PLAYING THE COURT: COURT THEATER DURING THE REIGN OF CARLOS II OF SPAIN (1661-1700)

by

CAITLIN O'REILLY BRADY

B.A., University of Oregon, 2009

M.A., University of Arizona, 2012

M.A., University of Granada, 2017

A thesis submitted to the

Faculty of the Graduate School of the

University of Colorado in partial fulfillment

of the requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

2017

This thesis entitled:
Playing the Court: Court Theater During the Reign of Carlos II of Spain (1661-1700)
written by Caitlin O'Reilly Brady
has been approved for the Department of English

_____
Núria Silleras-Fernández

_____
John Slater

_____
Andrés Prieto

_____
Juan Herrero-Senés

_____
David Glimp

Date_____

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

ABSTRACT

Brady, Caitlin O'Reilly (Ph.D., Peninsular and Latin American Literatures, Department of Spanish and Portuguese)

Playing the Court: Court Theater During the Reign of Carlos II of Spain (1661-1700)

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Núria Silleras-Fernández

This project analyzes a long-neglected dimension of Early Modern Peninsular Studies: court theater. My thesis explores theoretical, political, and scenographic frameworks of court drama written for and produced in the court of Carlos II of Spain. I explore the notions of imagined communities and agency in order to understand how the theater functioned within the Habsburg court, and I juxtapose the role of the king as a spectator to that of the individual consumer of the public theater to confirm it is possible not to identify as part of the mass public during theater consumption. From there, my archival research exposes the political conflicts during the 1670s between Queen Regent Mariana of Austria and her illegitimate step-son, Don Juan José, as their opposing factions vied to dominate the terrain of courtly politics in Madrid. My research investigates how these tensions were reflected in the 1670s works: *La estatua de Prometeo* and *Fieras afemina amor* by Pedro Calderón de la Barca. This then led me to consider the political anxieties around the topic of succession in the 1690s as well. I illustrate that Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo's political trilogy offered viable options for an heir through his presentation of what I term the nephew-king paradigm. My research illustrates how politics and royal theater production in the 1670s and 1690s were linked due to theater's status as a facet of the royal Baroque identity. My project concludes by establishing court drama as its

own genre through an investigation of court performance, the scenographic advancement, and the musical evolution in Baroque Spanish court drama—a highly original artistic genre in seventeenth-century Spain. I establish staged performance as malleable and trans-dynastic as it outlasts the performance of the monarchs for which the work was staged. Ultimately, this project proves that theater is a part of royal Baroque Spanish identity.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Jean and Al, who always knew the greatest gift they could give their children was roots and wings.
Thank you for both.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a thank you to several parties for their impact on this project. First and foremost, this dissertation would not have come to fruition without the support and guidance of Dr. Núria Silleras-Fernández. Her dedication to her own craft is an inspiration, and her commitment to her students, and to our projects, is unparalleled. To her, I am indebted. In a similar vein, some of this project's most magical pieces came about after Dr. John Slater proposed questions of which I had never dreamed. His critical eye is a blessing to any student's work. I thank you both.

Additionally, the archival research that supports this dissertation was made possible by two grants. A Department Research Grant from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese funded my summer research in 2015. Subsequently, the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sport in Spain awarded me the Hispanex Grant to fund my summer work in 2016. Their funding made possible powerful discoveries that contributed to this project, and will shape my early publications.

To my friends and colleagues that influenced this project, thank you. A particular thank you to Dr. Harrison Meadows. I bent your ear more than once and found inspiration in your musings. If not for the chance to explore the Golden Age with you over coffee and at conferences, this project would have been much different. Finally, to my fiancé—Daniel—and my family, I owe you the greatest debt of gratitude. Your support gave me energy when I thought I had none.

CONTENTS

FIGURES

Figure

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Figure 1. *Mariana de Austria entrega la corona a Carlos Segundo* by Pedro Villafranca Malagón, 1672.

"Behold the King with the crown with which his mother has crowned him" (Fig. 1). Although the Latin at the bottom of the above engraving seems to refer to a monarchical future with the coronation of a new king, Royal Engraver Pedro Villafranca Malagón captures the fears, dynamics, and people directly linked to the Habsburg Monarchy in the imagery of this 1672 engraving titled: *Mariana de Austria entrega la corona a Carlos Segundo*. Depicted here are Mariana of Austria (1634-1696), second wife and niece of Felipe IV (1605-1665), and her

youngest child, Carlos II of Spain (1661-1700). At the moment in which Villafranca engraved this image, Mariana was Queen Regent for Carlos, Felipe IV had died in 1665, Carlos' brother—Felipe Prospero—had died as a toddler in 1661, and Margarita Teresa was Carlos' only surviving full-sibling, and ten years older than her brother.[1] With much of the immediate royal family therefore deceased, this engraving depicts the monarchs responsible for the future of the Habsburg Monarchy. The Latin phrase, therefore, expresses not a call to interpret the artwork as a reference to a coronation, but rather expressed a fearful hope for the future felt throughout the court. Carlos, a sickly king was not to take the throne until 1675—the year in which Mariana's regency was to end. In 1672 this phrase evoked the desire that this young king would be able to wear the crown his mother symbolically holds out to him here, and the fear that he may not ever be ready or capable of doing so.

The body language of Mariana also suggests that she embodied these same concerns. While the black curve of her habit gives the illusion of her leaning toward her son, if you allow your eye to trace her arm from her shoulder to her elbow, you will see she is leaning fairly far back in her chair and it is only the illusion created by the lines of her habit that suggest she might be leaning forward, offering the crown to her son. Likewise, she does not seem to be extending the crown to Carlos or displaying it emblematically for him as a referent for his future. Rather, it looks as though she is waiting for him to reach for something that lies just beyond his grasp. I attribute this to yet another optical illusion. Although the base of the crown seems to be level with the top of Carlos' head, if you look at the rest of Carlos' body you will note how small he

---

[1] Margarita Teresa died, however, the following year in 1673.

[2] Although the play was set to celebrate Mariana's birthday, she had it postponed until January to celebrate the birthday of her granddaughter.

[3] See David Wacks' "Cultural Exchange in the Literatures and Languages of Medieval Iberia" in

is. Likewise, his chair is much smaller than Mariana's, and her presence seems to dwarf Carlos'. Although he was a child of about ten years, and he was suffering from multiple physical impairments, it looks as though, if he were to outstretch his left arm, he would not be able to take the crown, but perhaps just barely reach its base.

Most importantly is the gaze of these two figures. Carlos II does not look to the crown—real or symbolic—that his mother is holding out for him. He instead looks toward the observer—a gaze outside of and beyond himself. Carlos would need governmental support from advisors and councils if he were to rule effectively. This was something I believe Carlos was aware of, as he called his half-brother, Don Juan José de Austria, to court in 1675 for his aide. Mariana cast Don Juan aside as he was an illegitimate son—a product of an illicit relationship Felipe IV had had. On the other hand, Mariana is looking toward the crown. She is not concerned with the observer, nor does she look toward her son, the future of her bloodline and the Spanish Crown. She seems to be contemplating whether the future of the Habsburgs would be protected in the care of her son.

Villafranca was not the only court artist to depict Mariana and Carlos in this fashion. Paintings and engravings of this duo were not uncommon, but Villafranca and Royal Painter Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo seem to expresses paralleled notions in their similar works. Depicted on the following page in Herrera's the painting titled, *Carlos II y Mariana de Austria*, Carlos is reaching for the crown and scepter, although, he is not leaning as far forward as it would appear (Fig. 2). His chair, rather, is placed in front of Mariana's. While he could be standing in an effort to move toward the crown—indicated by the position of his leg made visible by his white stocking—he could just as easily be sitting. If you look at the proximity of his back

in relation to the back of the chair, you will notice his body's proximity to the back of the chair. If he is standing, the depth of his chair is rather shallow. Additionally, Carlos is reaching out for

Figure 2. *Carlos II y Mariana de Austria* by Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo c. 1671.

the crown and is doing so in quite a childlike way. He gingerly splays his fingers as if he is going to touch the crown with this index finger as a child might in a forbidden attempt to touch his grandmother's china. As to his gaze, it seems to be beyond the observer, while his mother looks directly at us. She places a hand on his arm, holding him back, as if to say "not yet", and all-too knowingly looks at the observer as if to relay the same message. His chair is more comparable to this size of his mother's, and he is not dwarfed by Mariana's presence. Yet, she is positioned between Carlos and the observer as if to protect her son, and by extension the future of her monarchy.

These images present the fears about Carlos and his ability to rule that preoccupied the court and Mariana during Carlos' life and reign. The work I do in this dissertation will discuss the ways in which court theater dialogues with those political fears and the actions Mariana took to lengthen her regency and protect the purity and legitimacy of the Habsburg monarch. This artwork also displays the two patrons and royal monarchs that are the central patrons and audience members of court drama. Most of the works I discuss in this project are dedicated to Mariana, celebrated her birthday, or celebrated Carlos' name day. Court drama was not limited to these celebrations, as I will explain later. However, as Mariana's presence is more notable in the first engraving, so will be her patronage during Carlos' reign. The works referenced in this project were gifts for and celebrations of the court from 1672-1694 and dialogued with the emotions and fears apparent in the artwork explored above.

Court Drama and its Roots

Still waiting to fully emerge from the shadows of academic discussion on Early Modern Theater lays court drama. Although trends and topics of the *comedia de corrales* in seventeenth-century Spain have been thoroughly studied, and many academics have ventured into the waters

of Spanish courtly theater studies, much remains uncharted. N.D. Shergold, Margaret Greer, John Varey, Melvina McKendrick, and others of the like have provided academia with volumes of estudios y documentos, and histories of Early Modern Peninsular Theater. Some volumes explore music, politics, and other trends of the century, but few have dug into the details of court plays to the extent that Greer has in her work, *The Play of Power: Mythological Court Dramas of Calderón de la Barca*. Similar trends in the discussion of theater spaces and playhouses exist. We see the detailed work of John J. Allen in *The Reconstruction of a Spanish Golden Age Playhouse: El Corral del Príncipe, 1583-1744*. However, since Spain has not received the research and attention that England has on Early Modern Theater, the court too has been neglected. These fields have not received profound investigation into its theatrical practices, particularly after 1680, arguably due to the death of Calderón in 1681.

Therefore, this project will define court drama as its own genre. My work is centered on the reign of Carlos II due to: the theoretical work that continued to be produced arguing for and against court theater and its possible uses; Carlos II's unique nature as a sickly king and the tensions that resulted as Mariana (his mother and Queen Regent) and Don Juan Jose of Austria (his step-brother) vied for political control of the court in Madrid; and, the heightened scenographic production, theatrical technological advances, and the growing role for music in drama that resulted in the creation of the Spanish *zarzuela*, all of which boomed in the late seventeenth century. The end result will be an expansion of the breadth of knowledge we possess on Early Modern court drama, as theater is a fundamental part of not only the Spanish Baroque identity, but also the *royal* Spanish Baroque identity.

The reign of Carlos II was unique for a variety of reasons. With Mariana of Austria acting as Queen Regent for Carlos II, the strong tradition of theatrical representation within the

court under Philip IV continues throughout Carlos' reign. Mariana's role was pivotal not only to the survival, but also to the flourishing of court theater in the late seventeenth century. It is Mariana for whom many of the performances were celebrated, and quite often for her birthday on December 22. In fact, Mariana's birthday celebrations were responsible for reinstating court theater six years after Philip IV's death.[2]

Additionally, due to Carlos' incompetence as a ruler, a large question within the court was whether the theater could be used to educate the young king, and if it was appropriate to do so. The moralists Ignacio de Camargo, Juan de Zabaleta, y Fray Manuel de Guerra y Ribera were strongly against theater as entertainment, seeing it as a pastime that did more harm than good. Many others, including personal advisors and the court's official playwright as of 1686, Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo, felt that theater in moderation was a perfectly acceptable pastime for the young king. These proponents took the opportunity not only to educate Carlos II, but also to bring to the court's attention to pressing political issues, as Bances Candamo did in addressing the concern for succession.

Before considering the court theater of the late seventeenth century, it is necessary to trace the origins of court performance through the Early Modern years predating Carlos II. Widely established is the fact that Carlos V and Philip II were not large proponents of drama, and harbored a personal distaste for the form. However, this does not mean that court drama, and the elements contained within it as part of the spectacle, do not have their roots firmly established in performance elements of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Song, dance, poetry, and court pageantry were well established in the court and are part of the history that

[2] Although the play was set to celebrate Mariana's birthday, she had it postponed until January to celebrate the birthday of her granddaughter.

precedes the development of court drama. For now, it is important to trace the tradition and history of court performances through the Early Modern Era.

Performativity in the court is rather timeless and is documented as far back as the tenth century. The poetry recited for the court in the Southern Iberian Peninsula, for example, was an "innovation" on songs that were frequently recited and sung (Wacks).[3] These poems were sung, according to David Wacks, in a "singsong" fashion from which, "people repeated and recited the most memorable lines in daily discussion and in public and private gatherings. More than just a rarefied art form that one studied in school or that a select group of elite read quietly to themselves, poetry was more like a high-profile medium that traveled from mouth to mouth" (12). This trend persisted and evolved throughout the Iberian Peninsula. By the late fifteenth century, there is documentation of writers such as Gil Vicente writing and presenting short written pieces in a fashion that would resemble the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century *particulares*, which were the simplified dramas presented in private royal quarters. Gil Vicente was a blacksmith drawn to the court in Evora due to the celebrations for the matrimony of the Crown Prince and Isabel, daughter of the Catholic Monarchs (Bell 11). Bell explains that once there, his work as a blacksmith attracted the attention of King João II and he began working for the Portuguese court in 1490. Upon the death of King João II in 1495, Vicente continued his work for the court, which was subsequently ruled by King Manuel I of Portugal. Inspired to write for the court, Vicente saw his opportunity to present one of his works to Queen María in 1502. The night after the birth of Prince João III of Portugal, Vicente entered the queen's quarters, dressed as a shepherd. He recited his 114-verse monologue for the king, queen, Doña Beatriz

[3] See David Wacks' "Cultural Exchange in the Literatures and Languages of Medieval Iberia" in which he discusses a variety of examples of Medieval Poetry including that of the court.

(the mother of the king), and Leonor—the previous queen, and sister, of King Manuel I (Bell). This gutsy move won Vicente the attention of Leonor who asked Vicente to recite his monologue, now known as *O monólogo do vaqueiro*, during the Christmas festivities. He accepted the invitation, but chose to write a new work for the occasion, *Auto pastoril castelhano* (Bell 13-14).

This courageous move by Vicente is the first documented instance of what would later become known as *particulares*, or private performances usually presented in royal quarters that became common in the mid-sixteenth century, and persisted throughout the seventeen century. In addition to the *particulares* and the plays represented in the court, performances for the royal court included such forms of pageantry as royal festivities and processionals, tournaments, banquets, court masques, and the dramatic pieces and dances that accompanied court plays, which were the *loas*, *bailes*, *jácaras*, *entremeses*, *mojigangas*, and *fines de fiesta*. This project will explore, particularly in chapter four, the diverse spaces and productions that took place in the court. Courtiers did not continue to perform in the spectacle productions as they had frequently during the sixteenth century, and the spaces in which these productions took place began to vary drastically, especially after the completion of the remodeling of the Salón Dorado in 1640 and the completed construction of the Coliseo del Buen Retiro in the same year.

