipline. Before that, you do not have it. But for me, it was, “This is easy.” And I served in different places.

**JAS:** And you had a successful career in Israel. I have done some research about you and I have found that you began your studies in dance and music at the Rubin Academy for Music and Dance in Jerusalem, and then danced with the Jerusalem Dance Theater, the Panov
Ballet, and later with the Israeli National Ballet Company. How would you describe those experiences?

**AB:** Yeah, it was great. It was great. Actually, I was fine with staying in Israel, but then my girlfriend, back then my girlfriend, today my wife, decided that we should go abroad. Actually, after I was done with the military, I thought I was going to the university. Thus, I started to attend Hebrew University to pursue a degree in math and computer science. I thought that dance was great, but, you know, I wanted to make a living. I started, but then my girlfriend said, “Let’s go abroad. Let’s go to the US.” And I thought, “Ok. Let’s go for one year. Why not?” I was already fond of taking correspondence courses. When I went back after one year, I would be able to continue with my degree. But, since then, I have been here. That was fourteen years ago. Sorry, no, eleven years ago.

**JAS:** Yes, I have read that in the U.S. you danced for many companies such as the Joffrey, Metropolitan Classic Ballet, Alabama Ballet and Gelsey Kirkland Ballet. You have toured through England, France, Germany, Italy and, of course, Spain.

**AB:** Oh, yes, beautiful Spain. I have been in Toledo. So beautiful! I have also been in Madrid and Barcelona. These three places.

**JAS:** And you have performed lead roles in the majority of renowned ballet productions such as *Swan Lake* (as Siegfried), *Sleeping Beauty* (as the Prince) and *La Corsaire* (as Ali). I am interested in hearing about your role
as Basilio in *Don Quixote*. What was your approach to the character when you were a dancer?

**AB:** One of the things that I did the most, maybe too much, was Basilio. This is maybe, I guess, why I naturally chose to do it for this year because, right now, as an assistant professor, as a new professor, I need to kind of create from scratch courses, I mean, you know, new courses to be taught at UNH. As a professor in the Department of Theater and Dance, you need to direct every year, so I thought that it would be good to begin with something that I knew very well, and *Don Quixote* was something that I did so many times. I knew all the details, so it was kind of easy.

**JAS:** You were confident. Do you think that your understanding of the story of Don Quixote is different now that you have analyzed it as a director and choreographer of the show here at UNH in comparison to your times as a dancer?

**AB:** Big time. It is so different. I cannot believe how different it is. Of course, I mean, I cannot generalize. When you dance, first of all, you do not want to be taught. You tell everybody, “Let me dance; let me go to study; and then go home.” Directing is also a big headache. But a huge surprise was that when I was teaching I really loved doing that. And even more, directing for the first time this year for me was to have the opportunity to see the big picture, everything. You have all those meetings with the designers, with the people in charge of the costumes and the lights, etc. To get the opportunity to put everything together is a really, really interesting ex-
perience. It just fulfills [your expectations] in a different way.

Also, another thing, very interesting, about being the director is that…When you dance, naturally, when you are doing it professionally, you are nervous. You need to make it happen every time you are on stage. And when it comes to dancing, many times you do not know how your body wakes up in the morning. Many times when you go on stage, you do not know how you are going to end up. So anyway, dancing, when you do it professionally, involves a lot of stress. When you are a director, I thought… When I started to direct, I thought, “This is nice. I do not need to put on my tights any more. I can sit and enjoy.” And it was no, the opposite. Unbelievable. Now you stress for thirty people on stage. It is even worse.

JAS: Yes, I could see that in the other student performance after your show, Rainforest. A dancer fell. I felt bad for her. It was at the beginning of her routine. She recovered very well, but I was feeling for her. I was in the front row. That was on Thursday.

AB: Yes, one of our dancers also fell on Wednesday. But it is what it is. This is called live performance and you need to stand up and keep going.

JAS: Yes, she recovered very well, and followed the routine. But you feel for her because it was her first step and she fell.

AB: Usually first live performance, especially because we are working with students in the department, is hard. You need more time to put it together.
JAS: Now that you talked about your experience as a professor, I saw that, indeed, this is not your first job as a university professor. You have taught at Barnard College, Rutgers University, Montclair State University and Raritan Valley Community College. Such a different variety of institutions. What did you change? What were your goals when you were teaching students ballet, men’s class, pas de deux, variations and modern dance? Did you have to adjust your goals based on the kind of student you had?

AB: Big time. Because I taught all the way from Columbia University to community college. It was very interesting, actually, to just meet different kinds of, you know, environment. One of the things I can say, that is very interesting and most surprising to me in a way, is that in Columbia University… You know, it is an Ivy League school. Well, in Columbia University, actually those students, I do not want to be mean, but they were kind of robots. And then you go all the way to community college and you get all these troublemakers, but they come with so much creativity. There is some kind of freedom. There is something free in their minds. I mean, you know, everything comes with something good and something bad. They do not know how to, you know, they do not have discipline. They do not know how to follow rules, but they know how to break boundaries of expression and integrate things into their art. So it was very different.

But, of course, I cannot generalize because there were good and bad things in each case. It was very different. One was kind of a jungle and you needed to be there. And the other was not, but you need to understand
the kind of student you have. One of the things that was
nice about all of them was that you come to the univers-
ty because you want to learn, so it is such a great envi-
ronment to be, because they can eventually learn from
others, and it is great. Many times in the professional
world, I can say at least about the dancing world, it can
be very dull.

JAS: What kind of shows, or productions, did you pro-
duce at those institutions? Which ones did you create?

AB: I actually… just small… small choreographies that
I did, but nothing big. This is actually very unique. We
have here [at UNH] a very unique program, very unique,
because the person who started this program had a very
good career. He was a professional, a very good dancer.
So he knew exactly how to build… what a production
needs. Many times at a university, again I do not want to
generalize… Many times universities will do three or
four productions per year, but they will do it cheaply.
There is no budget for costumes, backdrop, nothing.
Here, we do one but very well, with so much quality.

JAS: Yes, the quality of the painting [in the backdrop]
was really, really good.

AB: The costumes, the set, the scenery, all of that is a lot
of time, a lot of labor, and a lot of money. So, you can
do ballets like Don Quixote. If you do not have the co-
stumes, if you do not have the dancers, if you do not
have, you know, the scenery, or the set, you cannot do it.
You cannot do Don Quixote. And also another thing that
is very unique about our place is that we actually get the
possibility of putting ladies en pointe. Across the U.S.,
most dance performances are all modern based. Almost nobody goes *en pointe*.

**JAS:** Why do you think so?

**AB:** Because they are all modern based. Many of them are modern based. Then you would not go *en pointe*. I do not know if you saw all the ladies wearing *en pointe* shoes. It is kind of difficult. You need to be trained in classical ballet to actually be able to do that. It is not just like taking classes. You have to kind of, you know, do it for a few years, many years, to be able to perform on stage. And also we have another thing that is very unique in our program and that is the aerials. I do not know if you saw them.

**JAS:** Yes, I saw them.

**AB:** In the last years, across the U.S. only a few universities have added them to their repertoire.

**JAS:** Yes, I thought they were very innovative and creative. In fact, I would like to talk about the nature of this performance a bit more. This ballet was produced at the university and performed by undergraduate students. Who would be the ideal spectator that you had in mind? What would be your ideal audience?

**AB:** Let’s say, when you present *Don Quixote* at the university, you will not be able to really do the whole thing, which would take two hours depending on which version. Then, you would have bored the audience because it is difficult to educate the audience if they do not understand ballet. One of the difficult things about bal-
let, and dancing in general, is that you need to understand the art before you appreciate it. In other kinds of spectacle, you can watch them for a few minutes and you get the idea. You may not know the rules that you need to learn, but you get the idea.

But in ballet you have those *mise-en-scène*, all those *pas d’action*, gestures like this one [extending his arms and crossing his two hands to touch the two index fingers] that means that he and she are going to get married, etc. If you do not know… If you do not have this kind of knowledge, it would be very hard to understand what is meant. Or this one [moving his hand in circles around his mouth before kissing it] to express that she is very beautiful.

**JAS:** Especially at those moments in which characters are pretending to be talking, when there was no dancing, and they were moving along the stage.

**AB:** One of the things that I did, and that I tried to do, when I knew that I was coming to UNH, and that I was getting a UNH audience, was to use actors as much as I could in order to support the story, and also to kind of carry the story. So we actually brought some from…I do not know if you realized, but there were several actors that did not really dance, but that acted.

**JAS:** Like Lorenzo, for example. He was an old person.

**AB:** And Gamache, Sancho Panza and Don Quixote. They were all actors.

**JAS:** Were they actors from outside the university?
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**AB:** No, they were from our department, from our acting group. Because we are the Department of Theater and Dance. It seems that it worked well. It seems that it is something that we should keep on doing, because when it comes to dancing you need to know all those gestures to understand what is going on.

**JAS:** Great. In fact, this is another question that I had. The show ran for four days with four performances at night and two matinées. As I told you, my four-year-old daughter attended the event. It was such a pleasure that she was invited the day before, and she attended the matinée on Friday with her preschool and kindergarten classmates at the Child Study and Development Center here at UNH. Did you make any change in order to attract their attention, or maybe please or appeal to this younger audience?

**AB:** Yeah, we tried to, whatever you saw in the ballet. I think we added so much, especially when it came to acting. We added so many details, especially, you know, those funny moments, just to... You know, of course some of them were still very traditional and we took them from the version by Marius Petipa, the person who originally choreographed it in the eighteen hundreds, but we added a lot. When it comes to choreography, when you put a production together, when you work with it, you see what you have, you see all the dancers, and you decide what each person can bring with his or her talent. So apart from the dances, we created those side stories, those funny moments, and we combined them.

**JAS:** So the matinées were especially produced for...
AB: No, actually no. It was actually the same, but we were making sure that we were telling those stories. If they helped the storyline, in a way make them funny.

JAS: Following this stream of thought, in fact, there are clear changes from the original version. In other words, this production is a one-act version of the four-act and eight-scene ballet *Don Quixote* created by Marius Petipa (choreography) and Ludwig Minkus (music) in 1869. As you know, this ballet was revised by Petipa and Minkus and expanded into a five-act and eleven-scene version in 1871. You included most of the dances, but you left some of them out. Which directing decisions did you have to make over these weeks of work?

AB: I know the ballet so well, I just thought about the storyline. Actually, one of the things that bothered me when I danced Basilio in the ballet *Don Quixote* was that the story is not related to the book. It was kind of annoying. So why do you call it *Don Quixote*? So one of the things that I wanted to do for sure was to bring Dulcinea to the picture as much as possible. We were trying to do it in fifty minutes, and so in those fifty minutes I wanted to carry the story as much as we could. Because, if we think a bit about the character of Don Quixote, he is kind of crazy, he lives in his dreams, and also if you watch all these ballets, they are kind of dreams. You know, even the ending. It is kind of another day. He follows Dulcinea, he continues with his deeds, he believes in all those tasks he needs to do to help others. So I tried as much as I could, but it was very hard because the ballet follows such a different story. So I tried to bring Dulcinea as much as I could because in the original book the main focus is on Dulcinea, Sancho Panza and Don Quixote,
and their adventures such as the one with the windmills. I tried to bring them to the stage as much as possible together with Kitri and Basilio, who are of course the main characters of the ballet.

**JAS:** Nevertheless, it is interesting that you cut some of the most meaningful scenes of the novel. Obviously, Petipa did not include them, and you are right that the ballet is not the novel, but there are some scenes that are in the original ballet that are really meaningful in the novel. Among the most important subplots and characters that are not included in your production, and that were cut from the original version of the ballet, I would mention the plundering and purging of the books of chivalry in the library of Alonso Quijano in the Prologue of the ballet, the appearance of the theatrical company of Angulo el Malo in Act Two, Scene One, the puppet spectacle of Maese Pedro in Act Two, Scene Two, the famous tilting at windmills in Act Two, Scene Three and especially the final defeat of Don Quixote by Sansón Carrasco as the Knight of Silver Moon in Act Four. How did these variations affect the development and resolution of the identity crisis suffered by the Manchegan hidalgo?

**AB:** Yes, unfortunately we should have included them, but these cuts were due to the budget and resources. This is the moment in which he is fighting the windmills, and in which we can see him falling from them, but that would have been…

**JAS:** Too expensive?
**AB:** I will tell you why. If we get more technical. It is not even, I would say, about the money, but then you would have had to have changes of the scenery during the show, and then that means that it would take a lot of time, because if you do not have the right theater, the right scenery, to do it quickly, in two minutes, and put a new set, it would be very difficult.

In a theater like ours, you would need to bring people on stage maybe in the dark, and then start dragging the doors that were there, all the props, and then bring the windmills. It would have been impossible. People would also fall asleep. So you need to compromise.

**JAS:** But, still some people came to stage at some point, for example, when at the beginning they removed the bookcases and the desk after the Prologue. But, there is no plundering of the library of Don Quixote. Also, I noticed that you decided to change the ending. Don Quixote is not defeated by Sansón Carrasco as the Knight of the Silver Moon, which is something that also happens in one version of Petipa’s ballet. That version exists, and in that one Don Quixote is not defeated at the end. So, why did you go for one version and not the other?

**AB:** Again, it was again, unfortunately, because of resources. Otherwise, you would have needed a new set. You would have had to go away from the city of Barcelona and put another set [with the seacoast of the Mediterranean Sea].

**JAS:** So it would not have been Barcelona, the festivity of the marriage [of Kitri with Basilio/Gamache] and you would have had to go to the beach.
AB: Exactly, and that means, if we get technical, a new backdrop, which costs a lot of money. You should take off all the props, and the props, if you remember, had this door that was very heavy. You would need many people to do it in the dark. So it is kind of... When it comes to professional theater, everything can be on wheels. It can be moved in a few seconds.

JAS: Like when they did it with the horse.

AB: Oh, yeah, the horse. At least this time we could do it. Don Quixote came on a horse. So again it all comes back to resources. At least, what I tried to do, I do not know if it made sense. One of the things that we could say about the character of Don Quixote is that he is crazy, and many times when you are thinking about this kind of craziness, there is no purpose. Normally when somebody does something, there is some thought behind it. But usually a crazy person would do actions without thinking about them. There is a distance between his mind and his behavior. So this story ends as if it were another day in Barcelona, and Don Quixote keeps chasing Dulcinea. Nothing is kind of solved. What happened? Nothing. He dreams about all these stories and for him they make sense.

JAS: Yes, that makes sense. It makes sense to me. Another thing that I found very interesting, at least in my impression, were the body transformations. Indeed, they played an important role in the original ballet. Not only does Don Quixote believe that some magicians have turned his beloved Dulcinea into a peasant called Kitri, but Kitri herself disguises as a boy in order to escape
from her father Lorenzo, who wants her to marry Gamache in order to enjoy his fortune. That is all in the original ballet, not in your production. But, in your production you had the character of Gamache, which at least in my opinion was not very masculine. He was much more like a *castrato*. He was even wearing red makeup in his lips. How did you envision the artificial construction of human gender, especially in the character of the not-so-masculine Gamache?

**AB:** I mean, when you come to stage, you wear makeup. It is what you have to do. If you think about it, it is to highlight everything. Maybe Gamache put on too much.

**JAS:** Yes, I did not see it in Sancho Panza or Don Quixote. Also it was part of his physical appearance. He represented the nobleman of the time, so that created a distance between the peasants and the rich guy. I mean, there is no duke in this ballet so he is, we assume, a member of the upper class. Wearing makeup was normal at that time. It is just an idea.

**AB:** One of the things we tried to do, as much as we could, and going back to the book, was...I do not know if you got this idea. Every time Dulcinea would come in, we kind of froze everyone. So this was the moment of Don Quixote’s mind because nobody sees Dulcinea, except for him. At the beginning with Sancho Panza, when he is settling in, Dulcinea comes and everything freezes; in the town when Dulcinea comes in, everybody stops moving, as if they were puppets, and only Don Quixote follows her, and we create a dramatic scene with the lights. And then when she disappears, everything goes back to normal. However, with Don Quixote it is almost
the opposite. When she disappears, he becomes static and does not move. Also, a funny moment was when he comes to say hello to her, and he bows to her while hitting Gamache. So at least, you know, we try to project these motifs, to bring this craziness to stage.

**JAS:** That was pretty good. I do not know how familiar you are with the works of Cervantes outside *Don Quijote*, but in the ballet it is very clear how there are some characters that are, if not identical, similar to others from other works. For example, Graciosa is the gypsy dancer who is similar to Preciosa, the gypsy dancer of *La gitanailla*. What do you think is the effect of the use of characters from other Cervantine works? Do you think the audience is aware of these connections?

**AB:** There are gypsies in every production of this ballet, so the spectator will not know. They will think it is part of the tradition. But, yeah, we tried to compress everything in those fifty minutes and we thought that those gypsies would contribute to the live spirit of the marital celebration.

**JAS:** Also, another thing that I saw in your production is that you did not include magical elements such as the fairies, the gnomes and the monsters from the Enchanted Garden of Dulcinea in Act Two, Scene Five. Would this erasure challenge the premise that evil wizards are depriving the knight of the contemplation of the image of his beloved lady?

**AB:** I know, but remember that usually the audience falls asleep during this segment of the ballet. When Don Quixote falls asleep, they fall asleep. But, it definitely
goes back to the idea of time, and to include as much as you can while still keeping the energy and the joy of the celebration.

**JAS:** Indeed. In fact, talking to my daughter after the show, she told me that her favorite parts were the comic scenes in which Sancho is ill-treated and thrown into the air by some peasants, and also when Don Quixote hits Lorenzo and Gamache on their backsides with his lance. That was exactly what we were saying before, that you wanted to emphasize the comic moments so kids would enjoy the performance.

But, your version also includes several kinds of people living on the margins. In fact, some scenes were funny because they included biased representations of people living on the margins, such as gypsies and effeminate characters. Other cultural stereotypes that appear both in the original version, and your production at UNH, were the group of toreadors, the bullfighters, who dance in Act One in the open plaza in Barcelona. I noticed that the female ballerinas with whom they danced were wearing dark red dresses, and not peasants’ clothes. Furthermore, the leading bullfighter, in a white costume, was paired to a dancer in black. What was the meaning of color in your production?

**AB:** I would say that at least with the costumes we went traditional because it is costumes, and not scenery. Usually the character of Mercedes wears black; Kitri in white, sorry in red; and then we have the street dancers and the toreadors. I just went traditional as much as I could. Usually the toreadors, I mean Espada and Mercedes, wear white and black [respectively]; Kitri wears red; and then Basilio varies from one ballet to another;
some versions will dress him in black just to complement Kitri, and also white and black go together.

**JAS:** So it is a tradition of color that has been kept?

**AB:** Yes, since Petipa. This is since Petipa. And we can think that in a way Espada is the leader of the toreadors. You need to dress him a bit different. He is the leader. And the street dancer Mercedes is like, you know, how to say it…

**JAS:** Very suggestive.

**AB:** And in my mind, you cannot dress her in white.

**JAS:** It is kind of funny. I liked the change you made in their costumes because they were more suggestive characters. They looked like dancers from Moulin Rouge or something. You really emphasized their sensuality in comparison to the others, who dressed more traditionally. Also, I have been watching some ballet. Some of the couples were performing a *pas de deux*, which looked like a representation of an act of bullfighting, which some *aficionados* define as the aesthetic dance between the bullfighter and the bull. I thought this distinction was very innovative and creative. It was the white against the black, the good against the evil, right?

**AB:** Yeah, in terms of dancing, and again going back to the idea that I was working in a student environment, you have to know what you can do and what you cannot do. For example, there was a scene that I really wanted to create, but it was not possible. There is one moment in which the toreadors are dancing with the street dancers,
and the toreadors make gestures [with their hands imitating a sword before penetrating the body of the bull]. That would have been very Spanish, very traditional. I wish I could have done it, but I could not because we did not have enough time to prepare it perfectly with the dancers. Actually I prefer that than, you know, to work in a different environment where it is difficult to work, because it was wonderful, wonderful.

**JAS:** Talking about that, now, if we think about the student performer, which obstacles did you face in the selection of the dances and the *mise-en-scène*? Did you need to make hard decisions about what to dance based on the dancing skill of your students?

**AB:** I had to look at what exactly the dancers could do and what they could not. Actually, I would like to say that many directors would not let dancers do some technical steps that we let them do, because when you go on stage you need to look clean as much as you can. Do whatever you can do. Those two or three steps. Whatever you can really handle. So we looked at the dancers to see what we had and then we tried to modify some of their variations. Except for Kitri and Mercedes’s variations, we had to modify the rest, many parts of them, because again it goes back to the level.

**JAS:** But, it looked good.

**AB:** Yes, absolutely. I think it was great because eventually we were sure that we were letting our dancers go on stage feeling comfortable. During the first performance on Wednesday, there was one step that is called *double tour*, in which you jump and rotate twice in the
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air, and it is very difficult. Many times when you are learning that step, you normally fall. You need to know how to control your body and the strength of the jump.

During rehearsals it went okay, so we decided to let him [Espada] do that. But, then on stage he fell [on Wednesday]. So we thought that it was a good learning experience, but after that we eliminated it from the routine. Thus, on Thursday you did not see it any more. We worked with him after and decided to change the step. So you work with what you have.

JAS: That is great. However, in a performance, we do not only communicate emotions through our movement, but also by the facial expressions in our faces. What were the directions you gave to your students to help them control or channel their feelings through their looks?

AB: Ok, now I need to tell you a bit about history. Many years ago, going back to the Baroque period, one of the things... Ballet used to be danced as part of an opera. You would have the opera, and then in the opera you would have those sections of dance and ballet. At some point, ballet started to be developed because kings loved the dance. And, you know, you do what the king says. So the ballet started to be developed independently from the opera. And there was a kind of a dilemma about what to do. Because if you are going to detach the dance from the opera, how are you going to connect and communicate with the audience, as in the opera singers would sing the story? And that is why they resorted to gestures. Bit by bit, these pas d'action were developed to transfer information through gestures, dancing gestures. So one of the things I want to say, and this is one of the
interesting things about working with actors, is that when actors started to act, they were very literal. For example, they would move their mouths, although you cannot do that in dancing. You can open your mouth, and close it, but there is no talk. You need to act through movement. The gestures you are going to communicate need to be part of a movement. So this kind of acting is more like dancing-acting. And everything needs to be more fluid. If you are going to point at someone, you just do not move your arm, but the whole body accompanies your gesture. So it was kind of a process to work with actors. In the future, I will work a little more with them because sometimes they went back to their acting skills, and did something that was very literal, and it was not acting-dancing any more.

JAS: Good. Finally, what was the learning process of those involved in the production? How did you teach them about the ballet *Don Quixote* in particular and Miguel de Cervantes’s novel *Don Quixote de la Mancha* in general? You are an expert in dancing ballet and you have danced *Don Quixote* so many times.

AB: I just did not. You know what you know, and you do not know what you do not know. Basically, when you get into the company, it is not that somebody comes and tells you how it is going to work out. He puts you in the studio and you just start to learn the choreography from watching, from being there. I did not say anything to the dancers. I just say what I knew about dancing in the company and shared it with them.

JAS: Did you dance in front of them?
AB: It depends on which parts. In some cases we used videos of performances in which I danced. So we could use that. Or we took several parts from different versions, and then we had to modify them. When you learn, in the ballet we actually have this language of the ballet, which is French. So sometimes you have to show them the steps, and sometimes you just say the name of the step, such as arabesque, and they would understand. So sometimes they learn from watching a video, sometimes you show them the steps, and sometimes you let them listen to the music and express themselves, and then you decide whether that movement worked or not. So it is kind of complex and it depends on the moment.

JAS: And, how could you assess their understanding of the storyline of the ballet and the story of Don Quixote?

AB: When we dance, we are so busy learning the choreography, so busy bringing the level of dancing up, that we never have the chance to talk about what you are dancing. Obviously, dancers from dancing it embody the story. They will get it. They understand it from rehearsing it and watching it. So it is almost like you get the chance, and this is what is so beautiful about all those ballets, you get the chance to embody the story of the ballet, to put on those costumes, to express this story and art through your body. And that is beautiful.

JAS: Did students collaborate in the creation of the characters and the happy, festive spirit of the performance? I saw that Basilio was really funny when he kissed Kitri while he was pretending to be dead. Did the dancer there collaborate with the creation of the character?
**AB:** Usually, you would give directions about what they need to do, but then it is your job, your artistry, to show how you are going to present those attributes. In this case, you need to bring the knife, you need to convince the woman that you committed suicide, you are going to kill yourself and you need to kiss Kitri. So these are four simple directions. Now it is your job. Every person is totally different. In fact, we had two different casts. You saw one. We had another one. This person did this. The other person did something totally different. So you give them freedom, but at the same time if they go out of their character it is my responsibility to say, “No. This is not good.” For example, when Sancho Panza is being thrown in the air, one dancer wanted to knock Don Quixote in the head after being released. And that was a no-no, because Sancho Panza is a servant and he cannot do that to Don Quixote. So it is your role to come and say, “No. You cannot cross the line. You are the servant and he is the knight. You can do whatever you want in the range of your character, but you cannot cross the line.”

**JAS:** And to conclude, I saw that the Johnson Theater was packed on Thursday with many students. Which moral or societal lessons could we learn from a ballet like this? What is the role of dance, theater and the humanities in the education of future generations?

**AB:** I would say that. The main thing for me about *Don Quixote* is the humor. It is such an important component, and I wanted to bring it to stage as much as I could.
JAS: I mean, what I got from your ballet was first the happiness of the cast at the moment. I also saw their joy, their sense of freedom in the characters of Basilio and Kitri.

AB: Also, like in life, you can always find ways to solve your problems, challenges or whatever. You need to be positive.

JAS: And that shows that Don Quixote is still alive. We can learn about our own problems through the characters of Kitri and Basilio and always find a way to succeed and reach our goals.
DE LO QUE ME ENCONTRÉ EN UNA MALETA ABANDONADA A LA SALIDA DE UN TEATRO EN MONTEVIDEO. DRAMATURGIA Y DIRECCIÓN, CLAUDIO HOCHMAN. INTERPRETACIÓN, SERGIO ADILLO. TÍTRES, JESÚS CABALLERO. LA MÁQUINA REAL, EL RINCÓN DE LOS TÍTERES, XALAPA, (MÉXICO). 26 DE ABRIL DEL 2015.

ESTHER FERNÁNDEZ
Rice University

El director argentino Claudio Hochman, vuelve a sorprendernos una vez más con una creativa puesta en escena basada en textos dramáticos del Siglo de Oro. La experiencia de Hochman en dirección de obras clásicas ha sido extensa, especialmente con textos del bardo inglés. Sin embargo, uno de los sellos artísticos del director es la adaptación de obras de los siglos XVI y XVII al teatro de objetos y de marionetas. De lo que me encontré en una maleta abandonada a la salida de un teatro en Montevideo es un perfecto ejemplo de esta combinación estético-literaria.
La obra narra la historia de tres viajes que Sergio Adillo, único intérprete de este one-man show realiza (1) por su vida (ficticia) de artista y técnico ambulante, (2) por la historia de las marionetas utilizadas durante los siglos XVI y XVII y (3) por los textos más emblemáticos de la dramaturgia barroca. Estas tres narrativas se entrelazan para hacer un espectáculo único que no deja de asombrar al espectador en todo momento, no importa la edad o el conocimiento de teatro clásico que tenga.