Continuing with court performance trends and history, tournaments and jousts retained their dramatic setting throughout the sixteenth century, with even one such tournament being held in mythological terms, as Shergold cites.[4] Although the ladies of the court frequently

[4] N.D. Shergold. *A History of the Spanish Stage.* "In 1544, also at Valladolid, a tournament was cast in mythological terms, with reference in the proclamation to Jupiter, and to goddesses." (238)

performed court drama, mock jousts and battles were also commonplace. These events called for male performances as warriors and knights, and nobles took part in, and often led these mock scenarios. Events such as these were quite common, but lost their prominence in the seventeen century as the court plays began to grow as a favored pastime. Masques with influence from Flanders and England enjoyed a revival in the early seventeenth century under Philip III.[5] Yet, unlike English masques in which courtiers rarely spoke or sang, in the Spanish court the ladies of the court frequently performed songs, dances, or recited written works. While the recitation of written work, as we have seen, was not a new performance trend in the court, the beginning of theatrical elements began to come together in the court masques of Spain. While these events were held much in the style of English court masques, "Spain produced no Ben Jonson to exploit the literary possibilities of the masque, and so it did not develop as fully as it did in England" (Shergold 250). However, the court masque of the Spanish court primed the staged for the comedias and other court dramas that the courts of the mid- and late seventeenth century would enjoy. As early as 1616, Lope will mention that plays have been written for the court, however little other information from the moment exists (Shergold).

As the seventeenth century developed the rules for content and censorship, public plays found their structure and were regulated at three levels. By 1615, new works were subjected to the redactions, edits and alterations of a censor and a fiscal. According to McKendrick, if a play passed, it was then licensed by the Council of Castile. At any stage of the process, the Inquisition could seize, suspend, and/or edit the work. Upon being staged, plays were subject to the whimsy of the director of the acting company performing the work. Sometimes these changes included adding parts that had been previously cut during the censorship process. However, the director

[5] I will explore the similarities between English and Spanish theater in chapter four.

could make his own edits as well. The original author had almost no say in the manipulation of the work for its staging in the *corrales*. Works performed for the court in the early seventeenth century were initially chosen most frequently from the acting company's repertoire of plays, and already had been subjected to this level of censorship in the public sphere. As popularity of theater in the court grew throughout the reign of Philip IV—who greatly enjoyed the court performances—court playwrights were appointed. This is not to say relationships between playwrights and nobles had not been fostered before the reign of Philip IV, and in fact such relationships had been imperative to the success and notoriety of the playwright. Most notably, Lope cultivated a close relationship with the Duke of Lerma. These relationships were frequently created in an effort to raise the perception of the playwright's social standing through their association with members of nobility.[6]

Despite the fierce editing process, Shergold and Varey note in the introduction to *Representaciones palaciegas: 1603-1699 Estudio y Documentos* that the Court of Philip IV saw two to three plays per week between 1622 and 1623, which were a combination of new productions as well as re-stagings that took place on Sundays, Thursdays, and festival days. This trend continued throughout the last decade of the seventeenth century, before artistic production underwent a sharp decline under the new Bourbon rule of the eighteenth century. It is works like these studies by Shergold and Varey that have blazed the trail in theater studies of the court and have begun to supply us with imperative and insightful information on the inner workings of the performances and their trends in the seventeenth century.

---

[6] For a detailed description of Lope's work with the court and the attempt to better one's social standing through patronage see: *Pilgrimage to Patronage: Lope de Vega and the Court of Philip III, 1598-1621* by Elizabeth R. Wright.

Performance: The Writerly Text

There has been a trend to ignore the performative nature of these productions – a flaw we see in critical theory such as José Antonio Maravall's. These works were not meant to be read; they were meant to be performed and, as such, there is a demand to consider the performative nature of these works as they are analyzed. It is a mistake to analyze these performances only as texts, even though this is the medium that remains. In investigating the scenography of these works, I am concerned with the *writerly texts*. While the *readerly text* has come to define products, not productions, the *writerly text* makes a reader a producer of the text (Barthes 4-5). Therefore, under a subjective paradigm, we all may be the producers of the text. Here I am intrigued by the plurality of artists' creations that court productions reveled in. Although literary scholars tend to focus on the text at hand, and be manuscript oriented (Varey, "The Audience" 399), performance studies *and* performance art exist in domains apart from the textual (Sayre). I am not suggesting we ignore manuscripts, but rather that we also include these other domains. Sayre suggests that as performance art grew beyond the classical staged performance, "walls, galleries, public spaces soon began to function as pages for a form of 'writing' that included not only the transcription of language but also the physical gestures of voice and body in space" (Sayre 94). This is certainly true, and these "gestures of voice and body" already existed on the stage in these ways—ways that it had not in isolated art forms, such as sculpture or painting. The royal court was a unique and privileged space where various art forms coexisted alongside and within staged performance, as testified to in the detailed stage direction. Therefore, plays have a distinct transformative potential due to the plurality of artistic domains that converge in a given

representation.[7] By linking transformative potential (Sayre) to specificity (Limon) I will conclude in chapter four that the less specificity a work has, the more easily and readily one can adapt and reinterpret the work. Low specificity is not a requirement in order for a play to be adapted, but it does increase its transformative potential.

While Sayre focused on performance in its entirety, Limon researched post-dramatic theater and the court masque as its earliest predecessor. Although post-dramatic theater was characterized as part of performance theory from the 1960s onward, Limon notes that the propensity to discuss the non-verbal elements of theater aligns itself with the court theater's inclination for scenographic artistry of its productions, or what Limon calls *scenic synesthesia*. After all, "it is not true that the whole past of European theater has been dominated by the word" (Limon 261). Rather, post-dramatic theater focuses on the relation between the text and the audience and the kind of effect the production can have on an audience (Limon) and is thereby in alignment with a subjective, *writerly* approach. Limon argues that court theater's primary characteristic was its deviation from, and I would argue advancement of, what dominated the public theater. It is not focused solely on the written word, instead favoring "the image, stage design, costume, music, special effects, dance, and light" (Limon 263). The theater is therefore a scenic event (267), and Limon thereby proves that court theater has therefore always been "post-dramatic" (263). Therefore, scenography merits evaluation as one departs from the *readerly text*.

Although the text is the literary artifact that has survived to show us a brief glimpse of Early Modern culture, it is these works as performance(s) that most concerns me, and as

---

[7] Sayre too highlights the importance of any given performance's transformative nature and potential. Sayre, Henry. "Performance." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 2nd ed., University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1995.

performances they are therefore historical, as can be seen from these descriptions of Early Modern court trends in pageantry and performance. As Poirier described it, "performance is above all historical – that is, inevitably caught up in the social and political exigencies of the moment" (qtd. in Sayre 98). Much of what we see in the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century trends in court festivities and pageantries follow social and political demands, as it is nearly impossible to escape a cultural and social context. Therefore, by the late seventeenth century, the court theater was not only following social and political demands in the formality of staging the representation, but also called attention to these needs, demands, and preoccupations in the material performed as part of the body of works.

Additionally, I consider to what extent the courtly representations are "deeply historical" (83). Taylor explains:

> The past might be conceived not only as a timeline—accessed as a leap backwards and forward to the present again—but also as a multilayered sedimentation, a form of vertical density rather than a horizontal sweep – not a either/or but a both/and [...] So if we think about the past not only as chronological and as what is gone, but as also vertical, as a different form of storage of what's already here, then performance is deeply historical. (83)

"A different form of storage of what's already here" warrants particular attention. The idea that time can be conceived as not only linear pushes us to avoid relaying cultural and social trends as such, and I would furthermore suggest that theater therefore represents and stores ideas that are present in the moment. This has the power to create the timelessness of a work and/or its themes, and classifies it as trans-dynastic, or as outlasting the court that patronized it. This is part of the reason why we continue to see works repeated in the court.

Although Poirier places an emphasis on the present moment, Diana Taylor highlights that performance is capable of "reactivat[ing] issues or scenarios from the past by staging them in the present" (*Performance* 68). This therefore brings attention to the fact that the issues represented originally were still culturally, politically, or socially relevant, even though some time may have passed. Taylor also proposes that the works may reinforce notions of power, as we have seen was true in the Americas through Taylor's work; the works still hold relevance in the present moment of representation and help us understand the past. From a theoretical standpoint, it is important here to note that not all plays had primary functions in reinforcing power, and research should consider the variety of functions a work had. Even when works did reinforce power, or the image of the monarch, they often simultaneously challenged those notions. Taylor explains that performances in the Americas honored the gods and reinforced a belief system (*Stages of Cognition* 362). She comments that "these performances also had evident political as well as sacred power" because they "made visible the very real economic and military power of a state that could afford to sacrifice hundreds" (364). We see again here the reinforcement of power. Specifically, in this last citation, the element of the "sacrifice" is not where I want to draw a parallel, but the visibility of power is what is key here. María Cristina Quintero examines Bances Candamo's political trilogy, similarly noting a reinforcement of power ("Monarchy and the Limits"). However, these works openly question that power and advise Carlos II on choosing an heir. Considering the royal court audience, the purpose of such plays was much different than those designed for the Mesoamerican public. Colonial plays were rooted in an extensive communal environment and inspired by ritual dance/expression/performance, while court drama could be used to advise Carlos II under the guise of festival performance. Both are didactic, but court theater often challenged power, or called attention to an apparent weakness. Therefore, it is

foundational for the theoretical standing of this project that we consider all outcomes and possibilities of a work, not just those readings that reinforce power and/or stately images. Although these messages are undeniably present at times, they rely on a frequently superficial reading of the textual artifact that remains today.

As should be remembered with all studies on performance art, we are dealing with visual, staged, performed pieces of art. The manuscripts we retain are the written literature that supply us access to these works centuries later. Practices that are not texts in the literary sense lack textual stability, but they can also be recognized as discrete events (Taylor, *Performance*). Therefore, we can say that theater, or more specifically a representation itself, can be the object of analysis according to Taylor's guidelines. In fact, these performances may not lack as much textual stability as one may think, thanks to court documentation of the performance elements of the plays. Although much documentation has been lost or destroyed, enough remains to reconstruct an image of seventeenth-century court drama. However, I would agree that the manuscript itself still lacks stability due to its subjection to editing and censorship. Additionally, we do not have transcripts for the multitude of each individual, and varied, performance and its adaptations. It is therefore always utterly impossible to define theatrical works and their variations solely by the textual artifacts left behind, even though, as stated, the performance documentation and textual importance is of the utmost, as they continue to serve as the gateway for contemporary scholars to engage in performance analysis.

Court Drama and Baroque Identity: Theory, Politics, and Performance

As the project unfolds, the second chapter will evaluate seventeenth-, twentieth-, and twenty-first-century theory written about theater to contextualize the theater written for the court. To begin, an evaluation of Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo de hacer Comedias* merits evaluation to

call attention to the fact that much of what Lope writes about public theater, its creation, and its production does not hold up under a courtly lens. This then calls for a need to articulate an analysis of Bances Candamo's theory of *decir sin decir* from the three drafts in which this idea is developed in his work *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos*, all written between 1692 and 1694 by the court's only official dramaturge of the time. Not only is there a vast difference in approach between Lope de Vega and Bances Candamo and the nearly eighty years that separate their works, but Bances also writes from the viewpoint of a courtier. Although both public theater and court drama aim to entertain—something we will be able to see in Bances' *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*—Bances Candamo places an emphasis on the useful nature of theater as a didactic tool, among other things. In order to demonstrate what Bances Candamo meant when he said that the theater could be used as a tool to educate the court, and particularly Carlos II, I have included in this project's corpus *La piedra filosofal* and *El esclavo en grillos de oro*. The latter of these works can most clearly be compared to the medieval *espejo de príncipes* in its attempt to demonstrate to Carlos II how to be a fair and gracious monarch.

This study will consider critics from the twentieth and early twenty-fist centuries, including the foundations José Maravall and Walter Benjamin provided, as well as developments and criticisms presented by more recent scholars such as Margaret Greer and William Egginton. This dissertation will position itself with academics such as Margaret Greer and Jonathan Thacker to show that Maravall's theories are lacking, especially as a means of analyzing courtly theater. Specifically, I agree with Elliott that the ideology presented to the masses was not necessarily blindly consumed as an accurate representation of the dominant operating ideas of the political, economic, or religious standing of the state or its figures of power. In the case of the

court, the audience changes, and while I do not deny that ideology exists, I have explained that there are multiple readings of these works that suggest functions other than to reinforce ideology. We will see this in Bances Candamo's use of the theater to educate the monarch. Additionally, since commercial and court drama existed in theoretically distinct territories, Maravall's work and Lope's *Arte nuevo* do not attempt to explain court drama; both are concerned instead with popular works represented outside the court. This forces us to consider whether early twentieth-century theories on Baroque theater can be proved as pertaining to the court. It is the stance of this project that, due to their grounding in the *readerly text*, many of those ideas are far too narrow to capture and explain the entirety of the court's dramatic culture.

Chapter three will evaluate more thoroughly the politics of the court in the 1670s and 1690s. Court drama from the 1670s questioned two opposing sides in the political terrain, while Bances' work of the 1690s proposed a repeated solution to the question of succession. In my evaluation of the tensions of the 1670s, I work with *La estatua de Prometeo* and *Fieras afemina amor*, both by Calderón de la Barca. These two works present parallels to the tensions that festered between Queen Regent Mariana of Austria and her illegitimate stepson, Don Juan José of Austria. As Carlos II came of age, it was clear he would need help leading Spain. Don Juan coveted a position in the court in Madrid, but Mariana defended the legitimacy of her son and fought for Don Juan to be kept at more than an arm's length. I will explore Calderón's literary decorum as his fictitious works toy with this political rivalry.

My work in my third chapter will conclude in the early 1690s, with Bances Candamo's political trilogy: *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, *El esclavo en grillos de oro*, and *La piedra filosofal*. There were two major concerns at this point in time: the question of heir to the throne, and the concern for Carlos II as an inadequate monarch, both of which led to the

didactic nature of these works by Bances. A part of each plot line, all three of these works propose a new successor, each time promoting a nephew as the viable option. This is what I term the nephew-king paradigm. In working within this paradigm *El esclavo en grillos de oro* serves as a type of *espejo de príncipes* attempting to use the character of Trajano as a model for Carlos II. *La piedra filosofal* also looks to educate the king again on succession laying out three fictitious options that parallel Carlos' three real-life options, while the *zarzuela*, *Cómo se curan los celos, y Orlando Furioso*, is interesting as it served three functions as a production within the court. Therefore, *Cómo se curan los celos* serves as a magnificent example of the multiplicity of functions some of these works had. For example, this *zarzuela* was meant to entertain, and it serves as an example of theater created for the pure enjoyment of the court. The story presented by Bances' work here is extremely simplified and the details were for the most part common knowledge, at least for the courtly audience. However, the details are so simplistic that they served to support the work as a musical performance. One can see the attention Bances placed on the question of succession, as the relationship between uncle and nephew frequently showed up in Bances Candamo's works. It is by using this nephew-king paradigm that Bances illuminated Carlos II's real-life heirs—all nephews—in a possible effort to encourage the court to name an heir.