Fig. 1. Sergio Adillo (Don Juan) con marioneta (Aminta). Escena de El burlador de Sevilla. Foto de Jesús Caballero, cortesía de La máquina real.

La parte dedicada a la autobiografía del artista titiritero está marcada a lo largo de la obra por el don que posee el protagonista de encontrarse, en sus distintos viajes, objetos tan dispares como naipes tirados en la calle, una bicicleta abandonada, un
estuche con una guitarra sin cuerdas, una maleta con despojos de títeres antiguos y, hasta “cosas en sus sueños”, como el mismo dice en un momento de la representación. Estos hallazgos casuales le sirven para hilar paulatinamente los distintos fragmentos de obras clásicas, con la historia de los títeres barrocos utilizados en la Península por compañías conocidas como máquina reales.

Fig. 2. Sergio Adillo interpretando una de las canciones.
Foto de Jesús Caballero, cortesía de La máquina real.

El protagonista se sirve de un elenco un tanto extravagante—un par de marionetas, una pierna,
unas manos y varias cabezas de títere—para representar algunas de las escenas más emblemáticas de la dramaturgia del los Siglos de Oro como *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, *La dama boba*, *El perro del hortelano*, *El gran teatro del mundo*, *El burlador de Sevilla*, *El caballero de Olmedo*, *La vida es sueño* y *Fuenteovejuna*. Sin embargo, Adillo no se limita a ejercer simplemente de titiritero sino que a veces ocupa el rol de personaje, lo que le permite interactuar directamente con las marionetas o las partes de los títeres encarnando distintos papeles. Por ejemplo Adillo se sirve de una mano y una cabeza para entablar un diálogo amoroso sobre la definición del amor.

El uso de fragmentos de títere llega a convertir algunos momentos la representación en un teatro de objetos, modalidad artística que contribuye a dotar al conjunto del montaje de una estética sobria, carente de tramoya y basado en la fuerza de la palabra y el poder de la poesía. A este mismo propósito, el propio Adillo comenta en el dossier promocional: “Esta tendencia a la esencialización se acentúa más aún en nuestra última creación, *De lo que me encontré en una maleta abandonada a la salida de un teatro en Montevideo*, un solo en el que el material de trabajo no son los títeres, sino sus despojos”.

Fig. 3. Sergio Adillo (Fabia) con cabeza de títere (Tello). Escena de *El caballero de Olmedo*. Foto de Jesús Caballero, cortesía de *La máquina real*.

Tanto las escenas de las obras representadas como las partes títeres—no olvidemos que Adillo también trabaja con tres títeres completos—va tomando coherencia a través de cuidadas transiciones musicales y de anécdotas personales sobre los viajes artísticos del protagonista. Las canciones son especialmente importantes para el público más joven ya que a través de ellas el actor interactúa con los espectadores noveles y les invita a participar ya cantando—prestando atención a la musicalidad de las
rimas—o reflexionado sobre las escenas representadas. Este diálogo con la audiencia es una de las características del montaje ya que permite introducir de manera didáctica algunos de los parlamentos más famosos del Siglo de Oro de manera interactiva e incluso crítica. En efecto, los más jóvenes reaccionan a las situaciones propuestas, las cuales abordan temas de gran complejidad como el amor, el rechazo, la realidad y la ficción, la tortura o el coraje colectivo, entre otros.

Otra de las grandes singularidades de este espectáculo es la introducción histórica a uno de los tipos de compañías de marionetas más antiguos de la península, las máquinas reales. Éstas escenificaban en los corrales, generalmente en época de Cuaresma, comedias enteras, exclusivamente a base de títeres. El diseñador de los títeres para el montaje, Jesús Caballero se ha basado en documentación histórica para reproducir estas marionetas centenarias. De hecho, la maleta hallada en Montevideo que se menciona en el título del espectáculo, remite a una posible hipótesis histórica según la cual: “Se tiene noticia de que la máquina real viajó al Nuevo Mundo; concretamente al Río de la Plata, y no sería difícil imaginar que cuando estos muñecos dejaron de usarse, pudieron acabar abandonados en un viejo teatro de Montevideo, adonde llegarían desde el Buenos Aires colonial” (Adillo, Dossier).
En definitiva, *De lo que me encontré en una maleta abandonada a la salida de un teatro en Montevideo* es un espectáculo único dentro de las producciones que apuestan por presentar selecciones de textos dramáticos del Siglo de Oro. Esto no sólo se debe al uso de reproducciones artísticas de títeres sino a las técnicas interpretativas, musicales y didácticas que Sergio Adillo despliega en escena. No hay duda que el espectáculo consigue llegar a los más jóvenes pero no por ello los adultos se quedan indiferentes. Al contrario, esta “fantasía”—
como el propio actor la denomina—llega incluso a fascinar al público más especializado al conseguir materializar en escena una antología experimental del teatro del Siglo de Oro en miniatura.


Christopher D. Gascón
State University of New York College at Cortland

Repertorio Español presented a Spanish Golden Age play festival during the summer of 2015 featuring three productions directed by recipients of the Van Lier Young Director’s Fellowship, sponsored by The New York Community Trust. All three plays showcased the energy, innovation, and talent of their directors, casts, and crews.
The festival kicked off with director Estanía Fadul’s staging of Calderón’s dramatization of the Apollo/Daphne myth, *El laurel de Apolo*, the first zarzuela ever written. The music, of course, was the highlight of this production. Music director Marios Aristopoulos composed the songs and instrumental accompaniment that provided the backbone of the work, drawing upon a range of contemporary styles including flamenco, tango, and folk. The rhythmic guitar accompaniment played by Carmen Borla as *Eco* and Paloma Muñoz as *Iris* anchored most of the musical numbers, while Kendal Hartse’s violin playing added wonderful texture and depth to each piece. Borla and Muñoz accounted for a great deal of the singing as well, harmonizing beautifully with the rest of the cast as chorus. The lead singing of Samuel Garnica as Apollo was robust and energetic, while Inma Heredia as Zarzuela added great stylistic flair with her flamenco interpretation of “‘Norabuena sea.” The cast showed musical range in their ability to rouse the audience with upbeat dance numbers as well as to spellbind them with haunting, melancholy ballads.

Odd as it may seem to mention the intermission, this one merits commentary, as it was *pura fiesta*. Actors pulled audience members onto the stage to dance as Garnica and Venuz Delmar sang upbeat Cuban music and ballads. Other members of the cast served glasses of wine to audience members, who thoroughly enjoyed the unexpected party.
The most powerful scene of the play was without a doubt the climactic transformation of Daphne into a laurel tree. As Hartse played haunting minor arpeggios on the violin and hazy smoke drifted forth from the rear of the stage, the cast echoed Daphne’s pleas for help in multi-part harmony while at the same time methodically binding her in a web of ropes, abstractly evoking the laurel tree. The metamorphosis was a masterful visual and aural spectacle.

Dafne (Carmen Cabrera) converted into a Laurel in Repertorio’s El laurel de Apolo. Photo by Michael Palma, courtesy of Repertorio Español.

Though not dominated by music like El laurel, Victoria Collado’s El burlador de Sevilla opened to the sincopated rhythms of Santana’s “Oye como va,” featured seductive Cuban jazz as
transition music between scenes, and inaugurated the second act with don Juan (Sandor Juan) singing José Alfredo Jiménez’s Mexican classic “El rey” to Aminta (Bertha Leal). The latter was certainly an inspired choice, as the lyrics so aptly captured the essence of don Juan: “Con dinero y sin dinero / yo hago siempre lo que quiero / y mi palabra es la ley / no tengo trono ni reina / ni nadie que me comprenda / pero sigo siendo el rey.”

Repertorio’s *Burlador* was for the most part light-hearted, comic, and at times farcical, yet somehow none of this took away from the intensity of the more serious scenes. Sandor Juan was very convincing as don Juan, portraying all the smugness, arrogance, and irreverence of the character very well, with a devilish smile and twinkle in his eye adding elements of humor to this character that almost never takes anything seriously. Claudio Weisz played Catalinón very well; his facial expressions, physical humor, and comic timing made him a wonderful gracioso, blending fear and foreboding with comic gags. The versatility and range of Jessica Flori as both Tisbea and the Rey de Castilla were also impressive. She demonstrated sensuality as Tisbea, manifesting both restraint and rage in her soliloquy lamenting her betrayal by don Juan. Equally convincing were the authority and power she exuded as the king.
Though Comendador Ulloa’s visit to don Juan’s apartment was not as frightening as the servants seemed to believe it was, the climactic final scene was very effective. Blue lights flashed across a darkened stage as eerie violin music underscored the scene. A group of masked, skirted figures entered, hissing and clawing at don Juan, highlighted in red at center stage. A white sheet manipulated by the shadowy figures created the illusion of a great heaving funnel threatening to devour don Juan. After he disappeared beneath the sheet; all that was left of him was the jacket of his traje de luz, illuminated at center stage beneath a lone red spot. This visually spectacular scene with many novel touches
effectively provoked the fear and awe that Tirso strives for in his conclusion.

The festival culminated with Diego Chiri’s intelligent and visually striking production of Cristóbal de Virués’s *La gran Semíramis*. Chiri and the cast’s great strength in this staging was their ability to add depth and dimension, beyond what is evident in the original text, to every character. Maite Uzal’s Semíramis developed from a bright-eyed youth passionately in love with her husband in the first act, to an astute manipulator bent on revenge in the second, and finally to a mature, seasoned queen enslaved by her own desires in the third. Through it all, she was inventive, charismatic, playful, seductive; in short, Uzal’s protagonist was human and likable – a far cry from the monster condemned by Celabo at the end of the play.

![Repertorio’s *La gran Semíramis*](image_url)
This production was not only about Semíramis, however; it was really about the rise and fall of those with ambition that attain power and influence. Gerardo Gudiño’s General Menón was a sympathetic character as he emphasized his disenchantment with the violence and destruction of war and his sincere passion for Semíramis. Alfonso Rey’s imposing physical presence and commanding vocal range made for a perfect King Nino, tyrannical and lustful in the first act, betrayed and beaten in the second, but menacing and dangerous to the end. The relationship between Celabo (Christian López Lamelas) and Zopiro (Paul Montoya) morphed from that of comrades in arms to bitter rivals and courtiers continually frustrated as pawns in the games of the truly powerful.

Chiri’s production included several other conceptual gems. Fortuna (Noelle Mauri) was presented as a towering white divinity presiding over a recurring tableau in which the wheel of fortune turned and the cast ritualistically enacted the sacrifice of each ambitious character. Shadow images of birds, leaves, and hands were projected on the four white banner/curtains at the rear of the stage to add a visual narrative and an element of magic and mystery to the fabricated stories accounting for the deaths of Nino and later Semíramis. The royal counselors, robed in brown and wearing owl masks, were played by Montoya, Mauri, and Gudiño as an-
cient, blind, slow, and gullible, accepting unquestioningly the explanations and whims of the rulers. Wardrobe and makeup designer Yolanda Balañá Mbasa created spectacular looks for the characters. The costumes were highly dramatic, combining black leather with bright ornamentation, arm and leg bands, feathers and capes to evoke a war-like, pagan culture, with a medieval look similar to what one might see in “Game of Thrones.” Most notable were Semíramis’ elaborately layered dresses with hooped structures adorning her back and the hem of her skirt, and Fortuna’s brilliant gold gown and tree-like staff accenting her impossible height and majesty.

Overall, this Van Lier Golden Age play festival was highly successful in showcasing a depth of talent and innovation from cast, crews, and directors. Repertorio presented both canonical classics and rarely performed pieces from the seventeenth century with wonderful imagination and energy.
Las dos bandoleras welcomed a third outlaw onstage in the Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico/Factoría Escénica Internacional’s collaborative rendition of Lope's *comedia* during its Spring 2014 season at the Teatro Pavón in Madrid. In addition to the play’s titular bandoleras Inés (Carmen Ruiz) and her younger sister Teresa (Macarena Gómez), Leonora (Gabriela Flores), the legendary protagonist of *La serrana de la Vera*, joined the mix, along with her long-suffering suitor, don Carlos (Llorenç González). True to the precept-shattering spirit of the *comedia nueva*, together FEI’s Marc Rosich, who adapted Lope’s play for this production, and director Carme Portaceli
liberate *Las dos bandoleras* from classical constraint; not only from the three unities that Lope explicitly discarded—those of time, place, and dramatic intrigue—but also from the unspoken assumption that each play functions as a free-standing unit.

(From left) Leonora (Gabriela Flores) trains Inés (Carmen Ruiz) and Teresa (Macarena Gómez) to handle a sword in the CNTC/FEI co-production of Lope de Vega’s *Las dos bandoleras*, at the Teatro Pavón May/June 2014. Photo by Ceferino López
State-controlled violence and patriarchal control over women are two unifying themes of the play. Wardrobe designer Antonio Belart’s costumes become a marvelous time machine that forces these issues to spill over from the distant past and into modern Spanish history. The play commemorates the ratification by Fernando III (c. 1199-1252) of the Hermandad de los Colmeneros [Brotherhood of the Beekeepers], a rural police-force that Alfonso IX had authorized to rid the hills and highways around Toledo of bandits, as the King (Albert Pérez) declares: “Yo digo que lo confirmo, / Y al privilegio pretendo / Añadir más libertades: / Y así, de nuevo concedo / A los colmeneros dichos, / Presentes y venideros, / Que puedan cazar sin pena / Por los lugares y puestos / Por donde en tiempo cazaban / Del rey Alfonso mi abuelo; / Y que les sean guardados / Sus costumbres y sus fueros [...].”

According to Menéndez y Pelayo, the play was published in Doce comedias nuevas de Lope de Vega y otros autores (Barcelona 1630), and probably dates from Lope’s early years spent in Toledo. Against this historical backdrop, Las dos bandoleras dramatizes the plight of two sisters, Inés and Teresa, betrayed in love. To avenge their dishonor, the sisters become outlaws, wreaking revenge on any man foolish enough to cross their path. “[Y] con este ya son treinta los que hemos muerto, y robados son cincuenta,” tallies Teresa after a successful ambush. In the CNTC/FEI version, the heroine of another Lopean play,
Leonora, the legendary mountain-woman of *La serrana de la Vera*, becomes the tutelary spirit who—after the manner of Mr. Miyagi in the *Karate Kid*—schools the intrepid but unskilled sisters in the art of swords(wo)manship. The training scenes, which recall the rehearsal-within-a-play scene from Act III of *Fuenteovejuna*, combine comicity with pathos as the young ladies wrestle with swords as tall as themselves. The ringing of steel blades crossing in the “real” duels that follow serves to heightens the audience’s identification with these spunky heroines, who seem to be fighting not only on behalf of their own dignity, but for women of all ages who struggle against patriarchal oppression. Of the actors’ training in swordsmanship Carmen Ruiz remarked in an interview with José Ramón Díaz Sande, “Otra cosa que me ha impresionado fueron las luchas a esgrima, que nunca había hecho. Son espectaculares. Sabemos atacar y defendernos sin hacernos daño. Son potentes y se ha conseguido que no parezca una simple coreografía.”

Capitalizing on Lope’s penchant for wrapping theatrical fantasy around a nugget of local history, the CNTC/FEI production alludes to different periods of time through diverse costume changes that seem to flow naturally from Lope’s equally risky decision to superimpose a Golden Age honor plot over a thirteenth-century chronicle. For example, Triviño (Helio Pedregal), the father of the *bandoleras*, wears a stylized Spanish Falangist uniform early in the play, in keeping with his
commitment as a *cuadrillero* to maintain order in the Toledan countryside. His daughters first appear dressed in tight black pencil-skirts reminiscent of 30s film noir while their predatory lovers, Captains Don Lope (David Luque) and Álvar Pérez (Álex Larumbe), clad in blue police uniforms, fall upon the women in a disquietingly recognizable display of authorized violence gone awry. Later, Triviño carries a wooden rifle accompanied by his servant Orgaz (David Fernández), cowering in camouflage and a WWI helmet, as they scour the hills for bandits. Once Teresa and Inés have run away from home, they appear in matching 19\textsuperscript{th} century costumbristic shepherdess dresses, but for their fencing scenes, they sport leather leggings and boots and white lace tunics cinched at the waist with leather belts, typical 17\textsuperscript{th} century male attire.

In keeping with the Teatro Pavón’s bare-bones decor, Paco Azorín’s scenography is minimalistic: shiny metallic “mountains” lend height and depth to the stage; Jordi Collet’s percussive musical interludes serve as sound “curtains” that effectively bridge changes of scene. Although *Las dos bandoleras* was pulled from obscurity for its positive portrayal of female characters, the CNTC/FEI production avoids the pitfall of presenting an anti-male bias by including Leonora’s misunderstood suitor, Don Carlos, played by Llorenç González. Throughout the play, Don Carlos trails—indeed almost stalks—Leonora, seeking to disabuse her of her mistaken belief that
he had betrayed her. Symbolizing Don Carlos’s vulnerability to the dual furies of inclement mountain weather and Leonora’s ongoing disdain, his tunic suffers a “wardrobe malfunctin” that (depending on the angle of the viewer) subtly exposes his naked masculinity onstage. This costuming feint infuses Don Carlos’s character with a fragility that counterbalances Don Lope and Álvar Pérez’s sexual crudeness. Likewise, Helio Pedregal’s Triviño succeeds at emoting raw anguish as he points his rifle at first one daughter and then the other. The acting, uniformly superb, combined with the creative staging and effective integration of elements from La serrana de la Vera assert that, in the right hands, Lope de Vega continues to hold his own on the 21st century international stage.
The Segovia-based Nao d’amores, which always captivates and compels, does not disappoint with its most recent production entitled Triunfo de Amor, a collection of three little-performed églogas and musical works by Juan del Encina. The performance, a much-anticipated feature of the 38th Festival Internacional de Teatro Clásico in Almagro, was well received by a delighted and enthusiastic audience at the corral de comedias on the evening of July 12th. The work weaves together Encina’s Plácida y Victoriano, Cristino y Febea, and the eponymous Triunfo de Amor along with musical selections from Encina’s 1494 Cancionero. The highest praise must be given to director Ana Zamora who has designed and developed this collection.
of works into a coherent and joyful piece of theater. Rather than attempting to reconstruct the performance of a single Encina work, Zamora has succeeded in reviving an early Renaissance treatment of the theme of the power of love. To what extent are we controlled by love/Love? What are the limits of our free will? These questions are explored throughout the work as characters seek, mostly in vain, to control their desires.

A company of six actor-musicians plays all the roles with the help of some brilliant design thinking by the technical team. Coordinated denim costumes ground the work’s pastoral feel. These are not off-the-rack jeans, however, but rather layers of pieces stitched together which simultaneously evoke both Renaissance shapes and a contemporary register of informality. For example, Javier Carramiñana’s denim pants (as Justino in the Cristino y Febea segment) are cut generously in the hips and thighs and snugly around the lower leg—a shape that gives the impression of puffy pants and leggings. Denim shirts and jackets are interchanged, worn on the head, or tied around the waist (for example when Mr. Carramiñana portrays Eritea in the Plácida y Vitoriano segment) as actors double (or triple) in various roles. A particularly versatile hooded sport coat allows for Mr. Carramiñana to appear as a suitor from the city in the Triunfo de Amor segment. The working-class/labrador denim is juxtaposed nicely with white-feathered accessories for the divinities. Amor himself (also played by
a now shirtless Mr. Carramiñana) dons the set of lovely white wings featured in the production’s publicity photograph. Mercury (played by Sergio Adillo) gets a hat with white feather wings. Venus (played by Eva Jornet) dons a black slip dress (presumably worn under the denim shirt/skirt ensemble worn for the rest of the production) decorated with a white feather décolletage. The scenery is equally versatile. Five wooden panels are hinged together and feature openings with green curtains. These are rearranged in different shapes throughout. The actors enter and exit through the draped openings, whose color adds to the pastoral feel.

Throughout the company’s extensive exploration of medieval and Renaissance theater, Nao d’amores has excelled at enticing its 21st-century audiences into a proscenium-less, participatory space. In this production, they push the intimacy of Almagro’s petite corral to new heights. By placing a staircase downstage center, actors were able to interact with spectators within the mosquetero space. Furthermore, (perhaps taking a tip from Broadway’s recent trend of selling VIP tickets?) eight lucky spectators were seated directly on the stage itself for this performance along both the stage right and stage left sides. This proximity, interaction, and ignorance of any sort of fourth wall are much closer to street performance than anything else. Passing the hat at the end of the show would easily pay for tapas.
As such, it takes a special group of performers to effectively carry out such a scheme. Zamora has developed a wonderful ensemble for the task, keeping in mind that the actors must sing, and the musicians must act. Adillo, Carramiñana, and Jornet all sing serviceably in the clean straight tones typical of the period. Carramiñana’s bass lends a sweet humor to the character Amor. Most importantly, all three bring the kinesthetic energy required to pull off the multiple roles required without confusing the audience. Jornet is especially sweet and playful as the various pastoras in the production. All articulate an adept and consistent delivery of Zamora’s reconstruction of medieval Spanish diction.

Of course it is important to remember that, as always with Nao d’amores, the music is a critical component of the performance text. Triunfo de Amor musicians Irene Serrano, Rodrigo Múñoz, and Isabel Zamora (Ana’s sister) not only frame the work with a series of Encina compositions, but also provide humorous sound effects with period instruments that enhance the performance. Perhaps most importantly, this is not an orchestra separated from the performers by a pit. Seated on the stage itself, the musicians are also actors and participants in the drama throughout. Recorders, bassoon, percussion, and a beautiful wooden organ, form an intimate part of the action as illustrated by the photo below. Musical director Alicia Lázaro’s arrangements of Encina are not the first for Nao d’amores, but they are
creatively and tightly interwoven with the production’s text selections.

Musicians Serrano, Múñoz, and I. Zamora are full participants in the action of the production. Photo by Javier Herrero, courtesy of Nao d’amores.

All contemporary stagings of classical theater, of course, face the challenge of mounting a production that resonates with a modern public. Zamora mitigates this challenge through her treatment of the universal theme of love. As such, and by connecting with her contemporary audience through textiles and active sensory participation, *Triunfo de Amor* enchants as well as any modern rom-com.
Reading *El Buscón* on the Chamizal Stage

Morfeo Teatro’s *El Buscón* deals more with the art of narration in early modern Spain than with the adventures of the swindler Don Pablos, the title character of Francisco de Quevedo’s picaresque novel *Historia de la vida del Buscón*, first published in 1626. Based in Cuevas de San Clemente, Spain, Morfeo Teatro brought their play to the Chamizal stage on Thursday, March 19, 2015 as part of the National Memorial’s 40th annual Siglo de Oro Festival. The company’s director, Francisco Negro, and artistic director and costume designer, Mayte Bona, make up the two-person cast of their adaptation of
Quevedo’s novel. Negro plays the swindler and Bo-
na the innkeeper who accuses him of stealing food
and wine from her larder, and complains because he
owes her weeks of back rent. He promises that he
will soon receive money from his work as an actor
and also reveals his “true” identity as Don Pablos,
the protagonist of a novel by a famous writer who
will pay him a large sum of money for sharing his
story. The innkeeper has serious doubts about her
boarder’s story, but as it happens, she knows how to
read and she owns a copy of the novel. She retrieves
the book and they begin to retell the story of the
swindler, she reading chapter headings and he recit-
ing and acting out bits of each chapter. Because of
this structure, the play explores the nature of read-
ing and storytelling and questions the differences
between reality and fiction. By retelling the story,
the renter seeks to prove that he is, in fact, Don
Pablos. He is a good storyteller and often the inn-
keeper and the play’s audience become engrossed in
the details of the narrative, but doubts about the
man’s identity linger throughout the show. Is he tru-
ly Don Pablos or is he an actor (a professional liar)
who has memorized Quevedo’s novel?

Morfeo Teatro’s adaptation of _El Buscón_ is
also a pastiche, an homage to other great and canoni-
cal works of Spain’s “Golden Age.” At one point,
Pablos challenges the innkeeper to try to read a po-
em aloud without laughing. She fails, and the bet
leads to others and gives the two actors the oppor-
tunity to recite favorite poems. Eventually they
compete to recite the greatest love poem. The innkeeper chooses Lope de Vega’s “Desmayarse, atreverse, estar furioso” and believes she has won, but then her tenant declaims Quevedo’s “Cerrar podrá mis ojos.” Finishing, he almost kisses the innkeeper, but takes her money instead. Pasting together poems, references to other novels, and scenes from other plays heightens the metatheatricality of Morfeo Teatro’s show. It also creates some strange anachronisms: The first volume of Don Quijote (1605), El Buscón (1626), and La vida es sueño (1635) are all simultaneously brand new works, hot off the press, and their future critical success remains unknown. Quevedo has not yet paid Don Pablos for his part in the new novel, but Pablos can recite Segismundo’s soliloquies.

The twenty-first-century audience at Chamizal, though, does not care about these anachronisms. The spectators cheered, applauded, and laughed at the right moments. The production borrows scatological and sexual humor – jokes and buffoonery involving excrement, vomiting, and prostitution – from Quevedo’s novel and other source texts. And in this show, Negro and Bona do comedy well. They time their jokes and punch lines carefully and the audience responds. Negro varies the speed and volume of his normally slow, resonant voice, making his storytelling more interesting. He individualizes different characters in his tales by using different, sometimes silly voices. One of his characters has a verbal tic, repeating the word “eh, eh, eh;”
another character stutters in a ridiculous manner. The audience also enjoyed the actors’ physical comedy, which sometimes borders on slapstick. One of Negro’s characters walks in circles on the stage with his legs bent in an exaggerated and amusing fashion. Both actors use facial expressions, gestures, and movement to comic effect. The innkeeper repeatedly attacks the boarder with her broom, and at one point in the show, she develops a tic in her right eye in reaction to something he tells her. When she covers her twitching eye with her hand, the hidden facial expression becomes even funnier. When he uses sleight of hand to steal her bag of coins, he conspiratorially involves the audience with his own smiles and winks. Some of the humor in this production is literary and depends upon the audience’s knowledge of some of the classics of Spanish literature. After reciting parts of the first few chapters of the Buscón, the narrator does not want to continue, so the innkeeper agrees to read aloud. When she comes to certain details, he corrects Quevedo’s mistakes, clarifying amounts of money and his mule’s name. Later in the play, Don Pablos predicts that the new novel by Cervantes will not be as successful as Pablos’s own story told by himself. To prove his point he recites the first line of Don Quijote: “En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme” and loudly proclaims, “¡vaguedad!” Then he delivers his opening words in El Buscón: “Yo, señora, soy de Segovia” and declares, “¡precisión!” His overconfident insist-
ence on his mistaken judgment strengthens the comic effect.