The fourth chapter of this study will classify court drama as its own genre. To do so, I propose that the Coliseo del Buen Retiro is not an enclosed domain, as other European royal spaces were; the play is a separate, yet simultaneous, performance from that of the monarchs (part of the court spectacle); and these plays are defined by their multimedia composition. This, therefore, is where theoretical questions of performance will take root in this investigation. I show that court drama exists in the same spaces as the monarch's performance of his or her

station, and therefore drama and the construction of majesty unfold side-by-side. In relation to scenography, I reference *Los celos hacen estrellas* by Juan Vélez de Guevara, *Hado y divisa de Leonido y Marfisa* and *La estatua de Prometeo* by Calderón de la Barca, and *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso* by Bances Candamo, among others.

After discussing the court scenography, chapter four of this project elucidates the role of music in these productions, including the emergence and the evolution of Spanish *zarzuela*. The *zarzuela* is particularly important because it highlights and proves the active artistic development and evolution of Spanish court productions. Court representations did not wane as those of the *corrales* did in the mid- and late seventeenth century, which meant that the court produced new technologies in scenography and music. In fact, court theater reached its peak in technological advances, aesthetics, musical development and rate of production in the middle and latter part of the century. *Cómo se curan los celos* is my prime example of the Spanish *zarzuela*. *También se ama en el abismo* and *Tetis y Peleo* by Agustín de Salazar y Torres will be included as *zarzuelas-primitivas* in order to note the musical evolution of these works.[8] *También se ama en el abismo*, supposedly represented on December 22, 1670 in honor of the Queen Regent Mariana's birthday,[9] demonstrates the integration and increasing musical content of the works staged for the court. This focus on simpler language is a key difference immediately noticeable, and while O'Connor compares the mythological themes of Salazar y Torres' works to those of Calderón's, the language these two use is completely distinct, with Salazar y Torres implementing more

[8] It is not part of my work here to determine if the *zarzuela-primitiva* is a term aptly named, but I will borrow it from Daniele Becker.

[9] I have found evidence that suggests court plays were halted until 1672. I will discuss this in chapter three.

simplistic language to fit with his musical integration. The specific selection of these works does not mean that music was not used or was not present in other works that comprise the corpus for this dissertation. For example, in Calderón's *La estatua de Prometeo*, song is rather frequently used to delineate a difference between gods or otherworldly characters, and mortals. However, *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, *Los celos hacen estrellas*, and *También se ama en el abismo* have been chosen specifically for their scenographic and musical elements.

Meriting special consideration, as I mentioned, is the Coliseo; this space is an obstacle that few have tackled when addressing seventeenth-century theater. Some academics find themselves drawn to certain labels and binaries because they are neat, clean, and easily compartmentalized. The problem the Coliseo poses is that it does not neatly and simply serve the needs of the court exclusively, nor those of a solely public audience. Shergold acknowledges that the works presented in the Coliseo tended to be where we find the exceptions to the rules: the director of the *corral* staging a more elaborate production with access to stage machinery, or a court space, and therefore what we would assume to be a court production and royal audience, opening itself up to the public. It is messy to attempt to delineate which representations were meant exclusively for a royal audience, which were meant for a public audience, or which were re-stagings of the same production, in the same space, for a different audience than that of the premiere. While we have the beginnings of the norms set forth as indicators of courtly representations (such as staging in perspective), I will delve deeper into these representations that took place in the Coliseo, and consider the Coliseo its own unique space in seventeenth-century theater. In doing so, I will increase the breadth of available knowledge of the diverse types of representations and trends in the separate, but not mutually exclusive, spheres of Baroque

theater. Therefore, this dissertation will explore the diverse use of this space to consider precisely how the Coliseo united the more intimate representations of court drama and public audiences.

With court productions booming throughout the century while the *corrales* suffered, it is clear to see from the onset that court drama is an integral part of court culture. Therefore, there would be no innovation in confirming this to be true. Rather, this affirmation authorizes my proposal: court drama was a foundational part of royal Baroque identity. Through careful consideration of theoretical approaches, history, court politics, scenography, space, music, and the role of the monarch, I show that the court, its members, and its artists created something entirely their own: *the court comedia*.

CHAPTER II

Theoretical Approaches to Theater Analysis: The Court and the *Corrales* in Seventeenth-Century Spain

Theoretical approaches to theater have taken various forms since the early Seventeenth Century. Beginning in 1609 with the debut of Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*, theory frequently addressed the theatrical representations presented to the general public. These public spectacles, staged in the *corrales,* boasted noted popularity throughout the mid- and late seventeenth century. However, in his introduction to his edition of Bances' *Teatro de los teatros*, Duncan Moir indicates a shift in focus to the court: "El teatro palaciego llegó a reemplazar a los corrales como verdadero centro de la actividad dramática creadora" (Moir lxxix), and in the 1620s theater represented for the royal court began booming, and reached a new peak in popularity as a favored pastime of the court. Court drama came to sustain its wild popularity longer than the theater of the *corrales*; as productions for public audiences began to wane, courtly theater held steadfast well past 1681 and the death of Calderón, a date strikingly few Early Modern scholars trudge past in studying the role of theater in the culture of the Spanish Baroque at the end of the seventeenth century. Although Lope's work is significant, and addressed the theater of the early seventeenth century, theory that discussed theater's role in and impact on both the public and royal sectors in the seventeenth-century society was developed well into the 1690s. Since theater had an equally strong presence in the court, it is imperative that scholars begin to ask how we approach court theater, which theories should we be considering,

and what these theories do in serving our evaluations of royal theater. In this chapter I propose three approaches and their conclusions. The first is that Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* needs to be reconsidered in relation to the court, and in relation to late seventeenth-century theory on theater. Although scholars may choose to use Lope's work to describe theater as mass media, Bances Candamo saw theater as a means to educate the king. Secondly, the royal court in Madrid existed as an imagined community connected by its artistic trends. Finally, knowledge defines the individual's relationship with theater and maintains them as such when consuming art that was designed to be consumed in masses. Beginning with Lope de Vega's 1609 *Arte nuevo* and ending with William Egginton's 2016 book, *The Man Who Invented Fiction: How Cervantes Ushered in the Modern World*, I will outline theoretical works that facilitate an analysis of theater in order to prove that Lope's work needs to be reconsidered if we are to study court drama, the utility of a theoretical apparatus that considers court theater as an imagined community, and how it is possible to remain an individual in consuming theater as an art form destined for an audience with more than one member.

Specifically, in addition to Lope, the seventeenth century witnessed the production of the work *Discurso Teológico, sobre los teatros y Comedias de este siglo* written by the Jesuit moralist Father Ignacio de Camargo, who also considered the effects of the representations in the public *corrales*, but did so in order to leverage the commitments of the church and his fellow clergymen to justify his stance in opposition to theater.[10] He never directly named court theater

[10] The full title of the work reads: *Discurso Teológico, sobre los teatros y Comedias de este siglo, en que por todo genero de autoridades, en especial de los Santos Padres de la Iglesia, y Doctores Escolásticos, y por principios solidos de la Teología, se resuelve con claridad la*

in his work, although he does call on the church and the nobles to help him rid Spain of the theater in its entirety. Camargo's stance on theater clearly garnered attention, and may even have been banned in 1689 before its 1690 publishing in Lisbon (Moir).[11] Nevertheless, knowledge of his opposition to Spain's contemporary theater of the time found its way to the court and elicited a response from the official court playwright, Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo, who drafted and edited three versions of his work *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos* from 1689-1694. He refuted claims of the damaging and damning nature of theater and provided justification of its usefulness, minimally in the court. *Teatro de los teatros* closed the seventeenth century as the last profound theoretical work with a lens focused on theater, and is the only one here written from the point of view of a playwright holding an official position within the court.[12]

Including these three seventeenth-century theoretical texts and their authors in this chapter positions this project within and in relation to conversations about the function of Golden Age theater. However, it would be inappropriate to limit this theoretical analysis solely to seventeenth-century works on the matter. These works are indispensable as they provide

---

cuestión, de si es, ò no, pecado grave el ver Comedias, como se representan hoy en los Teatros de España.

[11] A draft of Camargo's work was circulated in 1689. It is believed by Moir that the odds Bances Candamo had access to Camargo's were high.

[12] Most frequently, other courtiers that expressed their thoughts on the influence of theater within the court were the members of the Royal Council. Their letters to Queen Regent Mariana of Austria regarding their opinion on the theater supplied early in her regency will be discussed in chapters three and four.

valuable context and insight as to the role of the theater in Spain's Early Modern and Baroque societies. Yet, twentieth- and twenty-first-century theories must be considered for a complete analysis of this topic. Therefore, I will examine the work of more contemporary scholars such as Margaret Greer, Melvina McKendrick, William Egginton, José Antonio Maravall, Anthony Cascardi, Nicholas Spadaccini, and Jenaro Taléns, thereby providing powerful insight into the theoretical approaches most recently used to evaluate Spanish theater. Additionally, I make use of Benedict Anderson, Michael Bratman, and Scott Shapiro's theoretical and philosophical models of imagined communities and agency to begin to characterize and define court drama as its own genre. This allows for the consideration of these models in relation to both the theater of the court, as well as the theater of the *corrales* in seventeenth-century Spain.

It is not the intention of this project to create a rigid binary of court drama versus that of the *corrales*. There are many ways in which these worlds collided, mixed, and were frequently intertwined. For example, chapter four of this project will tackle the complicated notion of space. Although the diverse uses of the Coliseo del Buen Retiro help me establish court drama as its own genre, this royal space also hosted public audiences. Theory is no exception as it can transcend both the public and private sector of theater in an attempt to discuss and evaluate said theater. However, this chapter will question notions of Early Modern theater in order to evaluate their validity in discussing court theater, as it was never its aim to do so. These theories will be questioned and evaluated here in order to test and understand just how far they reach. Here, I begin by discussing the aforementioned seventeenth-century texts: Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo*, Camargo's *Discurso Teológico*, and Bances Candamo's *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos* in considering the seventeenth-century theoretical models that existed, and, when necessary, incorporate contemporary theoretical

approaches. Camargo opposes the theater while Lope's work provides insight into possible theoretical approaches to the theater of the early seventeenth century, and Bances' work sheds light on the theoretical practices of the court theater specifically. As this chapter develops I will elucidate a more contemporary evaluation of theater, including notions set forth by Margaret Greer, William Egginton, and Anthony Cascardi, among others who acknowledge and consider the significance of multiple functions and readings of theater. In doing so, this chapter will address, but not be limited to, Lope de Vega's characterization of theater and its possible application to court production, Spadaccini and Taléns' question: how do I remain an *I* if I am part of a mass audience, and Bratman and Shapiro's analyses of agency and intention in order to explain the nature of the working relationships of courtly productions. Chapter three of this project will focus on representations at court. However, in this chapter I will not limit myself to court theater, as it was part of a much larger cultural trend, and the public and courtly sectors of theatrical production are frequently in contact with each other.

***Lope de Vega's* Arte nuevo**

In 1609, Lope de Vega (1562-1635) presented the Madrid Academy—a likely fictitious and figurative intellectual group—with his work *Arte nuevo de hacer Comedias en este tiempo*. Although Lope was no stranger to fostering courtly ties and seeking royal patronage, chiefly from the Duke of Lerma,[13] Lope's *Arte Nuevo* was anything but a how-to for courtly theater. His work has been foundational for exploring what theater was for Lope and how it functioned as a central facet in creating theater as mass media, and as such, earns a space here to trace theoretical notions of theater at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The audience Lope addresses is a

[13] See Elizabeth Wright's *From Pilgrimage to Patronage* for a more detailed examination of Lope, his ties to the court, and his attempts at securing royal patronage.

public one as he discusses theater as mass media presented to *el vulgo.* While Lope's target theater audience is different than the royal audience in question in my project, some of his notions of theater in the seventeenth century, the traditions it should maintain, and the ones with which it should break persist well into the latter half of the century. It should be noted, however, that Miguel Ángel Garrido Gallardo reminds us not to take *Arte nuevo* so literally (104-105). Garrido (105) refers to Menéndez Pelayo's works, which explains that Lope's *Arte nuevo* is "ambiguo y contradictorio, fluctuando siempre entre la legislación peripatética y las prácticas introducidas en el teatro" (Menéndez 576). This will be kept in mind as I analyze court theater under Lope's notions.

Some of Lope's hopes for theater are so broad they are easily adapted and molded in the theater despite the cultural, social, and political changes Spain endured during the Seventeenth Century.[14] For example, Lope suggests that playwrights: "harán grave una parte, otra ridícula" (177). In his article "Lo trágico y lo cómico mezclado: de mezclas y mixturas en el teatro del Siglo de Oro", Arellano points to the Aristotelian mix of tragedy with comedy that may have influenced Lope's writing here, thus giving way to the classification of *tragicomedia* (9-10). Juxtaposing this with the varying definitions and explanations of the *tragicomedia* put forth by Boyl, Alcázar, and Barreda, Arellano further lays the groundwork for consideration of the mix/mixture of these elements (10). We can easily adapt this notion to the court plays of the 1690s and the theme of succession by murder (as is the opening plot of *El esclavo en grillos de oro*, for example) paired with the popular *engaño.* Lope also recommends a three-act play, with three sequences of time. As for the ending, "[…] no la permita / hasta que llegue a la postrera

[14] The details of the political atmosphere in seventeenth-century Spain will be discussed in detail in chapter three.

escena" (234-235)—a recommendation he feels strongly about, repeating its importance and emphasizing that the resolution should by no means be revealed before the middle of the third act (300). Regardless of Lope's intended suggestions, these standards were part of an already established Aristotelian tradition,[15] will hold fast throughout the seventeenth century, and are characteristic of both the plays written for the *corrales* as well as the court.

Lope continues by declaring that: "[…]cualquiera imitación poética / se hace de tres cosas, que son, plática, / verso dulce, armonía y música" (54-56). Despite regard for literary decorum and the changes in the linguistic nature of the play that emerge throughout the century, these basic traits characterize the most fundamental notions of theater. In the court's case, music will take a front seat in the court through the emergence and development of the *zarzuela.*[16] However, despite the universality of some of these statements, the most pervasive recommendation Lope gives will dominate theater of the seventeenth century: "Engañe siempre el gusto, y donde vea / que se deja entender alguna cosa / de muy lejos de aquello que promete" (302-304). The ideas of the *ser/parecer*, *engaño/desengaño* are so prominent throughout the

[15] Garrido Gallardo questions if Lope is following Aristotle intentionally, or if Aristotle had already become the norm. For more on this argument see his article: "El *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias*, texto indecidible".

[16] See chapter four for thorough consideration of the performance elements of these representations, including the *zarzuela.*

whole of the seventeenth century, that even when the audience has been made aware of the ruse, the characters themselves frequently cannot shake their confused state.[17]

As the century develops, however, we will start to see some adaptations and evolution of the ideas Lope had presented. For example, in *Arte nuevo* Lope explains the difference between the *comedia* and tragedy: "sólo diferenciándola[18] en que trata / las acciones humildes y plebeyas, / y la tragedia las reales y altas" (58-60). By 1665 *comedias* will not be limited to "acciones humildes" and the "royal presence" as a fictitious character will arise in abundance in these works. Court theater also includes elements that Lope does not mention or include as necessary. Specifically, Lope states that the public spectacle should include dance, song, and the *entremés*. Due to the highly performative and celebratory nature of the festivities that included theater as a component, the *loa* and the *fin de fiesta* will almost always round out the court spectacle experience often dragging it past the two hour recommended limit Lope assigns the play:

> […] considerando que la cólera
> de un español sentado no se templa
> si no le representan en dos horas
> hasta el final juicio desde el Génesis. (205-208)

These situations exist as proof of the evolution of the theater throughout the seventeenth century as Lope's advice is not faithfully followed, nor is it dismissed, but rather expanded, adapted, and

---

[17] See, for example, *La piedra filosofal* in which even after the audience learns that Hispalo has been enchanted, and is now un-enchanted, he himself bumbles through the third act in a stupor of disbelief, still not entirely sure of what is real, and what is not when the play closes.

[18] "La" here refers to "la comedia" rather than "la tragedia".

built upon, which is precisely what we expect from the implications of a *texto indecidible*, to use Garrido's words.

Although some of Lope's suggestions such as, "elíjase el sujeto" (157) and "en tres actos de tiempo le reparta" (212),[19] and others of the aforementioned similarities between Lope's vision of theater and the theater of the late seventeenth-century court can and were implemented by playwrights such as Calderón de la Barca and Bances Candamo in their works for the court, the audience Lope had in mind initially is not the same audience for which Bances and Calderón wrote. Ironically, it is also not the audience Lope wrote for once he established noble ties and wrote for a noble audience. What will not change in Lope's *Arte nuevo* is his opening contention that he has to please those who dictate his work, referring here to the public who misjudge what the *comedia* should be.[20] Their supposed misjudgment aside, the court playwright will too always have to please those patrons that dictate his work. Additionally, stylistic trends and changes dictated by technological advances in the staging of productions and a newer more contemporary audience would divide the playwrights of the early and late seventeenth century.

One of the key problems in attempting to use Lope's *Arte nuevo* in analyzing court theater after the death of Felipe IV is contained foremost in one key term previously mentioned: *el vulgo.* Lope states that when creating a work for the public audience "es justo hablarle en necio para darle gusto" (48). There are two foundational problems here for the court. The first is that it is written specifically for the enjoyment—as well as the education—of the king and his

[19] Of course, these suggestions are so broad that these in particular do not diverge from what could be previously found in Aristotle's *Poetics.*

[20] For that reason Lope is forced to "deciros de qué modo las querría" referring to the *comedias*, admitting that he too at times bends to the desires of the public masses.

courtiers.[21] In the case of the reign of Carlos II, it is also frequently written for Queen Regent/Mother Mariana of Austria. This does not mean that there did not exist a variety of registers and writing styles among court playwrights. Lope himself suggests a list of linguistic rules that are merited under varying circumstances, by beginning with simple every-day language and adapting as the play calls for it: "Comience pues y con lenguaje casto" (246), and he confirms the suggestions of Aristides asking that:

> el cómico lenguaje
> sea puro, claro, fácil, y aún añade
> que se tome del uso de la gente,
> haciendo diferencia al que el político. (258-261)

Additionally, "no traiga la Escritura" (264) and if the character of the king should speak, "imite cuanto pueda / la gravedad real" (269-270). However, their are two key factors that contribute to the choice of linguistic register for court plays that Lope did not, or could not have considered: the first is etiquette and literary decorum, and the second is the centrality and importance of scenography and music in the mid- and late seventeenth-century court productions. It is true that the language of some of these plays is in fact ornate, in Baroque fashion, as are Calderón and Bances Candamo's works,[22] most closely calling attention to the possible influence of Luis de Góngora and his language on the playwrights' works. Even plays written for the public in the late seventeenth century were "más intelectual y menos emocional" than that of Lope's body of work (Moir lxxix).

---

[21] See John Varey's "The Audience and the Play at Court Spectacles: The Role of the King." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 61, 1984, pp. 399-406.

[22] The former more so than the latter.

Additionally, in court theater the question of language and register in instances such as addressing the monarch(s) directly was a question of courtesy and formality rather, and not an attempt to produce enjoyment by eliminating a miasma of eloquent speech. In this instance in particular, "hablarle en necio para darle gusto" would have ignored the rules of decorum.[23] It would be more appropriate to subscribe to Ricardo de Turia's description in his *Apologético*: "Y es que los que escriben es a fin de satisfacer el gusto para quien escriben" (*Preceptiva dramática española* 179) as it offers the possibility for a broad approach in attempting to satisfy the audience. Even if Lope was solely recommending to place enjoyment first and not to lose it as a consequence of language, we still see Calderón's decorous register side-by-side with moments of humor. Register aside; the goal would have been to be respectful in paying credit and tribute to the monarchs. For example, even Salazar y Torres who has been criticized for his overly simplistic language still pays respect to his king and his patron in the *loa* for *También se ama en el abismo*:

ESPAÑA: […]
pues, si a la Fortuna debo
nacer Carlos, Sol de Austria,
se deberán sus blasones
al mérito de Mariana,
que Aurora anuncia sus luces,
y, como al Sol guía el Alba,

[23] Later in this chapter I will evaluate the idea of literary decorum as it pertains to Bances Candamo, as he was particularly concerned with this idea. The topic is of rather significant importance in his work *Teatro de los Teatros.*

conducirá su esplendor. (326-332)

Salazar y Torres' diction here is dictated by courtly respect and pre-established, and frequently repeated court metaphors.

As for the second idea here of the central role of scenography in these productions, "hablarle en necio para darle gusto" (48) is not an appropriate cause and effect relationship for the representations that took place in the court, for it will not be the speech, the accessibility to language, or spoken humor that dominated the interests of court theater's attendees; rather, it will be the aesthetics of the production. Lope does highlight an important facet for all theater: the underlying goal to "darle gusto". He even further concedes: "yo hallo que si allí se ha de dar gusto, / con lo que se consigue es lo más justo" (209-210). With the increasing popularity of the theater in the court throughout the mid-seventeenth century, most aptly attributed to Felipe IV's love for the theater, there was the growing fascination with court drama as a spectacle, with all the visual ostentatiousness that implies. This did anything but taper off during the reign of Carlos II. Regardless of linguistic recourses, what gave the courtiers great pleasure, and in which they took great interest, was not un-occluded access to the messages and themes of the plays, but rather the visual representation of the ostentatious trends of the time.

While the *corrales* rarely implemented the use of *tramoyas*, staged works that offered little stage direction, and were presented with limited musical components that were usually implemented to mask the sound of the stage machinery, if any, the court enjoyed copious use of *tramoyas*, music including the development of the Spanish *zarzuela*, detailed stage direction,[24]

[24] More detailed stage direction tended to be the norm in court productions, with the exception of Calderón. It is thought that Calderón's limited stage direction either demonstrated a trust of scenographers Cosimo Lotti, and his successor Baccio del Bianco, to do the work justice, or the

the frequent granting of funds for such expenditures as new lavish costumes, and had stage design that included incredible perspective, particularly in the painting of the sets and frontispieces.[25] It is common opinion that all of these elements supplemented the poetics of the representation, rather than detracting from it. Salazar y Torres in particular makes calculated use of simplistic language not to remove rhetoric as an obstacle or distraction, but in an effort to let the music and scenography stand out in his *zarzuelas.*

Theorizing Theater in the Seventeenth Century: The Moralist's Objection and the Courtier's Defense

Artistic and linguistic trends aside; Lope does not attempt to address theater in the court and therefore an entire set of questions regarding function and etiquette is excluded. What Lope did for theater as mass media, Cosimo Lotti and the court scenographers did for theater as multi-media, making the more apt recommendation for the court playwright to strike a balance between intellectual versus emotional appeal to be coupled with the scenographic artistic prowess in order to "darle gusto". Yet, with steadfast opposition from the *moralistas*, and frequently the Royal Council (as is represented in the April 15, 1672 letter to Queen Mariana),

---

more commonly supported opinion that the lack of stage direction was due to Calderón's speculated involvement in the staging of his works. There is evidence to suggest that he worked closely with scenographer Cosimo Lotti and musician Juan Hidalgo, for example. See Jonathan Thacker's *A Companion to Golden Age Theater*. Tamesis Books London, 2007.

[25] A more detailed discussion of scenography will take place in chapter four of this project. Additionally, see N.D. Shergold's *A History of the Spanish Stage: From Medieval times until the End of the Seventeenth Century* for more details on the differences in visual perspective and production cost of the court spectacles.

that was easier said than done. In fact, the dialogue for and against the theater was already well established by the seventeenth century, and persisted into the nineteenth century, if not beyond, as is reflected in the varying defenses and explanation of *abusos* in the 1904 *Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España*, an anthology of theater related texts and theories complied by Emilio Cotarelo y Mori. Specifically, in 1689, eighty-one years after Lope's *Arte nuevo*, the *moralista* Padre Ignacio de Camargo wrote to discourage and reject such enjoyment in his work *Discurso Teológico sobre los teatros y Comedias de este siglo.*[26]

Camargo was an active member of the Society of Jesus, a theologian at the *Real Colegio de Salamanca*, and not the first to speak against the theater and its productions. However, his work is included here not only for its timely publication that makes it contemporary to Bances Candamo's *Teatro de los Teatros*, but more importantly because it provoked a response from Bances Candamo. As with most Jesuit works of the period, Camargo cites religious literature, his predecessors, and his contemporary theologians in his attempt to justify his arguments. Camargo notes his already established attitude toward the *comedias*: "Siempre las miré como malas, y peligrosas, en especial para la juventud" (19). To intensify his stance he explained that he concluded after having considered others' theological works so carefully that the *comedias* are far worse for than he previously knew (21). He calls for his readers to discover "la verdad" surrounding the powerful negative role of the *comedias* and encourages the reader to help him "desengañarte" (1) from "el gran Diablo de las Comedias" (22). Camargo repetitively declares the inappropriate nature of the *comedias* claiming those who view them sin: "Las Comedias,

[26] The version cited in my work is housed in the National Library of Portugal that offers a digital version available through their website. I have chosen not to follow Cotarelo y Mori as the version compiled there is abridged.

como hoy se representan, son ilícitas, y que los que las oyen pecan mortalmente" (23). He elucidates that these works are a sickness, a "perniciosa afición" from which there is no cure as people participate in this "frenesí voluntario" (24-25). Unifying his warning of their illicit nature and their status as a moral plague Camargo emphasizes that the *comedias* are not only "ilícitas, sino como peste de las costumbres, y semilla de innumerables pecados" (46). His ultimate suggestion is to "condenarlas a todos" (181-182).[27]

Camargo's word choice and imagery were not new, as he frequently draws on prior texts to support his argument. He readily conforms to the belief held by his brothers of the cloth that the *comedias* are a terrible sin and a plague for not only those who view them, but those who participate in them at every stage of the process. Camargo is careful never to say just that in those words, and rather cites specifically that the company of actors, for example, sin in their representation of the productions. A wise line to toe by any clergy member, as outright calling *all* those that participate in productions as sinners, would have included courtiers and members of the royal family that participated as patrons, audience members, and as acting participants. As if to leave us with final justification of his judgment of the *comedias*, and to distance himself further from the content of his text, Camargo concludes his work with the words of Luis Crespi taken from "su gran Sermón contra las Comedias":

---

[27] Although limited in fashion, the Jesuits used theater in the America's in order to teach the Christian doctrine. While Camargo saw theater as a sin, those in the Americas thought the way to appeal to the indigenous population was through the senses. This opened the door to *el teatro misionero.* For more information see Diana Taylor and Sarah J. Townsend's *Stages of Conflict: A Critical Anthology of Latin American Theater and Performance.*

> Suplico a todos los Superiores seculares, y Eclesiásticos, Príncipes, Prelados, Magistrados, y Reyes, que extirpen esta peste de sus distritos, que es hija del Demonio, y del infierno, madre de la herejía, y idolatría, y de todos los males, que padece la Cristiandad en los costumbres: que destierren talles Comediantes, a los libros, y Autores de estas Comedias. [...] Dios nuestro Señor por su infinita bondad, y misericordia lo remedie, dando espíritu, y resolución para desterrar de entre los Cristianos esta peste de las almas, celo para no consentirlas, y desengaño para no verlas, y su gracia para salvarnos. (226-227)

Although these words from Crespi's sermon were immortalized as final encouragement by Camargo to, at the very least, avoid the *comedias*—and more ideally eradicate them—theater had long since been a fixture in Spain's rich cultural history. In defense of theater, the *comedias*, and in response to Camargo's work, Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo (1662-1704) developed his work *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos*, written after court theater had been exceedingly popular for more than seventy years, and from the clear point of view of a courtier.

Bances Candamo was born in April of 1662, just five short months after the birth of Carlos II. Bances was from humble origins, to say the least. His father was a poor tailor who died while Bances was still an infant, which prompted his mother to send him and his sister to live with their uncle, Antonio, in Seville, who was a canon at the cathedral (García-Castañón 28). While there, Bances received minor orders from the diocese, and studied under his uncle and the bishop (28). Although we have no proof Bances ever earned a degree, he studied philosophy and law extensively (28). Quintero notes that nearing the end of a long economic crisis, Bances Candamo was named official Court Playwright in 1687 writing for Carlos II and his mother,

Queen Mother Mariana of Austria ("Monarchy and the Limits"). This was a title that not even Calderón had held. Bances Candamo saw his position and title in the Court as a "privileged position" and an "invaluable opportunity" through which he could "educate Charles II in the art of kingship" (Quintero, "Monarchy and the Limits" 310). Bances Candamo openly refuted moralists, such as Padre Ignacio de Camargo. Unfortunately, Bances could not hide behind such brash statements as Lope's "no vaya a verlas quien se ofende" (200) and refuted the *moralistas* by sustaining that the evolution of literary decorum justified theater's presence in Spanish cultural practice.

This concept of literary decorum became fundamental to the plays written in the second half of the seventeenth century (Moir lxxv). In refuting Camargo's claims that the theater was an illicit endeavor, it was decorum that Bances used to defend the theater, and by association his career and position in the court. In doing so Bances Candamo notes a distinct change in the Baroque theater of Calderón and the following generation of playwrights: the nearly perfect literary decorum and moral perfection of plays (Moir). Having such a clear understanding and respect for how men and women from each social class in society should behave gave Calderón, Bances, and their respective contemporaries the leeway they needed to play with these expectations and reinforce them when necessary. Although Lope recommended the topics of honor and heroic virtue as the best subjects (327-330), Bances clarifies the approach to these themes through the lens of literary decorum, explaining for example: "No se pone adulterio que no sea sin culpa de la mujer forzándola y engañándola" (34) and cites Calderón's *El pintor de su honra* as an example. Including literary decorum was the most important element of Bances' first draft of *Teatro de los teatros* and gave him the ground he needed to refute Camargo. Without a

moral argument, his objection to Camargo's claims of theater as sin would not have been sufficiently supported.