Sets, props, lighting, and costumes work together in the play to establish the setting and tone of the various episodes. All of the storytelling takes place in the room Pablos rents from the innkeeper. A large piece of billowy fabric stained with earth-toned dyes extends across the back of the stage. A doorframe and small window are set into the fabric, which becomes the back wall of Pablos’ bedroom. A simple bed, two chairs, a small writing table, a smaller end table, a stool with a water pitcher, a trunk, a basket, and two brooms make up his furnishings. The actors use every piece of rustic décor in the development of their tales, except the writing table complete with quill, which seems superfluous (the play focuses on reading, not writing). Sound effects and lighting help to create and shift the setting and tone of the scenes. At the beginning of the show, light-hearted music plays, a rooster crows, unseen wagons and carts pass by the inn, hens cluck and flap their wings. Later when Pablos describes his time in prison, a spotlight falls on the middle of the stage creating a small, bare, empty space. The sounds of dripping water and clanking chains create an eerie, lonely feeling. The feeling does not last, though, because Morfeo Teatro’s *El Buscón* always wraps up its serious moments with a punch line.

As the storytelling progresses, the actors produce props that alternately incriminate the boarder and corroborate his claims. The innkeeper
tricks him into revealing the wine and cheese he has hidden in his basket, but he also pulls letters from his luggage, the very letters that Don Pablos received from his uncle and other characters in Quevedo’s novel. The innkeeper reads the letters aloud, so she and the spectators know that the actor does not just recite them from memory. The two actors also cleverly use simple props to represent other characters. A small piece of fabric draped over his head turns Pablos into his mother, a bed sheet transforms him into his friend the jailor, and a goatee made from a piece a broom changes him into his miserly master. The innkeeper snatches the broom-goatee and plays the same character. Flexible, the bit of broom also serves as a piece of bacon dipped into an imaginary pot of boiling water for five seconds to flavor the water the master will feed Pablos and his friend for dinner. The innkeeper’s hair and loose-fitting peasant blouse recall Frans Hals’s *Gypsy Girl* (1628-30), and a long, full, light-colored skirt completes her costume. The blouse allows her to store (and the swindler to retrieve) coins between her breasts. Near the end of the show, she lifts her skirts to wash and show off her legs to her tenant. For his part, Pablos slowly gets dressed throughout the show. Adding more pieces to his costume enables him to shift his appearance from a drunken rascal to a fine gentleman. He begins the show in a long flowing shirt and tights, eventually he pulls on an outmoded pair of pumpkin breeches with panes (as in Sofonisba Anguissola’s portrait of Don Car-
los, c. 1560) and boots, and finally a leather jerkin and a cavalier hat.

The story of Don Pablos concludes as it does in the novel: the narrator tells us that he is determined to go to the Indies. Then the actor tells his landlady that the adventure in the Indies is another story, and Morfeo Teatro’s *El Buscón* features two additional endings. The first takes up the question of the boarder’s identity. The innkeeper tells him that she is stills not sure if he is just a play-actor or the real Don Pablos. He responds by asking her if it really matters and then recites Segismundo’s soliloquy about dreaming our identities in this life. The second ending to the play deals with the relationship between the boarder and the innkeeper. The actor, donning the last of his costume pieces, announces that he plans to leave for the *corral* theater. The innkeeper pulls her blouse off her shoulders and replies that she will go with him. When he exits the stage to retrieve his sword, she realizes that the ruffian has taken her money with him. He returns, though, with sword in hand, and lifts his hat to reveal and return her moneybag. Instead she wants a kiss and, after a few antics, he uses his hat to shield their faces from the audience while they kiss. The new double denouement resolves the conflicts set up in the metatheatrical frame and the storytelling ends happily ever after.
“Las cuatro mujeres de esta historia de pequeñas no querían sentarse como unas señoritas, pero lo hicieron. No querían una quinceañera, pero la tuvieron. Y ahí nuestra lectura de la obra cambia. Estas burladas no son vuestras niñas bonitas, no. Ni lo quieren ser.” Lucía Miranda, directora

Las burladas por don Juan es el segundo montaje de una obra clásica de la directora Lucía Miranda, recientemente galardonada con el premio José Luis Alonso de Santos 2013 para jóvenes di-
rectores. Su primera adaptación de un texto del Siglo de Oro, *De Fuente Ovejuna a Ciudad Juárez* (2010) fue una versión libre de la mítica obra de Lope, contextualizada entorno a los feminicios de ciudad Juárez. En este segundo montaje de un clásico, Miranda vuelve a tomar la violencia como punto de partida para adaptar *El burlador de Sevilla* de Tirso de Molina al problema de la violencia doméstica. Gracias a la Poética del Oprimido de Augusto Boal—concretamente al Teatro Foro—*Las burladas* rompe con la condición aristotélica del teatro y el pasivo del espectador al ofrecerle un espacio para la concienciación, la reflexión y la acción social.

El texto dramático se basa solamente en la primera parte de la obra de Tirso, enfocada en las cuatro burlas que don Juan va perpetrando sucesivamente a Isabela, Tisbea, doña Ana y Aminta. La segunda parte del drama, de matices teológicos y dedicada al Convidado de piedra se omite por completo por lo que los espectadores no llegarán a presenciar el castigo divino que Tirso otorga su don Juan. La dramaturgia del montaje debería calificarse como una versión libre de la obra original. Si bien Sergio Adillo Rufo, encargado de la adaptación dramática, mantiene algunos de los parlamentos y diálogo de las protagonistas y de don Juan casi intactos, la estructura del Teatro Foro que rige el conjunto de la representación obliga a condensar las historias de las cuatro protagonistas al máximo para dar cabida a los comentarios del moderador del foro y a la participación del público.
Partiendo de la metodología del Teatro Foro, el conjunto del montaje está contextualizado como si fuera un *talk show* televisivo en el que el *curinga* o moderador/a está encarnado por una de las presentadoras de televisión ecuatorianas más populares del momento, Mariela Viteri. Ella es la encargada de presentar sucesivamente a las cuatro mujeres y de exponer cada una de sus historias con don Juan. Una vez presentada la primera protagonista e introducida su tragedia personal, se pasa a una dramatización de la burla de la que ha sido víctima a modo de breve escena o viñeta y así sucesivamente con el resto de las heroínas burladas.

Doña Ana (Gilby de la Paz) lamentándose mientras don Juan (Ricardo Velástegui) y Catalinón (Juan Pablo Asanza) huyen. Teatro Sánchez Aguilar, Guayaquil 2013. Foto cortesía del Teatro Sánchez Aguilar.
Acto seguido, la moderadora anima a los espectadores a analizar el problema expuesto en escena y a buscar posibles alternativas a través de preguntas abiertas como: “¿fue burlada o se dejó burlar?” Sin embargo, el momento decisivo de este Foro ocurre una vez finalizada la dramatización de la historia de Aminta, la última de las protagonistas, cuando la moderadora llama al escenario a las cuatro mujeres y a don Juan para que los espectadores juzguen sus acciones y determinen su condena o salvación. Este “juicio final” dictaminado por el público justifica la omisión de la segunda parte de la obra de Tirso ya que es necesario dejar un final abierto para que sean los propios espectadores quien se encarguen del desenlace.

Si bien la idea de adaptar parcialmente *El Burlador de Sevilla* al Teatro Foro Boaliano enmarcado dentro de un *reality show* funciona de una manera muy natural, lo más impactante del montaje de Miranda es el documental sonoro que da fin a la puesta en escena. Éste incluye una serie de testimonios reales de mujeres ecuatorianas que narran distintos episodios de violencia doméstica. Por lo tanto, una vez concluido el veredicto de don Juan por parte del público, la ficción de Tirso se deja a un lado para dar paso a la realidad. El escenario queda vacío, con la excepción de cuatro sillas iluminadas ocupadas por las cuatro protagonistas bur-
Las cuatro burladas, Isabela (Ángela Arboleda), Tisbea (Érika Vélez), doña Ana (Gilby de la Paz), Aminta (Belén Idrobo), mientras escuchan el documental sonoro de los testimonios de las víctimas. Teatro Sánchez Aguilar, Guayaquil 2013. Foto cortesía del Teatro Sánchez Aguilar.

En la austeridad de esta escenografía resuenan las distintas voces en off que narran sucesivamente distintos testimonios de violencia doméstica, mientras las protagonistas escuchan en silencio prestando su cuerpo a estas voces de mujeres invisibles. Paulatinamente, cada de una de las burladas se va retirando hasta que las cuatro sillas quedan vacías en memoria de la miles de víctimas anónimas de los malos tratos.

Al igual que en su De Fuente Ovejuna a Ciudad Juárez, Miranda vuelve a lograr con éxito adaptar un texto clásico al contexto de una tragedia
actual a través del pragmatismo del Teatro del Oprimido. En su primer montaje, la directora optó por el Teatro Periódico para dar visibilidad a unos feminicios relegados por las autoridades a un segundo plano. Esta vez, con *Las burladas por don Juan*, la directora da un paso adelante en su misión social, al involucrar de lleno al público en una tragedia cotidiana y muchas veces invisible, como es la violencia de género y demostrar a los espectadores el poder que tienen de identificarla y de cambiarla.
Book Reviews


ENRIQUE GARCÍA SANTO-TOMÁS
University of Michigan

*A New Anthology of Early Modern Spanish Theater. Play and Playtext* es la más reciente de las antologías preparadas por Bárbara Mujica, quien ya en los últimos años nos había ofrecido, también con Yale University Press, una excelente selección de textos escritos por mujeres titulada *Women Writers of Early Modern Spain. Sophia’s Daughters* (2003). En ella brillaban todas las virtudes que vuelven a definir el presente volumen: un cuidado diseño en la ordenación y presentación de los diferentes textos seleccionados, un admirable rigor en el rastreo de fuentes textuales, un gran esmero a la hora de destacar la complejidad y belleza de cada obra, y una ejemplar atención al detalle, compartiendo estrategias interpretativas de gran utilidad para lectores de todos los niveles. Quien escribe estas líneas ha tenido en este reader de mujeres doctas un gran compañero de viaje por las aulas universitarias, disfru-
tando con sus estudiantes los muchos encantos de un grupo de plumas excepcionales. Este pariente cercano dedicado al universo teatral que ahora ve la luz logra objetivos parejos; no hay nada en esta nueva antología, de hecho, que resulte accesorio o innecesario.

Hasta hace bien poco, como observa la propia autora en el Prefacio del libro, quien buscara una antología fiable de teatro áureo en Norteamérica tenía que acudir a la ya conocida Diez comedias del Siglo de Oro editada por José Martel y Hymen Alpen. Con todas sus virtudes, esta selección puede hoy en día resultar para algunos un tanto anticuada, cuando no incompleta, en la medida en que no da cuenta de los hallazgos filológicos de las últimas tres décadas, que nos han revelado nuevos textos y autores, nuevos temas y nuevas inquietudes. Tocando dos siglos de producción dramática, Mujica propone ahora una selección ecléctica de textos, que incluye clásicos irrenunciables (Fuenteovejuna, El burlador de Sevilla, La Serrana de la Vera, La vida es sueño, El caballero de Olmedo, La cueva de Salamanca y El lindo don Diego), obras que en los últimos años han sido cada vez más estudiadas y editadas (Auto da barca da Glória, El médico de su honra y El gran teatro del mundo, Valor, agravio y mujer, La monja alférez), junto a lo que se podrían considerar novedades en este tipo de antologías, como son las piezas Santa Teresa de Jesús (atribuida a Lope), Cornudo y contento de Lope de Rueda y El parto de Juan Rana de Lanini y Sagredo, inven-
ción deliciosamente transgresora donde las haya; se añade a ellas el Arte nuevo lopesco enlazando con la página web de la editorial. En total, quince piezas de naturaleza muy distinta recogidas en un solo volumen, las cuales ofrecen al estudioso y al pedagogo la posibilidad de explorar cuestiones de toda índole—políticas, religiosas, metafísicas, científicas, metaliterarias, de género y sexualidad, etc.—y algunos de los géneros dramáticos más representativos del periodo. Si en algunas de las páginas introductorias la labor de síntesis y modernización de materiales es de agradecer (caso de piezas como Fuenteovejuna o El caballero de Olmedo), en otros casos, como es el de Santa Teresa de Jesús, la lectura puede deparar numerosas sorpresas agradables, habida cuenta del más que probado conocimiento que tiene Mujica de la monja carmelita.

El volumen se abre con el ya citado Prefacio, que anuncia las líneas maestras del volumen y justifica el método de trabajo escogido. Le sigue una Introducción extensa y bien articulada que opera como una mini-historia del teatro áureo, arrancando en los distintos modos dramáticos del medioevo, pasando por algunos de los grandes nombres del Renacimiento, haciendo cala en la figura axial de Lope, continuando por las diferentes generaciones de poetas barrocos sin dejar de incluir importantes consideraciones sobre escenografía y puesta en escena, para terminar con unas útiles páginas dedicadas a cuestiones técnicas concernientes a los tipos de estrofa y usos lingüísticos del periodo.
Es de destacar la atención que se dedica a autores de peso que no aparecen antologados (Juan del Encina, Lucas Fernández, Mira de Amescua, Leonor de la Cueva…) así como a figuras de gran importancia en el desarrollo de poéticas y cánones del gusto (Quevedo, Góngora, Cosme Lotti), cuya información ayuda al estudioso a completar el complejo mosaico de textos y autores del canon áureo. Cada texto viene precedido de una completa introducción en inglés, en donde la inclusión del signo + tras un término complejo o excesivamente técnico conduce al lector a un glosario final en el que se explica su significado. En los compases finales de estas páginas prologales se hace parada en diferentes representaciones recientes, ayudando así al estudiante a entender cómo se han solventado los diversos retos que presenta cada pieza, y cuáles han sido los logros más relevantes. La información ofrecida es la justa, y el equilibrio entre la crítica y la divulgación está perfectamente logrado, de manera que el lector consigue situarse sin problema alguno ante la pieza que se presenta. Destaca el acierto editorial de reproducir el texto a doble columna, con la novedad de ofrecer la numeración tradicional de los versos en el margen izquierdo y con una cantidad de notas razonable, en secuencia por número de nota y no refiriendo al número de verso. De gran utilidad resulta asimismo un Temario situado al final de cada pieza, que ofrece un número variable de asuntos a discutir, por lo general bien seleccionados y que facilita, sin lugar a dudas, la labor del docente para motivar la
discusión en clase. Al cuerpo central de textos le sigue una completa sección bibliográfica, cerrando el volumen un índice onomástico. Y, como no podría ser de otra manera en una antología que tiene como propósito subrayar el papel seminal de la puesta en escena, abundan las ilustraciones de diferentes representaciones contemporáneas, ya sean en los Estados Unidos como en otras partes del continente americano o en Europa. Se busca con ello examinar el mayor número de ángulos posibles de la fiesta teatral: texto, actores, recintos, vestuario, técnicas de representación... aspectos que antologías anteriores no habían llegado a cubrir satisfactoriamente.

El presente volumen cubre un hueco no colmado en la biblioteca de todo aquel interesado en el teatro del Siglo de Oro, y en particular para los que ejercemos la docencia en Norteamérica. La dedicación de Bárbara Mujica a este tipo de tareas críticas y divulgativas es una muy grata noticia, en un momento como el presente en el que cada vez resulta más difícil la adquisición de textos en lengua original y bien editados para el uso en nuestras aulas universitarias. Los diversos obstáculos a los que se enfrenta uno en relación con derechos de autoría y reproducción, los aranceles que encarecen el precio del libro importado, y la escasez cada vez mayor de librerías universitarias especializadas—y quien escribe estas líneas ha visto desaparecer en los últimos años las más importantes de su ciudad de trabajo por el encarecimiento del suelo y la especulación—
han hecho casi imposible ofrecer a los estudiantes libros de calidad a un precio razonable. En este sentido, *A New Anthology of Early Modern Spanish Theater. Play and Playtext* no solo es un ejemplo de scholarship bien hecha, sino que también provee al investigador de una utilísima herramienta docente. Confirma la vigencia y el atractivo de los títulos que consideramos clásicos hoy en día, al tiempo que invita a repensar el canon dramático áureo desde la inclusión de una serie de piezas que, por su temática a veces lejana de la ortodoxia heredada, resulta de gran interés al lector contemporáneo. El libro no solo es de gran valía para un curso de licenciatura, sino que también puede resultar muy apropiado en seminarios de doctorado en los que se quieran explorar los lenguajes críticos que han caracterizado la tarea de los comediantes en este lado del Atlántico. Es una antología, en el mejor de los sentidos, muy americana, que da cuenta de una actividad constante en este lado del Atlántico, y que evidencia no solo una pasión sincera y contagiosa por el texto leído y representado, sino también un criterio personal muy fino a la hora de reinventar el parnasio aurisecular para las generaciones de estudiosos de este nuevo siglo.
In her book, *Sor Juana/Música*, Pamela Long describes music theory in Europe and New Spain and notes the references to music in poetry by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. The book’s subtitle clearly explains the scope of the text: “How the Décima Musa Composed, Practiced, and Imagined Music.” The book focuses on music in the poetry and plays of Sor Juana.

Long divides her book into four chapters. “Chapter I: The Musicological Context of Sor Juana’s Works” describes music theory and practice in seventeenth-century Europe, Spain, and Mexico. It also explains how music was used in Sor Juana’s Convent of San Jerónimo. Although there is no hard evidence that Sor Juana ever composed music, her collection of musical instruments suggests that she at least played music. Long believes that "Sor Juana's works are well within the mainstream of musico-literary production of her time" (19), that
Sor Juana understood the shift from ancient Greek music theory to contemporary music theory.

“Chapter 2: Musica Pratica” discusses seventeenth-century music theory and notation. Long discusses the six-note scale used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and demonstrates that Sor Juana's poems and lyrics refer to this six-note scale, rather than the current eight-note octave. A previous knowledge of music theory is required by the reader in order to fully appreciate the fine distinctions made in this section of the book. For example, Long writes:

The diatonic and chromatic scales are familiar to us: the diatonic involves intervals of a semitone, tone, and tone when ascending, and tone, tone and semitone when sung in descending order. The chromatic is sung by a trihemitone, semitone and semitone in ascending phrases. (39)

As the quotation demonstrates, the prose is very dense in this chapter, especially if one does not have musical training. Long also quotes Sor Juana’s poetry that refers to music to prove that Sor Juana knew the musical theories of her time period.

“Chapter 3: Musica Poetica” describes religious and secular songs in Spain and Mexico, as well as dance forms. These songs and dances influenced the kinds of songs Sor Juana wrote. Long views Sor Juana as a product of her time and place, writing poems to be set to current musical forms, such as villancicos for church music and jácaras for
Comedias. The chapter also names the men who may have composed the music to the words provided by Sor Juana. Long notes that we have no record of any music composed by Sor Juana.

In “Chapter 4: Musica Speculativa,” Long details the references to music in Sor Juana’s poetry and plays. The plays referred to are the loas and El divino Narciso (but not her comedia, Los empeños de una casa) In both her plays and poetry, Sor Juana equates music with divine harmony (as many in her time period did). She compares the beauty of the Vice Reina with the harmony of heaven, seeing harmony in the moment of the planets, in society, and in individuals, as well as in music.

As the translator of Los empeños de una casa (which I entitled The House of Trials), I was looking for a reference to the song in the middle of the second act of the play. Since it discusses love and not harmony, it presumably did not fit Long’s thesis about harmony, and so she failed to mention it. This book is most useful to music historians who are interested in Sor Juana’s era, as well as scholars studying her poetry and songs. It does not, however, shed much light on Sor Juana as a playwright, nor does it refer to her most famous play.

GLADYS ROBALINO
Messiah College

El profesor Enrique García Santo-Tomás nos entrega una excelente contribución a los estudios de la dramaturgia tirsiana con esta edición de *Amar por arte mayor*, obra que, como él afirma, ha sido, inmerecidamente, una de las menos estudiadas del mercedario. De hecho, García Santo-Tomás reporta haber encontrado apenas breves comentarios de tres críticos en el transcurso del siglo XX: Blanca de los Ríos, Serge Maurel y Premraj R. K. Halkhoree. García Santo-Tomás detalla los puntos más relevantes en los comentarios de estos críticos sobre la obra, empezando con los eventos históricos contemporáneos al autor y sus propias experiencias personales que para Blanca de los Ríos pudieron haber motivado su redacción y la fecha en que tuvo lugar. Continúa con las aportaciones de Maurel y Halkhoree, mismas que concluyen que la obra debió ser escrita entre 1627 y 1629 particularmente por
“el tono de censura hacia el poder que tiene el texto” (12) que podría verse como reacción al decreto de exilio de la Junta de Reformación de 1625. Para García Santo-Tomás, esta obra merece estudiarse tomando en cuenta las contribuciones más recientes a los estudios tirsianos tanto desde el ángulo filológico (Ignacio Arellano) como del histórico (Antonio Feros) pues éstos pueden ayudar a comprenderla como un producto reducido a meras circunstancias particulares del autor. De hecho, apunta a la repetición en el corpus general de las comedias tirsianas de la figura del poderoso y la máquina del poder como tropos que se repiten frecuentemente y sirven para convertir a la comedia en instrumento para explorar “de forma ingeniosa y sutil el problema del abuso monárquico, del abuso del poder y autoridad” (32).

Además de la trayectoria crítica de la obra en cuestión, García Santo-Tomás dedica algunas páginas de su introducción para resumir la obra por actos y escenas, explicando la función de cada una de éstas dentro de su estructura general. Al mismo tiempo, en esta sección, se va detallando el trasfondo histórico sobre el que se construye (con detalles de su localización geográfica y circunstancias políticas), cómo el referente medieval permite a Tirso hacer una crítica a la situación política contemporánea, y las relaciones que existen y se van desarrollando entre los personajes que conforman el drama. Además, los estudiosos de esta obra encontrarán de gran utilidad las notas que se proveen sobre la versi-
ficación utilizada (cuya síntesis se halla en la sección “Sinopsis Métrica”). Ciertamente, García Santo-Tomás deja con esto una rica fuente de información sobre esta obra.

Sobre ésta, calificada comedia palatina, García Santo-Tomás dedica una sección específica para explicar los eventos históricos en el reino de Asturias en el siglo X que la inspiran y cómo Tirso los reescribe “mezclando lo real con lo anecdótico desde una sensibilidad que incorpora soliloquios amorosos, juegos de lenguaje y chanzas bufonescas” (19). Se realza justamente la caracterización de los reyes distraídos en sus caprichos amorosos, abusando del poder para lograr sus deseos, mientras descuidan las crisis políticas de sus reinos. En medio de guerras y conflictos entre territorios cristianos y musulmanes, la primera imagen que se presenta del rey Ordoño es cazando aves en el campo, cacería que termina con su encuentro con doña Elvira y el coloquio entre ellos donde la conquista amorosa (hombre-mujer) replica el ejercicio de la caza (cazador-ave). García Santo-Tomás compara esta escena con la que cierra el primer acto de Fuenteovejuna pues le parece que el rey, ballesta en mano, queda “ante una indefensa Elvira” (21), aunque doña Elvira, según la acotación, está también armada (“Ella con arco y flechas y él con ballesta” [73]). No obstante, García Santo-Tomás apunta acertadamente a que la escena muestra la imagen de un rey negligente de sus deberes, de ahí que los conflictos históricos quedan en segundo plano, mientras que el
ingenio lingüístico, la escritura misma, el juego cortesano asumen el lugar primordial de la comedia. Al final, la solución “a las intrigas amorosas y las rivalidades políticas” (21) tiene que venir de fuera—en la figura de don Sancho, rey de Navarra—debido a la ineficacia de Ordoño. La obra critica tanto el poder al mostrar los intentos de Ordoño de utilizar su posición para manipular a sus vasallos con el fin de lograr sus deseos personales, como la ineficacia del rey en el manejo del gobierno. En efecto, Ordoño resulta además de un rey endeble, “el rol más débil de la pieza” (24). El editor añade además cómo elementos de utilería (el retrato en pedazos), motivos comunes (amor, honor, celos, intrigas), y la contraposición entre verdad-mentira, real-ficticio, presente-ausente, van dando complejidad a la trama, y presenta cómo éstos han sido interpretados por él y críticos anteriores. Se introducen también referencias a notables similitudes entre esta obra y otras tanto del mismo Tirso como de Lope de Vega, abriendo con esto sugerentes posibilidades para futuros estudios.

En última instancia, García Santo-Tomás resalta el papel primordial de la palabra como personaje central de la comedia. A más de alabar el “virituosismo” (24) que Tirso utiliza en los intercambios epistolares en esta obra—equiparado el amor con el ingenio lingüístico de los amantes—Lope y Elvira. Son ellos (los amantes y la palabra) quienes terminan venciendo. Más allá de alabarse la destreza poética del autor, se apunta al lugar que se da a la pala-
bra—escrita y hablada—que con su ambigüedad, su doblez, y su opacidad, crea “un teatro dentro del teatro” (27). Se revela en la obra una clara calidad metalingüística y autoreferencial sobre el acto escriturario y su lugar dentro de los estilos prevalentes en la época. La comedia da espacio al lenguaje culturano y conceptista, a las “metáforas caducas” y el “lenguaje acartonado” a los que se contrapone “la frescura y gracejo” del habla de Bermudo (29) a la que García Santo-Tomás describe de “connotada” y “distorsionada” y, al mismo tiempo fresca, renovada, y llena de “inteligentes neologismos.”