Supplemental to his argument of the imperative role of literary decorum, Bances argued that court theater in moderation was a proper form of entertainment and could be used to educate the king and his entourage. This idea of the theater as educational is foundational to my readings of his political works, particularly *El esclavo en grillos de oro,* which can be read as a type of *espejo de príncipes.* In his own words Bances Candamo refers to and supports Cicero, justifying his stance by explaining: "Cicerón dice que aunque el principal intento del Poeta sea deleitar, con todo eso desean *enseñar*, persuadir, y contar" (80; emphasis added).

This is an appropriate place to juxtapose the ideas set forth by Bances Candamo to those of José Antonio Maravall. Although Bances and Maravall address different spheres of the theatrical world, Maravall eliminates the possibility that a work might "enseñar" when he states: "El teatro español tiene escaso valor *pedagógico*, a diferencia del francés, y la comedia carece normalmente de ejemplaridad" (*Teatro y literatura* 27; emphasis added). The key term here is "pedagógico", or what I would prefer to call didactic. Although Maravall denies this capacity, this is precisely the utility that Bances Candamo sees in court theater. However, theater under Maravall's perspective is used to continually reinforce the reigning ideology for the masses. Contrarily, theater of the court was used during the reign of Carlos II as a way to educate and teach the king and his entourage. It was a means to present the king with a model to follow and emulate. Works such as *El esclavo en grillos de oro* by Bances Candamo present the character of the king, Trajano, as a gracious, just, and wise king. There is no veil here or delusion in trying to present a one-to-one relationship between Carlos II and Trajano. It was well known that Carlos

was anything but a well-composed, gracious leader. Rather, this work serves as an *espejo de príncipes* for the lack-luster king.

Most foundational to the theories and descriptions surrounding court theater that Bances Candamo provides in his work *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos* is his idea of *decir sin decir*. In the edition of this work with an introduction and notes by Duncan Moir, Moir explains: "El dramaturgo palaciego debe obrar de manera más sutil, sugiriendo al Rey, por medio de intriga y personaje teatrales, unos mensajes que el Rey mismo debe deducir del espectáculo" (xcvi). This idea of *decir sin decir* certainly was not new, but it is foundational to Candamo's theory – whether or not he implemented it well himself. Prior to Bances Candamo, Carrillo y Sotomayor used the phrasing "disfraces del decir", and much later, in the twentieth century, there is the emergence of Maravall's idea that you have to "vestir la verdad" (Quintero, "Political Intentionality" 49). Quintero concisely cited these phrases in the same paragraph, and it is easy to blur the lines between these three authors and their ideas. Quintero does not highlight the potential differences these phrases carry, and it is quite important to call attention to the different ends these means served. Maravall, for example, was discussing a way in which he believed a propagandistic ideal of the State would have been carried out in the public theater, without exhausting or raising noticeable alarm among the audience. Maravall's idea here of having to "vestir la verdad" plays to the idea of what Egginton would call the veil(s) of the work. This idea of *decir sin decir,* in Candamo's words, was used for a different purpose in Bances Candamo's work. Bances' political works are an example of his attempt to implement *decir sin decir* in order to shed light onto existing apprehensions—chiefly the question of succession—that permeated the court at the end of the seventeenth century, while attempting not to overstep

the lines of literary decorum, something he and Calderón respected conceptually, and that Lope was criticized for lacking.

Addressing this idea of decorum, María Cristina Quintero explains that Candamo's works, particularly his political trilogy, (*Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, *El esclavo en grillos de oro*, and *La piedra filosofal*) are defined by "a dialectical process which simultaneously teaches and entertains, disguises the truth while making it evident" ("Political Intentionality" 42). This subtly highlights the fact that Bances Candamo's effort to bring to light the truth, without saying it so bluntly, plays to the rules of decorum. His attempt was to honor these rules, but still get his message across. He was not operating under any delusions that the court would not see past his subtleties; most commonly for example, in all the plays that comprise the political trilogy, the question regarding the heir to the throne is always presented with a nephew-king relationship as the clear choice in resolving the monarch-successor dilemma in these plays. After Carlos II failed to produce any offspring, the general idea was that his sister's child and grandchild would be named as heirs. His sister, Margarita Teresa could not serve as his heir, as she passed away in 1673. However her daughter, María Antonia, bore a child in October 1692, just before she herself died. This child was José Fernando, Prince of Asturias, great-nephew of Carlos II, and was generally favored to be the heir to the Spanish crown in an effort to keep the Spanish monarchy out of the hands of the French and Austrians. With these productions being written between late 1692 and 1693, this is the great-nephew Bances Candamo likely had in mind. However, José Fernando would eventually pass away at the age of six in early 1699. This left the French Crown with the greatest entitlement to the throne and Carlos II named another great-nephew, Philippe, Duke of Anjou, as his successor before his death in 1700.

This nephew-king relationship directly parallels the suggestion of José Fernando, Prince of Asturias—Carlos II's great-nephew—as the preferred heir to the Spanish crown at that time. In the opening of *La piedra filosofal*, Rocas explains:

> De los reyes españoles
> quise investigar atento
> la sucesión, y encontré
> mi muerte en el heredero
> de Hispán. (29-33)

From these first lines, aside from the obvious foreshadowing, the topic of succession is at the forefront of the production and posits the notion of an heir to Hispán. The audience will find their answer in his nephew, Hispalo. In *El esclavo en grillos de oro* it is roughly 250 verses from the start of the work when mid-monologue about his own desires to rule Obinio Camilo notes the already established uncle-nephew heir relation comprised by Trajano and Adriano:

> Su tío, el Emperador
> Trajano, a Adriano le encarga
> los militares manejos,
> en las facciones más arduas,
> a fin de nombrarle César [...] (261-265)

These clear references may well fall outside of the bounds of *decir sin decir.* Although none of them break the fictitious plane of the work by directly challenging Carlos II to choose an heir, Bances Candamo also does little to weave this very real political concern delicately into his plays and does more than "sugerir", always presenting an obvious uncle-nephew relationship. The fact that Bances was asked to leave the court in 1694 may very well prove that he did in fact finally

overstep the boundaries and limits of decorum as he may have come across as saying exactly what he well pleased, and openly discussed the question of succession: something Carlos II demanded was not to be discussed in theatrical works (Quintero, "Monarchy and the Limits").[28]

The changes that took place in seventeenth-century Spanish theater throughout the century place a large rift between Lope de Vega and the playwrights of the second half of the century, such as Calderón de la Barca and Bances Candamo. Although I have shown to which characteristics of playwriting the late playwrights still adhered, Lope's views of theater as mass media for the *vulgo* were long out of date by the time court theater and its multi-media visual spectacle had almost completely edged out public theater after Felipe IV's death. Calderón's and Bances' respect for literary decorum and intellectual versus emotional appeal gave Bances Candamo the ammunition he needed to defend the theater as he refuted Fray Ignacio de Camargo in the first draft of *Teatro de los teatros*. Bances had difficulty adhering to his own ideas behind *decir sin decir* in his political works, which led to him leaving Madrid in 1694. However, court theater would remain a part of court culture through the end of Carlos II's reign. Bances Candamo, Camargo, and Lope de Vega allow contemporary scholars to analyze the role of theater in Baroque Spanish society and culture, and the dramatic differences that transpired over the course of the century. Leading twentieth-century research and theoretical production on seventeenth-century Spanish theater was José Antonio Maravall: a scholar defined by his cultural context. Today, late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century scholarship has moved past many of the limitations inherent to Maravall's theories and has begun to consider what these works *do* and how they are characterized.

---

[28] Bances Candamo may have left the court as early at 1693, but scholars are unclear as to the official date, hesitant to do more than suggest the year.

New Approaches to Theater: The Imagined Community and Pervasive Shared Agency

To begin, one of the ways in which court theater in particular can be characterized is as an imagined community. By subscribing to Benedict Anderson's views of nations as imagined communities, at first glance, seventeenth-century Spain itself might appear to be an imagined community as "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (6). It was also "an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (6). However, Anderson posits that imagined communities are comprised of a camaraderie existing on a horizontal plane, and his understanding of what a sovereign entity is, is defined by the ideas around sovereignty after the degradation of dynastic hierarchies (7). Therefore, Spain can not be considered as an imagined community in the seventeenth century as it violates the second of Anderson's three conditions; nations as imagined communities emerge as a possibility only after "the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centers—monarchs who were persons apart from other human beings and who ruled by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation" lost its significance in "men's minds" (36). However, if we consider the court its own entity, it is possible to classify the expansive community that was the theater of the court as its own imagined community.

In demonstrating this imagined connectivity of Spain and its territories, there is one example in particular that I would like to consider: Calderón's *La estatua de Prometeo*. Written for Mariana, Greer posits that it is likely the artistic influence from Vienna was responsible for motivating the creation of *La estatua de Prometeo.* In 1670 nine copies of an opera titled *Benche vinto, vince amore ò il Prometeo* were sent to the court in Madrid, four of which were given to

Queen Regent Mariana. Greer proposes this led Mariana to ask Calderón to write her his own version of the play.[29]

Regardless of the direct motivation that led to Mariana asking Calderón to write his own Prometheus-Pandora play, the sheer fact that the story and script of *Benche vinto, vince amore ò il Prometeo* was gifted to the court in Madrid is evidence of the artistic connection between Vienna and Madrid. The courtly artistic community exists as its own imagined community, limited by its definition of being *courtly* art and exchange, with those who comprised the community being fellow-members that did not know each other individually. This community extends throughout the vast expanse of the Spanish Habsburg court's reach with their territories in present day Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Milan and Flanders, and it is connected by other examples such as Bances Candamo's use of the basic framework of the Italian story of *Orlando Furioso* in creating his own *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso* and the Italian opera's influence on the creation of the Spanish *zarzuela*.[30] These connections, influences, shared stories, and artistic inspirations unify the theaters of the court into an imagined community, a community defined by its shared agency.

This notion of agency is a key characteristic of the theater, whether of the *corral de comedias* or of the court. In particular, what is striking is the presence of shared agency in the production process of a play. Agency is frequently forgotten or largely ignored, perhaps as an

---

[29] For more on *La estatua de Prometeo*, its commission, and the influence of *Benche vinto, vince amore ò il Prometeo*, see chapter three's section: "Factions Divided: Political Tensions of the 1670s".

[30] It should go without saying these certainly were not the only Italian influences on Spanish artistic production.

unintentional consequence of avoiding the controversial idea of analyzing authorial intent. However, agency, intention, and author intent are distinct concepts, and the former two merit closer evaluation. Let me begin by defining these terms in order to clearly separate agency and intention from author intent. Agency is the individual's participation in an activity. The collaboration of these individuals under the right conditions, evaluated below, results in shared agency, as two or more work toward a (common) goal.[31] A shared goal and a shared intention may be different, as I might intend that we produce a play, but you might intend that you only do your part, while our shared goal may be to produce the play. We both wish to produce the play, but the way in which we each intend to see that come to fruition may be different. However, when the intention is common among multiple agents, we have shared intention. Therefore, according to philosophical theory of agency and intention, shared agency and shared intention are intrinsically linked as Scott Shapiro notes: "Shared agency, it is natural to say, is distinguished from individual agency by virtue of the intentions of the agents" (259). According to Shapiro, these participants are all committed to and invested in the success of the activity (258). However, I will prove that this is not necessarily true. In applying these ideas of agency and intention to the creative process of theater production, it is evident that the theater presents a multi-facetted web of shared agency and shared intention with a unique understanding of the role authority plays in these relationships. Multiple shared intentions exist, creating microcosms of agency and intention within the larger framework of shared intention, and for those who do not share the group's intention, they will exist as alienated participants.

Typically, theory on agency—including that of Michael Bratman—has considered rather small projects and instances of shared intention where the individuals share an equal interest and

[31] We will see later that the goal and intention need not be shared to have shared agency.

commitment to the project, and all possess roughly the same power throughout the process. Shapiro notes that this has two limitations: it does not consider the presence of authority, and it does not entertain the idea of massively shared agency. In the case of theatrical productions, I am not concerned with Shapiro's work to situate massively shared agency in the discussion on agency as its examples are defined by such instances as contemporary large scale corporations, and clearly falls outside the scope of this project. However, I agree with Shapiro that Bratman's lack of consideration of the impact and potential consequences of the presence of an authority figure should garner further attention. For my purposes it is precisely the idea of patronage and the role of authority in shared agency that makes some of these relationships particularly indispensible to our understanding dramatic art within the context of the seventeenth-century Spanish court.

In dealing with the court, there are four sets of relationships included here that all exist under the ideas of shared agency and intention, although the ways in which they can be explained and analyzed differ.[32] This difference is in large part due to the role authority plays in agency and intention, as we will see later on. The first relationship is that of a playwright and their patron. In my work here the patron will always be Mariana of Austria or Carlos II, and the playwrights considered may be many, although I will frequently reference Bances Candamo due to his official status as Court Playwright, and Calderón de la Barca. Although Calderón was not officially a playwright for the court, that title was merely a formality as Calderón wrote plays specifically for the court—and its monarchs—as well as collaborated closely with the court

[32] As this project deals with court theater, I am defining these relationships as pertaining to and within the court. That being said, some of these relationships and groupings exist in the *corrales* as well. The ideas presented here, when appropriate, need not be limited to the court.

scenographers for years. In this playwright-patron relationship there is an intensification of the authority figure for which neither Michael Bratman nor Scott Shapiro account. Shapiro largely considers cases of authority in which the authority figure is agreed upon or chosen from a group to lead said group. The conclusions that accompany that assumption attempt to justify and explain the relationship between the authority figure and the subordinate(s), including how to approach planning, sub-plans, and the meshing of those plans in a way that at times can be irrelevant due to the position of the monarch as such an authority. The other relationship considered here is that of the *autor*—that is to say, the director of sorts—and the company of actors. It is here where authority will most closely resemble Shapiro's description of its function. Additionally, the actors themselves, amongst each other have their own shared intentions and agency, and finally I include the section artists themselves as a group all their own. When I refer to "section artists" I am calling upon those artists that were put in charge of specific production elements. For example, Cosimo Lotti as scenographer, Juan Hidalgo as a musician of the court, those who painted frontispieces, etc. Although among any of these groups any individual may have their own intentions, and therefore experience alienation (as discussed later), they have shared agency in staging the production.