Sobre la historia crítica a la obra y sus representaciones, García Santo-Tomás recuenta su suerte desde “los comentarios algo despectivos” de Hartzenbusch (32) hasta “su escasa fortuna escénica” particularmente durante el siglo XIX, especulando sobre las posibles razones de ello particularmente la poca ejemplaridad del rey en ella en un tiempo que prefería las “figuras emblemáticas y ejemplares” y las historias de “glorias patrias y … hazañas nacionales” (33). También se recuenta aquí la “trayectoria impresa” de la obra “a partir de la editio princeps”—pues no se ha encontrado su manuscrito (34), sobre cuyos ejemplares en las Bibliotecas Nacionales de España, Francia y Austria se basa esta edición, compilando y revisando las ediciones posteriores con sus correspondientes modificaciones al original incluyendo las dos de Hartzenbusch (1841 y 1910—5ta edición), y aquella de Blanca de los Ríos (1958). En la transcripción del texto, se en-
cuentran notas eruditas, explicaciones a referencias históricas, y aclaraciones de términos ayudándose tanto del *Diccionario de autoridades* como del *Tesor de la Lengua* de Covarrubias; así mismo, se explican las correcciones hechas sobre la edición príncipe cotejadas con aquellas en las dos ediciones de Hartzenbusch y en la de De los Ríos. Otros detalles sobre las líneas que guían esta edición se pro- veen en la sección “Criterios editoriales” al final de la introducción, así como una extensa bibliografía de fuentes de referencia para el estudio de la obra. García Santo-Tomás ha producido una edición de alto calibre que echa nuevas luces sobre una olvida-da obra del maestro Tirso de Molina. No me cabe duda que esta edición inspirará múltiples estudios sobre la misma.
In this brief work, Margaret Boyle links the idea of theatrical unruly woman with their real world counterparts. As part of her initial presentation, Boyle argues that “she [the unruly woman] is not merely a stock figure but rather that she dramatizes pressing and controversial issues for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain: the rapidly changing role of women and the increased bureaucratization of the state, which was manifested in the creation of custodial institutions for women” (15). She further refines this idea by focusing on custodial institutions and the theater of repentance that they created. The text is divided into an introduction, a one chapter first section dealing with historical institutions, a second section comprised of three chapters, each examining a *comedia* exemplifying unruly women, a conclusion, epilogue, and two appendices.
The first section of the book deals with historical examples of attempts to reform unruly women, both in the Casa Magdalena and the galera. As she does, Boyle highlights the contradictory nature of custodial institutions as both loci of control and of protection. This is the longest section of the book and delves into the history of the Magdalen House. In it she points out the connection between the funding of La Casa de Santa María Magdalena de la Penitencia and the corrales through their mutual patron Don Francisco de Contreras while likewise linking the theater’s performances to the performances of recogimiento and rehabilitation performed by the Magdalen House. She is at her best during her discussion of the role of female structures of power in the formation of the galera and her discussion of branding as a form of advertising.

The second section considers three theatrical archetypes of unruly women, with one chapter dedicated each to the widow, the vixen, and the mujer varonil. Boyle begins in chapter two with Calderón de la Barca’s Dama duende. In it, Ángela is a young widow who is forced to remain enclosed in her brother’s house due in part to financial constraints. In order to escape her monotonous prison-like space, she disguises herself and ventures into the city, including visits to the theater. Using her wits, and a hidden space within her home, Ángela is able to snare Don Manuel as her new husband. In her discussion, Boyle links Ángela’s enclosure to the Magdalena House and highlights how “Ángela’s
participation in the life of the theatre represents a cathartic escape from her daily existence” (54). During this chapter the author elaborates on her earlier discussion of *recogimiento* as a rehabilitative practice that allows women, in this case Ángela, to re-enter society. At the close of the play this is clearly the case for Ángela as she moves from ghost-like nonentity to wife. Boyle wisely notes that with her new marriage, Ángela loses her power and returns to domestic compliance (59). In this sense, her *recogimiento* is successful even though it costs her some elements of freedom.

Chapter three is focused on María de Zayas’ *La traición en la amistad* as Boyle develops her consideration of the role of the vixen, represented in this play by Fenisa, in female social settings. Boyle asserts that the play represents the “policing function of female friendship” (62). In her analysis she observes how critics generally have either focused on Fenisa as a female Don Juan or on the representation of the female community. In each case, Boyle emphasizes how she is portrayed as a challenge to the existing social order. Boyle then tries to connect the female structures within the play to contemporary events in Spain, linking the Duke of Lerma’s attack on Magdalena de Guzmán to the “perceived threat of female networks” (65). It is in this section that book suffers its greatest faults. It may be due to the brief space given the discussion, but the argument falls apart as Boyle equates structures of social control, e.g. slave owners, and racial stereotyping
with “patriarchal norms” (66) without doing more than note that actresses in the period occasionally owned slaves and acted in theater pieces which mocked other races. The chapter concludes with an interesting discussion on the complexities of communities and the policing of social norms. I would have liked to see this discussion expanded and explained in more depth. Unhappily this chapter feels too short.

The final chapter discusses *La serrana de la Vera* and is focused on the relationship between exemplary violence and the concept of the *mujer varonil*. In it, Boyle points out the nature of Gila as an exemplary object, from the initial parade in her honor to the monstrance-like display of her body at the end of the play. Yet in discussing the masculinitiy of Gila, I’m surprised by the lack of a reference to Catalina de Erauso whose history seems custom made for such a comparison. Boyle’s analysis is valuable as she highlights the penitent elements of Gila’s transformation after she is betrayed by a false suiter, and although she doesn’t state so explicitly, her analysis notes how Gila goes from a virile woman to a dehumanized being as she become a social outcast. There are a number of good observations including a discussion on the univalent nature of the honor code, and how the play’s conclusion echoes an *auto de fe*. Her final sentences: “Gila’s violence – one that is transparent and whose agency she fully claims - leaves its own exemplary mark on the audience of the play. *La serrana de la Vera* de-
mands a revision of traditional norms that punish women for exerting their power and, worse yet, for making a scene” (95) [pun intended?] is a convincing reading of the play.

In her conclusion, Boyle argues that the moral lessons of the plays are rehabilitation through containment, exile, or death “exemplary murder” (97) for La dama duende, La tración en la amistad, and La serrana de la Vera respectively. Yet this progression also follows the severity of the offense; the first play deals with an offence against appearances and the families’ good name, with potential financial considerations. Fenisa’s actions in La tración en la amistad, threaten a serious disruption of society, while in the last play we are presented with a case of mass murder. This is an aspect that I would like to see further developed.

The conclusion ends with a puzzling paragraph. Boyle mentions that there are a number of plays on the topic of rebellious women and their rehabilitation and she highlights the two brief works Las mozas de la Galera and La Baltasara as works which explicitly portray the rehabilitation of women with references to contemporary society. I am unclear why she chose not to include what are seemingly the texts most pertinent to her thesis. The Epilogue is mostly focused on her experiences discussing this theme in her classroom and a brief discussion of current views of women.

Boyle also includes English and Spanish versions of the Reason and Form of the Galera and
Royal House (1608) Appendix 1 A-English B-Spanish and excerpts from the Historical Compendium and Instructive Manifesto on the Origin and foundation of the Royal House of St Mary Magdalene of the Penitence, commonly known as the Recogidas of Madrid by Manuel Recio (1777) Appendix 2 A-English B-Spanish. The notes section is generally useful and helps to reveal Boyles thought process. The Works Cited section is thorough and an index is provided.

On the whole this book is an admirable effort. Boyle is able to link historical accounts to their stage representations and to discuss the characteristics of the stock characters of the widow, vixen and mujer varonil in context of a changing Spanish society. My single complaint is that with a length of scarcely 100 pages without the appendices and notes, the book is too brief. Boyle brings up a number of interesting ideas and observations, only to move on to the next without leaving herself room to elaborate. I would look forward to an expanded version where the reader could see in greater detail Boyle’s full arguments. Despite this, Unruly Women: Performance, Penitence, and Punishment in Early Modern Spain provides the reader with a valuable contribution to the field, which will help to bridge the gap between the stage and the street.
BENITO J. QUINTANA
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

*Female Amerindians in Early Modern Spanish Theater*, edited by Gladys Robalino, is a collection of nine essays addressing an area of inquiry in Spanish Classical theater studies that has been neglected: that of the relevance, representation, and role of the Indigenous women in the *comedias de Indias*. That is, the small corpus of about fourteen plays whose central focus is the encounter, conquest, and colonization of the Americas. While in the last decade or so several serious and extensive studies have been published about these particular *comedias*, most have looked at them from broader perspectives. In Robalino’s edited volume, however, the critics have narrowed their focus on the Amerindian women (whether historical or fictitious) whose roles are of particular relevance to the conquerors and the conquered. Throughout this collec-
tion of essays, nine scholars discuss ten comedias de Indias: Lope de Vega’s El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón and Arauco domado, Fernando de Zárate’s La conquista de México, Tirso de Molina’s Amazonas en las Indias, Calderón de la Barca’s La aurora en Copacabana, Luis Vélez de Guevara’s Las palabras a los reyes y gloria de los Pizarros, Gaspar de Ávila’s El gobernador prudente, Ricardo del Turia’s La belligera española, and Algunas hazañas de las muchas de don García Hurtado de Mendoza, Marqués de Cañete by Luis de Belmonte Bermúdez and nine other playwrights.

By reading the Amerindian women’s body as a metaphor of the conquest, Melissa Figueroa argues how the Spanish comedia’s lack to embrace the exploration, conquest, and colonization of the Americas as a popular topic can be attributed to the resistance of the genre to depart from its almost obsessive attachment to romantic complications. In “Courting the Female Body: Towards a Poetics of the Conquest in Lope de Vega’s El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón,” Figueroa presents to the reader a viable alternative that can help explain why the comediantes paid little attention to the conquest of the Americas, an issue that has often been brought up yet never fully resolved. And while it is true that standard comedia formulas about tensions between lovers as applied to historical dramas, and particularly to those addressing the conquest of the Americas, need to be extended, adapted, and thus gain new meaning as Figueroa proposes, it is
also important to note that historical comedias need not incorporate romantic relationships at all. Nevertheless, as other critics have previously noted, the Amerindian female is often the object of desire that stands for the lands to be conquered and possessed.

Fernando de Zárate’s unfinished comedia, La conquista de México, is a rather critical work that addresses Hernán Cortés and his fellow conquerors’ goals during the conquest of Mexico. The co-authored chapter “The Role of Amerindian Women in Fernando de Zárate’s La Conquista de México” by Ronna S. Feit, and Gladys Robalino, considers the high number of Amerindian women present in the play (in comparison to other comedias de Indias), to argue a reading on the complexities of the Amerindian women-Spanish conqueror relationships as it pertains to the apparent failure of the Christianizing efforts.

Amazonas en las Indias, the second part of Tirso de Molina’s trilogy Trilogía de los Pizarros, is discussed in two separate chapters. Glenda Y. Nieto-Cuevas approaches her analysis of the comedia suggesting that otherness can be identified and marked in Amazonas through two central female characters of the play: Menalipe and Martesia. In her chapter “Amazonas en las Indias or Witches in the Amazon? Representing Otherness through the Stereotype of the Witch,” the scholar considers 16th- and 17th-century treatises discussing the characteristics of witches, and Greek and Roman mythology that describe Amazons and the Devil. She
then suggest that the comedias use an alternative way of marking Otherness that goes beyond the playwright’s own historical time with its corresponding descriptions and characterizations of the witch.

Taking a different approach to consider the criticism within Tirso’s play, Gladys Robalino discusses in “Amazonas en las Indias: Mixed Marriages and the Pizarros’ Political Project,” how Gonzalo Pizarro is characterized as a tragic hero. And more importantly, the mestiza Francisca Pizarro’s role as a representation of the idealized emerging nation. A symbol that contains the political, racial, and religious makeup of Spanish Perú. Robalino thus suggests that within the fiction of the play, Gonzalo’s death and Francisca’s exile to Spain are at the center of Spain’s imperial failure to consolidate their power in Perú.

The criticism toward the American enterprise and the conquerors is addressed by Judith G. Caballero in “The Siren Song and the Enchanted Victim: The Portrayal of the Conquistadors and Tucapela in Palabras a los reyes y gloria de los Pizarros.” Her essay considers the conqueror’s embodiment of the siren as a vehicle through which they lure and attempt to enchant the Amerindian female Tucapela. Departing from previous studies that have proposed an interpretation of Tucapela as a symbolic representation of America and her willingness to be conquered and dominated, Caballero proposes instead that it is the conqueror Francisco
Pizarro, through a characteristic siren-like song, who attempts to lure Tucapela. Such reading, then questions Pizarro’s humanity, a form of criticism toward the conqueror and the American enterprise. Simultaneously, the Amerindian female is elevated and given a remarkable level of complexity.

Perhaps the richest and most complex of the conquest plays, and the one that culminates the 17th-century’s body of comedias de Indias, is Calderón de la Barca’s La aurora en Copacabana. In “La aurora en Copacabana: Guacolda from Vestal Virgin to Virginal Model,” Maria J. Ferrer-Lightner discusses the Amerindian female Guacolda’s role and character development in upholding the social, religious, and linguistic imperialistic agenda of Counter Reformation Spain. After laying out a thorough background on the Marian tradition in the first half of her chapter, Ferrer-Lightner then considers and argues how the role and transformation of Guacolda from pagan priestess to redeemed Christian serves to uphold Calderón’s projected purpose. The play, then, sustains the relevance of Christian values and the role that the divine power played in the conquest. Simultaneously, any sign of rebellion or criticism that might had surfaced in the early stages of the comedia are silenced. Thus Guacolda, and the Amerindian women (and men) are relegated to subservient roles under the paternalistic care of the conquerors.

Guacolda, a Mapuche (Araucanian) female that Alonso de Ercilla creates for his epic poem La
Araucana, is, naturally, present in all six comedias de Indias that address the wars of conquest of Chile. Her presence and characterization as fictionalized by Ercilla, however, is only seen in three of those comedias: Ricardo del Turia’s La bellígera española, Gaspar de Ávila’s El gobernador prudente, and the collaborative work Algunas hazañas. Esther Fernández’s discussion of Guacolda in “Envisioning Guacolda, from Lyrical Creation to Ideological Manipulation,” takes into account Ercilla’s imagined Guacolda and the ideological manipulation she undergoes from poet to playhouse. The scholar suggests various reasons that might have lead them to include her in their works, and throughout her analysis, Fernández elucidates ways in which Guacolda is manipulated to fit each playwright’s perceived agendas. At the same time, she posits that the playwrights leaned heavily on representations that placed Guacolda in closer proximity to the conqueror’s (and the genre’s) characterization of the exotic dama of the comedia.