Although agency can be shared among the whole of the group that works to stage a production—from commissioning, to writing, to acting—it should be remembered that intentions can in fact be individual, and they need not be shared. Although the group may have the broad shared intention of staging the production, in which case their shared intention is universal, it is also possible for each individual to have their own individual intentions about the process whose execution will contribute to the success of the universally shared intention. This universally shared intention marks my framework, and this is where we begin to see the layers and levels of

distinct intentions. What is imperative to the production is that minimally each participant intends to do their own share. That is to say, the painter does not have to intend that he does his own work and that the carpenter does his work, and the carpenter does not have to intend that he does his work and that the painter does his own work. If they did, they would have shared plural intentions (Shapiro 260).[33] Rather, the painter need only intend to paint the sets, and the carpenter need only intend to construct them. However, should they share such intentions, they will have to coordinate their planning and their actions. Shapiro explains Bratman's contention: "Shared intention coordinate[s] the actions of each participant toward the realization of their goal" (260). In other words, the painter cannot paint the sets before the carpenter has constructed them, and therefore the two will have to coordinate their actions and their planning to execute their intentions. Shapiro also suggests that Bratman's original model requires a third condition that there be the possibility of bargaining in case of conflict. This third condition will be rendered moot in the presence of a strong authority figure. Bargaining in those situations will not be necessary. What will be necessary is the adaptability of those in a subordinate position to change their sub-plans and conform them to the new intentions of the authority figure.

Before moving on to analyze sub-plans, meshing, and role of the authority figure, there is one more point to be elucidated in relation to coordinated actions and planning. It is possible to

---

[33] Shapiro clarifies in his discussion on shared intentions the notion of interlocking intentions: if my intent is that we both do out part is based on your intent that we both do our part, and vice versa, we have interlocking intentions. Here, these intentions need not be interlocking, only shared. I intended I do my work and you do you work, as uninfluenced by your intention that you do your work and I do my work. For more on interlocking intentions see Shapiro's 2014 chapter, "Massively Shared Agency".

coordinate actions without coordinating planning. In this case, the activity will occur in a manner that at least one person did not plan. For example, let us imagine that an actor and *autor* have interlocking intentions of staging a play. That is, they both rely on the other's intention that they both do their part. If in the activity of staging a play an *autor* contends that the actor must enter stage left, and the actor insists he should enter stage right, their plans are not coordinated. Although their actions may be coordinated as one directs, the other acts, and the actor will enter the scene, their plans have not meshed. Should the actor enter stage right as he wished, the activity of staging the play did come about, but not in the manner the *autor* intended. Shapiro confirms: "Although our interlocking intentions led us to coordinate our actions, they did not lead us to coordinate our planning. Our activity came about in a manner that one of us did not plan" (262). Their goal was met, and the intention to stage the production came to fruition. However, they have broken the second of Bratman's rules—that you must have shared intentions in shared activity—rendering coordinated planning moot in low-consequence scenarios, such as this one.

All of these processes included sub-plans and the meshing of said sub-plans. Sub-plans are the finite details of a shared intention. In order for a shared activity to be successful, we all have to "intend" in accordance with the sub-plans and these plans have to mesh (Shapiro 262). If we cannot cooperate and accept the sub-plans, our attempt will fail by the threat of the halt of the shared activity until we can remedy and mesh our sub-plans. For example, if Mariana and Calderón have the shared intention of having a new play produced for Mariana's birthday, and they have shared agency, each doing their own part—Mariana commissioning and Calderón writing—it is possible for their sub-plans not to mesh. If Mariana wishes something mythological to be written, and Calderón writes about love and jealousy without implementing a

mythological framework, not only did their plans come about in a way Mariana did not wish due to the lack of coordinated planning, but their sub-plans did not mesh either. In this case, the lack of a mesh does not prohibit the emergence of a new script, and that shared activity of having a new script written can be seen as successful. That is to say we can have shared agency in producing a new script, but we have individual intention and individual agency on the part of the playwright that function below the patron's individual intention to produce a play because they did not coordinate their actions or their planning. Thus, the failure of the thematic nature of the work to mesh with Mariana's sub-plans may result in the play not being staged, or at least not being staged for the present intended purpose of her birthday. Until Calderón and Mariana can mesh their sub-plans, Calderón's work will not be staged for her birthday.

Let us consider more detailed hypothetical example. *Fieras afemina amor* was meant to be staged in December of 1671 for Mariana's birthday. At her behest it was moved to January 1672. Should the artists boldly have gone against their monarch and have staged the play in 1671 it would have been because they did not mesh their sub-plans to those of Mariana. The play would have come about; its representation would have been realized. However, it would have come to fruition in a way Mariana did not intend.[34]

In general, Shapiro states: "Each [individual] must be committed to adjusting their intentions in light of the intentions of other members of the group, or at least committed to convincing the others to adjust their intention so as to achieve a mesh" (263). In a case where all individuals share the same authority level, I agree with Shapiro; negotiation, or the

[34] This was not an actual problem in staging *Fieras afemina amor*. We will see shortly that Mariana's authority authorizes her to make the necessary changes to avoid situations like this hypothetical.

aforementioned bargaining must take place in order to mesh sub-plans. However, in instances with Mariana, we have the unique presence of authority. In the first hypothetical I proposed between Mariana and Calderón, Mariana has the right to replace or eliminate Calderón in this particular process. She has the right to find another playwright, or repeat an older, previously staged work, there-by eliminating Calderón's role in the process of this particular production. Authority has given Mariana the option to not mesh her sub-plans with Calderón's, nor to have to request or wait for Calderón to mesh his sub-plans to hers as Shapiro suggests others must do in order to follow the lead of an authority figure. Shapiro explains that it has to be part of the participant's sub-plan to mesh their other sub-plans with that of the authority figure's, should the authority figure modify their sub-plans. Should Mariana assume that Calderón would modify his sub-plan to hers as needed, we have a case of vertically interlocking intentions. This means part of subject's sub-plan is to modify their plans according to the authority's plans, *and* the authority's plan includes the assumption that the subject will modify. This can arise in any of the relationships posited here that present automatically with or with the potential for an authority figure. Shapiro states that vertically interlocking intentions are insufficient in creating reasonable authority (267). This will only hold true in instances where authority is created by the activity. We will see later, that just the opposite is possible: the authority may allow for the nature of the activity. Additionally, Shapiro does not account for instances in which the authority figure has no obligation to respect the agency and intention of the participant. In Mariana's case, she may bypass Calderón if she wishes and have another play staged. Her intentions in no way need be reliant on Calderón's agency, intention, or will to modify his sub-plans.

This example functions so because authority is a top-down model between the monarchs and their court. Shapiro argues that in order to have a shared intentional activity you must have

mutual responsiveness of intention. That is to say, all must be attuned to one another's sub-plans. Additionally, Shapiro notes that there must be mutual responsiveness in action. Participants have to be aware of others' behavior and be able to adjust their own behavior to achieve the intended results. The authority figure as well has to be attuned to the intentions and actions of its participants, according to Shapiro. Specifically: "The function of authorities in [shared intentional activities] is to ensure than the participants' actions are organized so that goals of the activity can be achieved" (269). For example, Mariana of Austria oversaw the painting of the ceiling of the Hall of Mirrors. To ensure the frescos were painted as the monarchs saw fit, Mariana and Felipe IV did oversee the artists' actions presumably to ensure the activity was done as they desired. It is imperative to remember though that in these instances with the monarch, their lack of attentiveness does not imply the goal will not be achieved. The monarch has the option to rely on others to do their job in their absence because of the power and authority their position carries.

Let us consider the example given by Shapiro. His example presents an agreed upon captain among a group of friends sailing. Shapiro says the captain may not revise her own plans, but she will negotiate or bargain to get the others on board with her plan. This model fits for all the relationships, except that of the monarch and their relation with the playwright, or with any other artist in the court for that matter. The actors yes, will have to work together, mesh sub-plans, and modify their own actions and behavior to adapt to the situation. It is even reasonable to consider that an *autor* might have to negotiate, justify, or bargain with his actors. How these individuals adhere to the plan defines whether or not it is shared intentional activity, and by consequence, each singular representation of a play has the potential to be a shared intentional activity – or not – depending on the adherence to these guidelines.

This is not to say that the monarch would not be willing to engage in such activities. Rather, their authority level, authorized by their nobility, in no way obligates them to do so. Of course it is then hypothetically possible to argue that according to Shapiro's explanation the monarch, in not participating in mutual responsiveness of intention and mutual responsiveness in action, does not engage in a shared intentional activity. This is simply not true. As long as those working to stage the production have built into their sub-plan the assumption that they will mesh their own sub-plans with those of the monarch, staging the production—from start to finish—is a shared intentional activity. It is not the obligation of the authority figure to build into their own sub-plans the need to bargain or negotiate. Due to vertically interlocking intentions—that is to say, it may be part of the monarch's sub-plan that those not in the same authority position will have built into their sub-plan the intention to mesh via what I call compliance—the greater the authority, the less necessary it will be that the authority figure defaults to negotiation to alter other's sub-plans. However, it is possible for the subject to participate in resistance, or defiance.

Cases of defiance pose a contradiction on the part of the participant in the case that they entered the activity planning to mesh their sub-plans with those of the authority figure. Should someone's sub-plan include the intention to defer to the authority figure they will be in direct conflict with their intention to defer if they choose to defy the authority's orders. Shapiro explains: "If someone submits to the authority of another and yet ignores an order directed to him, then he will be acting in a manner inconsistent with his intentions" (268). Shapiro notes that it is irrational not to revise your sub-plan as your authority figure wishes, unless you have good reason to reconsider. Even though "agents might nonetheless be irrational for submitting to authority in the first place" once they have accepted and incorporated the intention to modify their sub-plans in accordance with the authority figure, they will still need just cause to break

that intention (268). As an example we can consider the staging of a fight scene. If the *autor* decided the actors should use real weapons, rather than stage props, an actor might find just reason in rejecting the plans of the *autor* due to the potential harm actors may accidentally incur from the presence of a real weapon. Therefore, defiance under compliance to an authority figure found just cause.

Shapiro offers us two more characteristics of the role and emergence of authority in shared intentional activities. The first is that frequently these situations do "not show us how to determine whether someone has J-authority, only that certain inferences can be generated from such a determination" (267). J-authority here is defined as authority in the shared intentional activity, and this applies to situations in which the authority figure has been chosen within the parameters Shapiro outlines. These parameters delineate a rather democratic election of someone in the group to be the authority figure. Therefore, it can be hard in analyzing these groupings, such as the actors or the artists, to determine who exactly would have had authority because this authority is more closely aligned with a leadership position. Under Shapiro's model, just because we elected one person to captain our sailing outing this time, does not mean that person will always fill the authority role. However, we can make certain suppositions as to the relationship this authority has with the rest of their group, such as the aforementioned requirements for meshing etc. In these situations the authority figure may choose to delegate or defer tasks to others: "When others know more than we do about what we do and can be trusted to point us in the right direction, or when we can conserve precious cognitive resources by deferring to others without risking too much error, we should plan for others to plan for us" (Shapiro 268). For example, a scenographer may call for the frontispiece to be represented in a certain manner, but he will defer the task of construction to a carpenter and the task of painting to a painter. This idea

will crumble at the authority level of the monarch, as their authority comes from the legitimacy of their bloodline and their status as king or queen regent/queen mother.

The second characteristic in question that Shapiro offers us is the following: "It is plausible to suppose that authority relations in a [shared intentional activity] are created in part by that very activity" (267). Imagine once again Shapiro's example of a boat outing. Shapiro posits that a previous unsuccessful outing that lacked leadership has motivated the group to choose an authority figure for this second outing. Therefore, the nature of the activity, and the previous experience of the boaters, led to the development of an authority relationship within the group. In the case of the troupe-*autor* relationship this may be true. The activity's need of direction, as well as any experience without that authority figure leads to and maintains the need for the position. However, in the playwright-monarch relationship the monarch's authority as a patron and in commissioning a play is not created by the activity. Rather, their patronage has created a platform for the activity. This is due to the fact that the authority of the monarch in this particular relationship is not generated, it is preexisting, pre-established, and generally accepted.

The last element to consider in this evaluation of agency, intention, and authority in the relationships that comprised dramatic production is the role of alienation. I previously mentioned alienation as the outcome for an individual who has his or her own intentions. Shapiro explains that the traditional models of agency posit that "shared agency requires shared plural intentions, not just shared plural goals" (272). Other academics such as David Velleman have argued that this statement can be unnecessary and too strong. I agree with Velleman's hesitation, but I believe there is a middle ground that can be struck here in relation to court drama. This middle ground is that if we both intended to do our individual parts, and if we both complete our

intentions, we have shared agency and shared activity in the staging of the production.[35] All I have to intend is that I do my part. You likewise can do your part, and intend to do you part, without me intending that you do your share. In other words, we do not have interlocking intentions. We have individual intentions of only doing our own share of the work, regardless of anyone else's involvement. In these cases, where the individual has only intended to do their part, this person is considered alienated. Bratman would surely disagree stating that we cannot share agency if we did not share the intention. However, if my intention is to do my piece, I have still shared in the agency of producing the play, but not in the intention. That is to say, my agency did not support my intention to only do my work, and I did not do my work under the assumption that it would stand alone. Further clarifying: my intention may be to get paid. I am not concerned with the success of the staging of the play or whether or not all the components needed to stage the play are complete by the time the representation begins. I did my share of the work because my work provided earnings. Nevertheless, I have shared agency and shared activity in creating the finished product for the stage. Regardless of my intention, my part contributes to the group's activity of staging the play.

After ignoring the possibility of an authority figure that permits the activity (and not vice versa), the next biggest flaw in the contemporary philosophical theory surrounding shared agency and shared intention is the assumption that if a group succeeds, they fit the model of shared agency and shared intentions. Shapiro adds: "Without some centralized control over behavior, the odds that many people will organize themselves toward the same objective and resolve their conflicts in a peaceful and efficient manner is apt to be low" (258). Shapiro is

[35] Shapiro likewise contends that shared agency does not require the same motives for each participant in order for them to engage in shared activity (270).

considering the involvement of the authority figure here, but he repeats something that is of particular interest: the assumption of the resolution of conflicts in a peaceful manner. Shapiro never defines what is "peaceful". Is it a lack of violence? A lack of confrontation? I find it highly unlikely under these group conditions that nobody argued, or passionately disagreed. I cannot imagine all resolution as "peaceful", especially in situations in which the authority figure does not have such a strong presence, or is altogether absent. Group success is not necessarily contingent upon peaceful resolution and shared intentions. An individual may be an alienated participant, but in doing his share the group successfully completes the task. These cases of alienated participants prove that shared agency is not reliant on shared plural intentions, and we can definitively characterize dramatic representations by shared agency and shared activity.

These notions of shared agency, intentions, activity, and alienated participants allow for the consideration of the working relationships in seventeenth-century theater through a philosophical lens. Authority in the case of the theater does not have to plan to negotiate or bargain in all scenarios, as previous models have suggested, however. While an authority figure may choose to negotiate, and even defer certain tasks to others, in the case of the monarch, their position in the court is what grants them their authority and even nullifies a priori the possibility of negotiation. Additionally, it is their authority that allows for the activity, proving an exception to the previously held thought that the activity creates a position for authority. Finally, I showed that staging a play exists as the universally shared intention providing the basic framework to begin considering these concepts. However, within the framework of universally shared intention, there are varying and differing cases of intention and agency. I have demonstrated that when a participant does not share in the universally shared intention they are an alienated participant. Yet, they still may have shared agency. Their individual intentions and individual

agency in doing their own part allow for them to have shared agency in staging the play. My research has only begun to scratch the surface of shared agency's place in defining theater's relationships in the production process, but in the very least I have begun to understand how the relationships in court drama fit or contradict philosophy's notion of authority in shared actions.

Maravall, Greer, and Egginton: Approaches to the Golden Age and Their Applications to Theatrical Analysis

The ideas presented here of imagined communities and shared agency have come a long way since the days of more traditional schools of thought on theater analysis. For example, in the chapter titled, "Una cultura dirigida" from his work *La cultura del Barroco: Análisis de una estructura histórica*, Maravall explains that the forces that guided the culture of the Baroque acted over *la voluntad* of an individual, driving them to a conformity which produced characteristics of the masses. For Maravall, the theater is a social practice that adheres to certain obligations under an ideology it cannot escape. This ideology for Maravall is ever present. Here, Althusser would remind us that it is not about what the people believe, but rather presenting them with what they think they believe. William Egginton refers to Kant explaining that this is "mak[ing] room for faith", and once this has been established it is easy to keep fooling the masses (qtd. in *The Theater of Truth* 4). Egginton also explains that the purpose of a propagandistic apparatus as such "was to have their target audience form a 'passionate attachment' to a particular version of the world" (*How the World* 155).[36] Under Maravall's framework, art is not ideologically free, and according to Walter Benjamin, the fact that a work of art even exists is a paradox. Under this Frankfurt school of thought, a work of art was inspired by a tangible subject that the art can never be. Nevertheless, it exists in spite of this. However,

[36] Egginton uses Maravall's words here from *La cultura del Barroco.*

the ideological referent here is not tangible either. Therefore, under a combination of Benjamin and Maravall, the work of art exists in relation to and under the ideology that produces it. However, it is imperative to call attention to the fact that ideology exists under something that is bigger than the ideology, which is the Baroque itself. The Baroque, I argue, is bigger than the Spanish monarch and the ideology that radiates from the State. In other words, the Baroque is larger than the State apparatus of control. Contemporary scholars have begun to explore this idea, and have begun to discuss the unique nature of the population, individuals, and works of the period.

One such scholar, Anthony Cascardi, asserts that: "Maravall thought that the *comedia* represented an attempt to impose a fixed social stratification. But the genre was less socially doctrinal than reflective. It was a social mirror. What seems an attempt to *impose* fixed social forms was an effort to unify a national existence that had grown increasingly polyvalent and disparate rather than tightly unified" (122). In accordance with MacKay's thinking, an ideology is just that: an ideal. MacKay explains, for example, that the "appearance of monarchs *deus ex machina* at the end of *comedia* does not mean that the Spanish Habsburgs ruled with absolute power" (qtd. in Bass 3) or that individuals were fooled into thinking there was absolute rule. Therefore, Maravall's views on theater offer one prescribed reading of the work: a decidedly propagandistic interpretation that is assumed to be present from the onset of the production and therefore taints the reader/observer's views and readings of a work. While it is frequently possible to identify and trace these trends and representations of stately power in Baroque theater, they lend themselves to a rather over-simplified view of the production and are dependent on a stereotypical resolution provided by the authority figure in the last 200-300 verses.

Additionally, in her work *The Play of Power: Mythological Court Dramas of Calderón de la Barca*, Margaret Greer carefully walks the line between Maravall and more contemporary criticisms. Greer eloquently outlines the ways in which Maravall's theories can be upheld (in relation to Calderón's works specifically). She also highlights the overarching nature of his perspective, which demonstrates that his view cannot be all encompassing. She states: "Calderón's mythological court plays, while a genre unique to Spain, were also part of an explosion of spectacular court entertainment throughout Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Such spectacles were, in a general sense, both a tool and an expression of absolutist rule" (7). However, Greer herself begins to pull away from this line of thinking and is more closely aligned with MacKay when she conveys that these works did not express or impose an absolute power that existed, but rather, "provided[ed] an image of an ideal state that was to *serve as a model* for ruler and subjects" (7; emphasis added).

Egginton as well proposes that the poetic text (and I would add, theatrical representation) should present an individual as they *ought* to behave, not as an actual representation of the State.[37] For his purposes Egginton uses Cervantes's work to explain that he teaches by example, which suspended judgments of truth or falsity and undermined the agenda of the State. The purpose is not to promote the State ideology, but rather to consider an ideal. It goes without saying that if its sole function were to promote the agenda of the State, why do we see diverse themes such as violence, honor, and strength of the female character carefully developed over

[37] This idea was put forth by William Egginton in his April 2015 presentation: "*Don Quixote*, Fiction, and the Politics of Irony" a talk inspired by the last chapter of his book: *The Man Who Invented Fiction.* I have maintained the citation of the talk in this instance because it more succinctly presents this idea.

2900 lines if only the last 200 need be considered to analyze the work? How do I then justify the technological advances, the evolution of the *zarzuela*, and the subversive political conversations that infiltrated theater if court drama's only purpose was to perpetuate the rhetoric of the state? The reading of theater for the masses as expression of the State ignores too much.

More boldly McKendrick states "to claim that the theatre . . . was directly harnessed to the purposes of government and class is seriously to underestimate the complexity of the relationship between the Spanish theater of the day and the society that produced it" (qtd. in Thacker 177). Jonathan Thacker, in his work *A companion to Golden Age Theater*, describes the people of the time: "Spain was not a homogeneous whole but a country with a large population of *conversos* (from Islam and Judaism) and a good number of intelligent and perspicacious individuals who could see fault-lines in the world as it was presented to them" (xii). This illustrates how it is possible to break the mold of a singular passive mass receiving the ideological message of the State through the apparatus of the theater. While presented to the masses, reception was not necessarily constructed by the masses at all levels, nor accepted passively. Passive acceptance does not function in the court of the seventeenth century for two reasons. The first is the court's active role in performing in and around these productions. Theater was not something to accept passively, but rather a pastime to enjoy and in which the members of the court could participate. Secondly, theater was not used in the court as a form of control, but rather a medium through which one could present and question the politics of the time.[38] Additionally, the court was comprised of individuals "who would see fault-lines in the world as it was presented to them" who were writing theater that questioned, challenged, and contemplated the problems of the time, such as Bances Candamo.

[38] See chapter three.

Now, there were a few ways to understand the theater of the *corrales* as a debate around 1600: in relation to antiquity, as the imagination of a creator, or from the role of the reader/spectator. The ethical debate we find here is how should theater produce meaning. Cervantes proceeds with the idea that he is addressing a heterogeneous audience, and critiques Lope and how Lope feeds ideological uniformity. Lope turns the public into a spectator with uniform feeling among the masses. Cervantes is not the only one accusing Lope of ideological uniformity. Both Nicholas Spadaccini and Taléns in their introduction to *El rufián dichoso*, as well as Maravall, accuse Lope of the same.[39] This is the ethical problem defined clearly, which leads us to the question Spadaccini and Taléns attempt to answer: as an audience member—particularly in Lope's model—how do I remain an "I"? Rather, how do I not become a part of the mass of emotion? How can one maintain the individual relationship that the act of reading carries as part of the audience of a theatrical representation? This answer we can find in the role of the monarch, and in the individual's experience and exposure to the information presented in a production.

To begin with the analysis of the role of the monarch, writing for the monarch is a convention of a sub-genre and is performed for more people than the individual person for which the production was written. The monarch becomes a representative member of the audience, and therefore we could still assume ideological uniformity. Theater is a convention of court life, not

---

[39] Although not being addressed here, this is a good place to note that it is this ideological uniformity that allows Lope to create the theater as mass media. Without a grandiose unifying factor, Lope's theater would not be *mass* media, and instead we would be discussing the theater as something niche or queer, where the word "queer" adheres to the explications presented in Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner's article "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about *X*?"

court drama, and the ideological uniformity radiates from the monarch. However, the monarch has maintained a one-on-one relationship with drama because he or she is not dependent on anyone else's reaction or interpretation from of which to model their reactions. Therefore, we have what are plausibly taken to be the values of the monarch, their individual self, and the space they inhabit, projected to other members of the court. This becomes a vicious cycle if we identify an exclusive pleasure with someone like Felipe IV, as I will show in the fourth chapter Varey does. The only convention dictating the monarch's reaction is court etiquette on physical displays of behavior or expression of emotion. Although, we can say that just because the monarch may not display their reaction to a work, does not mean they have not maintained a one-on-one relationship with the presentation.

Additionally, consideration must be made for the case of the *particulares*, or private productions presented to the king or queen in private quarters. The idea of ideological uniformity among the public or uniform audiences does not apply in this instance. In these situations there is no "uniform mass" to be had as the *particulares* were represented for the private enjoyment of the monarch, and therefore break with the models and suppositions of Maravall and Lope de Vega. They are as close to an isolated experience of the theater that as one could imagine. Therefore, we effectively have an answer to Spadaccini and Taléns' question, the monarch is the personification of the one-on-one relationship maintained, and we have the greatest fear of Maravall – the monarch as a model that could produce, and reproduce, uniformity. However, to assume uniformity does a disservice to these representations, which limits the various readings of these plays, where "readings" means interpretations. The problem with Maravall's approach is that it obligates all other readings be executed. That is to say, Maravall creates orthodoxy and heresy, and heresy must be blotted out. In true Baroque fashion, these works need to pay with the

blood that is the Spanish Baroque. However, it is precisely these other readings that have garnered my attention.

Another point to consider here is Birmingham's idea explained by Bass that, theater is not about the dramatic text, but rather, the most fundamental relationship that is the exchange between actor and spectator. Even the most propagandistic text could be rendered far less so by the gestures, actions, and tone of the performance of an acting company, especially when we consider the amount of changes a work for the *corral* underwent once sold to the *autor* of the theater company. While critiques of the monarch or their reign may have been masked or made more subtle by techniques such as Bances' *decir sin decir*, they were not necessarily eliminated. This combination of factors begins to open the door to the individual experience. However, the question becomes, how do I maintain an individual relationship with the work if I am not the monarch? The answer can be found in William Egginton's most recent work on the role of fiction.

In his most recent book, *The Man Who Invented Fiction: How Cervantes Ushered in the Modern World*, William Egginton discussed the relationship between expression and truth, as well as how one can learn through exposure, and fiction's role in this learning process. Specifically, Egginton discusses the idea of expression perverting truth, and cites Wilde as saying: "Man is least himself when he talks in his own person. Give him a mask, and he will tell you the truth" (164). In application to the theater, this is not to say the stage is equal to the truth that exists in the audience's reality. Rather, theater can discuss the truths of the time through the characters represented on stage. Additionally, I argue, that the stage is its own truth. It has its own set of governing principles within the court, its own structure, and timing, etc. The cosmos of the stage is in and of itself its own reality with one foot in the reality, as we know it, a group

of actors abiding by certain theatrical norms, as well as a mirror of the society it wishes to discuss.

Egginton continues by mentioning the relationship between exposure and knowledge as seen by Leibniz.[40] Egginton comments: "In the modern world … thinkers such as Leibniz could start to envision how works of imagination could benefit knowledge as opposed to detract from it, not because such works necessarily pointed to a greater or more general truth, as in Aristotle's defense of poetry, but because they saw them as essential to how we think" (165). This relationship for Leibniz was described orally by Egginton as follows: mere exposure to a concept, fact, or topic increases one's knowledge base, even if what is presented to the individual is not true ("*Don Quixote*"). Therefore, the fictitious reality presented on the stage has the power to teach, and increase one's knowledge, independent of the factual merit of the work. Additionally, this will tie in and contribute to the one-to-one relationship discussed when considering Spadaccini and Taléns' question: how do I stay an *I* while consuming something that is being presented to a group? The theories here of Leibniz and Egginton, working in conjunction, provide the spectator with the opportunity to increase their personal knowledge base solely with exposure to the work. Not everyone's exposure and experience will be the same, thus creating a unique knowledge base in each individual who leaves the production space. Although Egginton does not address the theater specifically, this is what he describes as individuals in relation to their communities. The simple act of taking in a production is an act by the individual that increases their unique knowledge base in relation to and within their community. This

[40] Leibniz earns little attention in Egginton's final chapter, but did occupy a larger portion of his talk "*Don Quixote*, Fiction, and the Politics of Irony", given April 23, 2015. In addition to the space in his book dedicated to this topic, his lecture influences this section as well.

recognition of the individual in relation to their community defends the subjective interpretation of events, instead of a textual review, as well as produces a unique knowledge base through the individual's exposure to a unique combination of consumed productions: i.e. not every individual saw the same play produced by the same acting troupe, during the same run, on the same day, nor could they have all constructed the exact same meaning from the work. The audience member's personal corpus of plays attended is unique to the individual and therefore creates a singular and independent knowledge base. This idea is foundational for the analysis of theater as I constantly push to consider plays in the form in which they were intended to be consumed: as production and performance, not as a text. Although the text is what links us to the production that exists in a cultural past in relation to our present, the playwright's text should not stand on its own.

Egginton's point becomes, "it was fiction that taught us to think about ourselves this way in the first place" (178). Everything could exist here for the benefit of the individual (178). Under Egginton's effort to work within the framework of the *Quixote*, this makes Don Quixote the ultimate enchanter making of his surroundings what he wishes. This fiction then pits desire against reality (180). Converging on all of Egginton's ideas, desire in the fictitious plane does not produce a reality outside of that plane. However, desire here can produce a new reality, the truth of which is irrelevant and its simple creation and your exposure to it increases your knowledge in the reality in which you exist at the moment.

Contemporary theory has moved past the idea of the theater as intrinsically linked to the State ideology. More careful consideration of the diversity of the seventeenth-century audience has allowed me to answer lingering questions about the theater; chiefly, I have resolved the question of individual experience through Egginton's work on fiction, reality, and the knowledge

base. This analysis does not rely on the consideration of the individual as a collective part of the masses. Rather, it considers the individual's unique knowledge base, and pertains to the audience of the *comedia de corrales* as much as it does to the courtly and exclusively monarchical ones.

Conclusions

Now at its conclusion, there are three main points that should be taken away from this chapter. The first is that the applications of theories set forth by Lope de Vega have to be reconsidered in analyzing court theater. While Lope's *Arte nuevo* can be utilized to describe theater as mass media he fails to address the court and can perpetuate the idea of ideological uniformity. Additionally, Miguel Ángel Garrido Gallardo has shown that *Arte nuevo* is an elusive text. Therefore, to consider it as functional for only one purpose limits the expansive potential application the text has. It is our responsibility to extrapolate from *Arte nuevo* the characteristics of theater that comprise court drama as well. Bances Candamo and his work *Teatro de los teatros* should be used to understand the importance of literary decorum and the idea of *decir sin decir* in late seventeenth-century playwriting, particularly of the court. It was also this text that gave Bances a voice to refute *moralistas* such as Fray Ignacio de Camargo and the view of theater as a sin. Theater, as Bances saw it, was a means of expression that could be used to educate the king, and was an appropriate pass-time for the royal audience.