A closer examination into how the playwrights manipulate Guacolda to fit their ideological agenda is discussed at length by Erin Alice Cowling in “La María sin Don: Subtle Mockery of the Establishment in El gobernador prudente.” In her analysis, Cowling argues how Gaspar de Ávila’s Guacolda is used to criticize Spanish society and the conquerors—specifically García Hurtado de Mendoza, whose family commissioned the play—, while also underscoring the relevance of the Amerindian’s
conversion to Christianity through the influence exerted by Guacolda’s own conversion and acceptance of the new faith. In the end, Cowling argues, Guacolda’s behavior stands in sharp contrast with that of the conquerors whose outward manifestations of their faith ultimately are contradicted by their actions and lust for material wealth and sexual favors from the Amerindian females.

In addition to Guacolda’s presence across all six of the Chilean conquest comedias, Caupolicán’s wife, Fresia, is also featured in several of them. Her evolution and characterization, however, has been largely ignored. María Quiroz Taub’s “Love and Fury: The Evolution of Fresia in Arauco domado of Lope de Vega,” presents an innovative approach that considers the character’s origins, her development, her prominent role in the wars against the conquerors and the subsequent infanticide of her own child, and her relationship to the Classic Medea. As is the case in all of the comedias de Indias, Lope’s work also presents a certain level of criticism of the conquest and the conquerors, albeit significantly more subtly that some of the other extant American plays. Nevertheless, the characterization of Fresia reinforces the perception of the uncontrollable and fierce nature of the Araucanians and their tireless resistance against the Spaniards, while simultaneously criticizing the conqueror’s announced Christianity, and the real motivations of the American enterprise.
Overall Female Amerindians in Early Modern Spanish Theater is a valuable collection of essays that will certainly prove useful to scholars of comedia studies. In particular it will be of interest to those that would like to broaden their knowledge on the subject of the encounter, conquest, and colonization of the Americas as represented in Spanish classical theater. And although there seems to be some imbalances in the length and depth in which some of the chapters treat their subject matter, none of them have gaps that could leave the reader wanting. Furthermore, given the small corpus of plays being treated, and the tightly knit interrelationship between many of them (out of the fourteen extant comedias de Indias, six address the conquest of Chile, for example), the reader might perceive that at times similar readings seem to recur across the volume. Lastly, while it is clear that the publisher requested that all quotes be translated into English (which in itself is reasonable to make the book reach a wider non-Spanish speaking audience), the translation of all the titles of the plays, articles, and books comes across as cumbersome and unnecessary. Additionally, in some isolated instances, there seems to be some inconsistencies on what is or is not translated. Thus, for example, the reader will find that some brief passages remain in Spanish, while others are presented in English without their accompanying original Spanish text. Nevertheless, all original quotes in Spanish always appear in the footnotes. In sum, this is a book that will be valua-
ble in the *comedia* scholars’ personal library and the individual chapters will certainly prove to be a great contribution to scholars wishing to explore in greater depth the various perspectives of the Amerindian women in the *comedias de Indias*. 
As its subtitle indicates, the purpose of this important volume is to provide an overview of trends in recent stagings of Spanish classical plays. Among the questions it asks are the following. Which plays were produced and by which companies? How were those productions received by the public to which they were addressed? What were the distinguishing features of the productions and what seem to have been the aims of the staging? Who were the people most instrumentally involved? What were the challenges faced in the productions? How successfully were those challenges met? And so on. The questions are taken up in a series of nine essays, each of them written by a different scholar. Five of those essays are devoted to a particular play and various stagings of that play, the majority of them mounted in Spain. Three of them focus on a specific theatre...
company and the works it has performed in the last several years. And one of them consists of a survey of productions in English translation in Great Britain. Without exception, the essays are well-informed, well-written, and filled with perceptive and thought-provoking observations.

Following each of the essays there is a substantial interview, presumably conducted by the author of the essay, with a theatre practitioner who had a significant role to play in the staging of the works being discussed. The distinguished figures who offer their observations and opinions are: Juan Mayorga, Ricardo Iniesta, Eduardo Vasco, Jesús Peña, Lucía Miranda, Eduardo Galán, Patxi Freytez, Carles Alfaro, Ana Zamora, and Laurence Boswell. The volume also includes as a kind of appendix some forty brief interviews with a number of other individuals who have, or have had, a significant connection to the staging of Spanish classical theatre. They include not just directors, but actors, set, costume, and lighting designers, translators, critics, and academics. The line-up is truly impressive.

Although each of the essays and interviews in the volume is different from the others in its focus and emphases, it is possible to distinguish a number of themes the run throughout. One of these is the continuing relevance of classical theatre, even in—or perhaps one should say particularly in—the twenty-first century. Another is the urgency of expanding the canon beyond the small number of plays already known and performed. Still another is
the necessity of adapting a production so as to connect with the audience for which it is intended. Yet another has to do with the widely accepted belief that the great works of classical theatre, like all significant works of art, can be interpreted in a multitude of entirely valid ways. A final theme, mentioned in several of the contributions, is that in recent stagings there has been decreasing emphasis on elaborate sets and increasing emphasis on costumes and on the actors themselves, their voices and their bodies. This shift in focus has led, in turn, to significant attention being devoted to on how lines are spoken in performance, most directors opting for a balance between naturalness on the one hand and the underlining of poetic qualities on the other.

The authors of the essays that deal with one particular play are Sergio Adillo Rufo, María Bastianes, Esther Fernández, Noelia Iglesias Iglesias, and Francisco Sáez Raposo. Adillo Rufo begins his piece with a useful critical examination of the related terms adaptación, versión, dramaturgia, revisión de texto, refundición, and reescritura, after which he proceeds to apply the definitions to three contemporary stagings of La vida es sueño, all of them mounted by the Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico. The first of these productions was directed by Ariel García Valdés, the second by Calisto Bieito, and the third by Helena Pimenta.

María Bastianes’s essay is a fascinating examination of the stagings of La Celestina that have taken place in Spain. The history is surprisingly
long, beginning in 1909 and extending to the present day, and shows an evolution from more idealized, “romantic” interpretations in earlier times to those of the present day, which have been far grittier. Her study devotes particular attention to the production presented by the Atalaya company under the direction of Ricardo Iniesta, one that was notable for rejecting the supposed didactic qualities of the text, frequently underlined in previous stagings, and for emphasizing instead movement, violence, and the ritualistic aspects of theatre.

In her probing contribution Esther Fernández focuses on two recent adaptations of Fuente Ovejuna, both of them engendered by the wave of femicides that has taken place in recent years in northern Mexico, and both of them set in Ciudad Juárez. The two works overlap in their ferocious denunciation of violence toward women, but their theatrical modes are quite different. The first play, titled De Fuente Ovejuna a Ciudad Juárez (New York, 2010), was directed by Lucía Miranda and presented in the manner of Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed. The second, titled Laurencia (Kerala, 2010) was directed by Eugenia Cano Puga and performed in the style of Indian Kathakali.

Noelia Iglesias Iglesias’s essay is a stimulating study of the theatrical fortunes of Calderón’s El galán fantasma. A popular work in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the play largely disappeared from the boards until a production under the direction of José Luis Alonso Mañes was presented
at the Teatro Español in 1981. It used a radically adapted text and was staged with wit and energy, and it proved to be hugely successful. In subsequent years a number of other productions were mounted, many of them influenced by that of Alonso Mañes. The most notable of these was a staging of 2010 that was directed by Mariano de Paco and produced by Eduardo Galán and Daniel Pérez.

In his thoughtful article, Francisco Sáez Raposo centers his attention on the theatre of Moreto. He first considers the disjunction between critical opinion regarding individual plays, which has on occasion been highly unfavorable, and the audience reception of those plays when presented on the stage. He then argues that the negative view of the playwright has been largely due to his use of *ars combinatoria*, a technique sometimes regarded as mere plagiarism. When produced, however, the plays reveal themselves to be well-constructed, fluently written, and highly theatrical, whatever their borrowings from earlier works. He concludes his discussion with consideration of modern stagings of *El lindo Don Diego*, in particular that of Carles Alfarò for the Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico.

The three essays that center, not on a specific play but rather on the work of a particular company, were written by Purificació Mascarell, Gema Cienfuegos Antelo, and Julio Vélez Sainz. Mascarell’s interesting piece examines the work of the Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico during the period 2004-11, and focuses in particular on the
productions staged during those years by its director, Eduardo Vasco. She argues that those stagings were marked by a particularly “elegant” style. Characteristics of that style were a minimum of sets, beautiful, detailed costumes, the use of live music, and a special emphasis on clarity and naturalness in the speaking of the verse.

In her insightful article Gema Cienfuegos Antelo spotlights the Teatro Corsario of Valladolid, analyzing the various Calderonian productions of Fernando Urdiales, one of its founders and its director until his death in 2010. As she makes clear, those stagings were forward-looking in some respects and backward-looking in others. Under the influence of such figures as Artaud, Cocteau, and Brecht, Urdiales sought to create modern-seeming productions that would move, illuminate and shock, but at the same he rejected the contemporary notion that verse should be spoken as naturally as possible, emphasizing instead the poetic, “artificial” quality of the lines.

Unlike the other essays in the collection, with the exception of the one focused on La Celestina, Julio Vélez Sainz’s piece deals not with the Baroque, but rather with the theatre of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance. That theatre, until recently sorely neglected by companies in Spain and elsewhere, has in the last few years drawn increasing attention. In his informative study Vélez Sainz concentrates in particular on productions of the works of Lucas Fernández and Gil Vicente, high-
lighting the pioneering work of Ana Zamora and the group Nao d’amores. Their stagings, known for their skillful blending of spoken text, visual images, music, and movement, have been among the most successful in Spain in the last decade.

The volume concludes with Jonathan Thacker’s chapter on recent British productions of Golden Age theatre. His authoritative overview centers on two different productions of Lope’s Peribáñez, as well as on stagings of Calderón’s No hay burlas con el amor and Tirso’s El condenado por desconfiado. Thacker discusses both the disadvantages and the advantages of presenting Spanish works in translation, and he points to the varying reception that Golden Age plays have had in London and elsewhere. Central to his survey is an incisive analysis of the work of the director and translator Laurence Boswell, who, more than any other, has been instrumental in stimulating interest in Spanish classical theatre in Great Britain.

Given its interest and timeliness, one might wish that the purview of Diálogos en las tablas had been somewhat wider, taking into account stagings of classical plays not just in Spain and Great Britain but in Latin America and elsewhere as well. Nevertheless, this pioneering and carefully-edited volume constitutes a notable contribution to contemporary Hispanic performance studies. It deserves to be warmly welcomed and widely read.
Taking into account the ephemeral nature of performance, this book develops innovative approaches to the reconstruction of historical staging practices through the lens of Spanish classical theater. Vidler emphasizes the need to take into account not only structures of culture, but also the human capacity to manipulate those structures for both individual and group expression. Through a detailed analysis of approaches to space, the body, the stage object, and the spectator in the comedia, it is possible to discern analyzable artifacts that permit us to reconstruct significant aspects of early modern stagings. Furthermore, because it actively engages and intertwines both objective and subjective modes of interpretation, Vidler argues that performance theory itself will be the locus of the next breakthroughs in interpretive studies.

Laura Vidler is Professor of Spanish and Chair of Modern Languages and Linguistics at the University of South Dakota, USA. She has published numerous studies on performance theory and early modern Spanish staging practices. She serves on the Board of the Association for Hispanic Classical Theater and was previously Program Director of Spanish at the United States Military Academy.
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This volume brings together twenty-six essays from the world’s leading scholars and practitioners of Spanish Golden Age theatre. Examining the startlingly wide variety of ways that Spanish comedias have been adapted, re-envisioned, and reinvented, the book makes the case that adaptation is a crucial lens for understanding the performance history of the genre. The essays cover a wide range of topics, from the early stage history of the comedia through numerous modern and contemporary case studies, as well as the transformation of the comedia into other dramatic genres, such as films, musicals, puppetry, and opera. The essays themselves are brief and accessible to non-specialists. This book will appeal not only to Golden Age scholars and students but also to theater practitioners, as well as to anyone interested in the theory and practice of adaptation.

HARLEY ERDMAN is Professor of Theater at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. SUSAN PAUN DE GARCÍA is Professor of Spanish at Denison University.
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'Aquel Breve Sueño.' Dreams on the Early Modern Spanish Stage is a collection of ten essays by distinguished scholars from Spain, France, and the United States. Originally an idea by Ricardo Sáez of the Université de Rennes, France, this volume includes a variety of approaches on the significance of dreams as dramatic discourse. In Part I, “Oneiric Discourse on the Early Modern Spanish Stage,” contributors are Belén Atienza, Ezra Engling, Ellen Frye, Rogelio Miñana, Charo Moreno, and Sharon Voros. Topics included are the prophetic dream in Lope de Vega and Guillén de Castro, dreams as motif and dramatic device in Pedro Calderón de la Barca, the metatheatrical function of dream sequences, the dream as dramatic character in Calderón’s *auto*, *Sueños hay que verdad son*, and the performance dream in Leonor de la Cueva y Silva’s *La firmeza en la ausencia*. “Aquel breve sueño” is a line from Garcilaso’s second Elegy.

Contributing to Part II, dedicated exclusively to Calderón’s *La vida es sueño*, are Nelson López, Christian Andrés, Ricardo Sáez, and Christine Aguilar-Adan. Topics include staging and directing *La vida es sueño*, a comparative study on Pierre Boasituau’s *Theatrum Mundi* and Calderón’s *La vida es sueño* and *El gran teatro del mundo*, poetic structure and style in the redondillas of *La vida es sueño*, and *La vida es sueño* and the political institution of the prince.
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