Additionally, the theater of the court can be seen as an imagined community extending throughout the expanse of the Spanish Empire and unified by artistic production and trends. The theater of this community contemplated political concerns of the period, entertained the royal audience, and was defined by its shared agency. These situations of shared agency I have proven have a basis for evaluation in contemporary philosophical theory, but present with their own

characteristics calling for a more intricate understanding of shared agency, shared intention, and authority if we are to apply these musings to the creative process of theater production.

Finally, I was left to address the question: How do I remain an *I* when consuming an art form that was, and is, performed for a group of people, whether that group be the public masses, or a group of elite members of the court. I have proven that the answer can be found in William Egginton's most recent work on Cervantes and the role of fiction. If it is assumed that exposure to any information increases one's knowledge in the world, regardless of the truth or falsity of said information, then exposure to the worlds and realities presented on the stage are capable of increasing one's knowledge base. As these productions in the Court served as models of how to carry oneself and contemplated questions of the period, they need not be presented in a factual manner or accurately depict real-life situations in order for them to be used as a tool to discuss relevant social or political concerns and (as we will see in chapter three) as a tool to educate the monarch(s).

Although I have shown that the theater, whether of the court or the *corral* was not intrinsically linked to the State ideology, this does not mean the theater was not influenced by the politics of the time. It is quite the opposite rather; the court theater of the late 1600s was deeply politically rooted, addressing two primary political situations. The first was the political tensions of the 1670s and the conflict between Mariana of Austria and Don Juan José. The second was the topic of succession and the concern for the lack of an heir to Carlos II. This concern was discussed throughout Carlos II's life and is prevalent in Bances Candamo's works from the early 1690s. The next chapter will explore to the political shifts and tensions of the 1670s and 1690s and their impact on court drama.

CHAPTER III

Politics and the Prince

Chapter two of this project considered the theoretical approaches to seventeenth-century theater and their implications in analyzing court theater. Analysis of theoretical frameworks such as imagined communities, *decir sin decir*, literary decorum, agency, and the role of the individual in theater consumption began to contextualize the theater produced in the court. It is now necessary to question how I can further investigate these works without imposing a framework that leads to an improper analysis of these plays. To do so, I have found the best approach is to evaluate these works within a historical framework. However, in order to delve deeply into the intricacies and idiosyncrasies of these works, careful review of late seventeenth-century politics sheds light on the strong ties between court theater and the political sphere of the late seventeenth century and permits a well framed investigation of *Fieras afemina amor* and *La estatua de Prometeo* by Pedro Calderón de la Barca and *La piedra filosofal* and *El esclavo en grillos de oro* by Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo.

There are several ways to approach the question of the relationship between art and politics. One might believe that theatrical production is just another propagandistic tool of the reigning ideology. However, as I have mentioned in chapter two, that is not the framework for this project, as: "In the last decades, the facile one-sided view of the *comedia* as nothing more than a monolithic and systematic propaganda machine—a view held for a long time by literary critics and historians alike—has been decidedly put to rest" (Quintero, *Gendering* 1). Therefore

if politics do not always ideologically manipulate the arts for their own agenda, how do we define the relationship between art and politics in the seventeenth century? Can we say that theater is independent except in relation to itself as Kreft does of the arts?[41] Our problem is that art, and theater, can fill every label assigned to them, and more. However, there is a tendency not to recognize that art exceeds our capacity to label it as we attempt to categorized and define functions of art as scholars. In a small case study from 2009, Irfan Nihan Demirel and Osman Altintas found seven distinct opinions about the relationship between art and politics in the community. Participant's opinions ranged from "art's politics is a revolutionist stance" to "the idea of art as a political view carries it away from its artistic ID and turns into something functional" (446). Demirel and Altintas also logged thirteen opinions on what contributions art makes to politics and introduced a new complication: art's politics. Is this then how we should approach art and politics; how art impacts politics with thirteen differing and overlapping labels classifying that relationship and arguably complicating the discussion further? Rather, I suggest that the relationship between art and politics is a mutual relationship that can be analyzed in either direction: how politics influences the arts, or how the arts play a role in politics. This chapter explores how politics influenced court drama of the 1670s and 1690s in Madrid, questions what role these plays served in seventeenth-century court culture, and asks what we can gain from them now. I have found, that independent of the playwright's personal affiliations or opinions, the plays written for the Madrid court in the 1670s question both sides of arguments

[41] Referenced from Demirel and Altintas: "Relationship Between Art and Politics." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, no. 51, 2012. Kreft's 2009 work *Sanat ve Siyaset, Kültür Çanda Sanat ve Kültürel Politika* has not been translated to English.

that occupied the political sector, and those of the 1690s proposed solutions to concerns of the time. These political concerns largely centered on questions of power, and as Quintero notes, gender (*Gendering*). These dynamics were "infinitely complex" and "the comedia also became a chronicle of societal anxieties or tension and a tentative vehicle for critique" (*Gendering* 1). Without the knowledge of the status of Spain in Europe during the seventeenth century and the happenings in the political sector during these decades, it would be impossible to thoroughly analyze the parallel political themes between royal theater and politics in these final decades. Therefore, this chapter will explore Spain's seventeenth-century history, and then, more closely investigate politics and drama at the end of the century.

There has been a tendency among contemporary scholars, unlike the last remaining Habsburg nobles, to give up on Spain by the 1670s, as it had been easy to ignore, especially after multiple economic crises, political turmoil, the death of Diego Velázquez in 1660, Felipe IV in 1665, and Calderón de la Barca in 1681. It seems as if the Golden Age were over. Even histories warn they will not forge into the last few decades of the century, such as Antonio Domínguez Ortiz' *The Golden Age of Spain (1516-1659).* Although the last decades of the seventeenth century in Habsburg Spain endured a trend of over all decline, and Carlos II's shortcomings in producing an heir would put the final nail in the Habsburg coffin, the 1680s in particular offered hope of revival and renewal of the Spanish Empire. John Elliott notes these trends and declares it unjust to ignore the last twenty to thirty years of the seventeenth century, as has been the tendency (*Its World* 266). To trudge through the seemingly hopeless end of the Spanish seventeenth century, as Christopher Storrs has done, is a lesson in resistance. Therefore, it does not seem quite right to give up on a country that, despite all signs of economic and political downturn, had not given up on itself.

The decline of Spain was a slow process, from a vast empire seen as a European powerhouse, to the dismal state of affairs it was as the Habsburg reign neared its end. The 1600s brought the last three Habsburg kings: Felipe III who inherited exorbitant debt and whose reign saw a widening economic gap between the Spanish empire and the monarchies of northern Europe (Elliott, *Wider World*); Felipe IV and his love of the theater; and Carlos II, the physically and mentally handicap king who could not produce an heir. No single event can be asked to carry the blame for Spain's downward spiral after nearly a century of poor spending, veracious wars, and ill-fated political transgressions. The Spain Carlos II inherited in the late seventeenth century was stained with the blood of the last several decades of war, and carried a ledger soaked in the ink telling of extravagant expenditures that had come to define the Habsburg court life. Although fiscal records for the length of the seventeenth century are incomplete across the board, we know that spending in military and political arenas remained high (Storrs 108-109), as did spending on court entertainment.

In attaining its vast political standing, Spain, as much of Europe, had a history of planning for their empire through unions *aeque principaliter*. In his work, *Spain, Europe & the Wider World, 1500-1800*, John Elliott explains that these unions were achieved through territorial acquisition or merger and/or political matrimonies, thereby maintaining the distinct identities of the regions represented through the union. The most notable was the 1580 union of Spain and Portugal with Felipe II officially gaining control of Portugal. In an effort to fortify this acquisition, an attempt at a customs ban was made at the boarders between the territories of Portugal and Spain; efforts to establish and support the customs ban were implemented in 1580, but abandoned it in 1592 (Elliott, *Wider World* 15) as such a ban contradicted a union *aeque principaliter*.

During the end of the sixteenth century, Spain would continue to enjoy its illustrious status and be the envy of others such as the English monarchy. After its union with Portugal, Spain would revel in another forty years of its elite status before its European and global image would begin to tarnish. With such success came lavish expenditures for court celebrations and entertainment represented for local and visiting courtiers alike. After all, what good is your illustrious image if you do not have the means to externally represent such a status? Greer and Varey note that in the Spanish court there was a desire within palace bureaucracy to control the finances, but everything was subject to the royal whim (*El teatro* 12), and Spain was trying to maintain its image despite decline. Although these celebrations further reinforced Spain as the envy of many, that does not mean that they did not hold high company. England also defined its early years of the seventeenth century by extreme expenditure. Elliott explains: "The first two decades of the seventeenth century, in Spain and England alike, were to be decades of lavish court expenditure. Vast sums were poured into banquets, masques and other court festivities, while courtiers competed in the richness of their clothing, their jewelry and the ostentation of their tables" (*Wider World* 265). In 1605 for example, the Earl of Nottingham and accompanying nobles traveled to the court in Valladolid and noted that they "were given a magnificent reception in Valladolid, and were treated to a round of festivities in the course of which no pains were spared to impress upon them the wealth and splendor of the Spanish court" (264). Extreme expenditure (within and outside of court entertainment) defined the Habsburg court for the rest of the century, and as economic downfalls plagued the court, the monarchs clung to rich visual representations of court life, both on and off the stage.

In 1617, with the Thirty Years War on the horizon, Spain's "free" revenue was 5,357,000 ducats with expenditure at twelve million, and by 1618, that "free" revenue had dropped to

1,601,000 ducats (Lynch 39). Despite this hard hit to the Crown's finances, expenditure persisted in the 1620s, a state of war plagued the Spanish for nearly the next four decades, and in the midst of the Thirty Years War (ending in 1648) Felipe IV ascended the throne in 1621 upon the death of his father. Royal favorite, Gaspar de Guzmán, the Count-Duke of Olivares, worked closely with Felipe IV in making him more visible in the court. Both Felipe II and III frequently remained behind closed doors bringing an exclusivity and reverence to the title of monarch. Felipe IV however, lover of the theater, would participate in making his presence more visible in the court, *performing* his title.[42] Politically, Olivares would use his influence in the court in Madrid to push for change. Olivares' agenda was to advocate for a more cohesive unification of the Spanish territories, pulling away from *aeque principaliter* and transitioning toward the ideals held in the slogan "many kingdoms but one law" (Elliott, *Wider World* 17). In particular, he saw military cooperation as imperative to the Empire's survival (17). This military union he named the Union of Arms, which provoked the Rebellions of 1640.[43] Additionally, Olivares sought economic reform (*Wider World* 46), but in the face of war, his agenda failed, which only validated those who clung to the Habsburg political traditions.

In addition to the Thirty Years War, Spain warred with England from 1625-1630, only further defeating Olivares' plans. England hoped to defeat Spain seeing their geographically divided state as a weakness that could easily be exploited (41). Despite the confident English

---

[42] For an investigation of the performance of the monarchs, see chapter four's section titled: "The Monarch as Spectacle and Plays for "His" Solace".

[43] For in-depth information on the Union of Arms' connection to the Rebellions of Catalonia and Portugal see John Lynch's book: *Spain Under the Habsburgs: Volume II Spain and America 1598-1700.*

attitude, Spain still was a force to be reckoned with, and would remain as such as they basked in overwhelming military and financial resources from the 1550s well into the 1650s; through the 1650s they proved they still had the power to defend their empire (41). This is a powerful statement that speaks to the wealth of political and financial resources Spain had at its disposal when considering the decades of war and the constant disappointments of the 1640s.[44]

The 1640s was by far one of the most devastating decades of the seventeenth century for Spain. In 1640, in the thick of the last decade of the Thirty Years War, both Portugal and Catalonia stage rebellions with Sicily and Naples following suit. Catalonia's rebellion ended in 1652 while Portugal's war with Spain would last until 1668, although they considered themselves an independent state from the outbreak of the rebellion. Despite what McKendrick calls Olivares' "visionary ruthlessness" (71), Felipe IV dismissed Olivares from court on January 24, 1643 announcing it in a letter to the Consejo de la Cámara (Elliott, *The Court* 649). After twenty-two years of royal service Olivares was relieved of his duties, including those he fulfilled as stage manager (*Wider World* 276).[45] As court extravagance was already a source of tension among the public in the mid-1640s, Olivares' dismissal carried the silver-lining possibility of keeping these tensions in check and under control. The following year Felipe IV's first wife,

---

[44] Due to how devastating the 1640s were, twentieth-century scholars marked it as defining the beginning of the end of the Spanish Empire. However, Elliott, among others, comments on Spain's fortitude well into the 1650s.

[45] In his book, *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in an Age of Decline***,** Elliott speculations that it was pity, rather than anger, coupled with Olivares' requests to withdraw from his royal duties (due to his own health concerns) that motivated Felipe IV's decision to guide Olivares into retirement.

Isabel of Bourbon, died, and his only legitimate male heir, Baltasar Carlos, died in 1646 at the age of sixteen, leaving María Teresa as heir. Despite having fathered eight children with Isabel, six of Felipe's children died before the age of two. Felipe IV had no intention to remarry, but the pressure to produce a male heir after Baltasar Carlos' death made him take his niece, Mariana of Austria, as his bride. She had been the intended bride of Baltasar Carlos and arrived at the court in Madrid in 1649 at barely fifteen years old (*Wider World* 297), fulfilling original plans to have her serve as Queen Consort in the court in Madrid. Mariana and Felipe IV would bring five children into the world, only two of which would survive to adulthood: Margarita Teresa and Carlos II.

In 1660 the Peace of the Pyrenees ended Spain's war with France that had begun in 1635 and would commence again in later decades as Louis XIV and his France vied for the Spanish crown. After the Peace of the Pyrenees, the 1660s marked a significant change in Spain's status as a fortified political, military, and financial entity. Spain was in an obvious state of decline although they resisted it feverishly. English opinion that had both envied and underestimated the Spain of the early seventeenth century realized that Spain's status was on the outs, and the Spanish Empire became a European model for a what not to do politically (Elliott, *Wider World* 42). The 1660s gave way to the 1670s and its intensifying political tensions between Mariana of Austria and Felipe IV's most famous illegitimate son, Don Juan José, who staged two coups on Madrid (in 1669 and 1677). Louis XIV incited another war with Spain from 1672-1678 in hopes of gaining territory in the Netherlands. Sicily revolted from 1674-78, Mariana was exiled to Toledo from 1677-1679, and Don Juan José died in 1679. These last two dates are of particular importance to both the political and theatrical histories of Spain. Don Juan José was Mariana's only significant political opposition after the death of Felipe IV. Their tension polarized the

political sphere, placing Carlos II in the center of their strife. Mariana's absence from Madrid left her out of the day-to-day politics of the Madrid Court (although she still had an influence over Carlos II as they wrote letters to each other during her exile). Carlos gave his official kingly support to Don Juan, allowing him to serve as Prime Minister. Don Juan used this position to try to implement progressive change. His death in 1679, however, did not allow him enough time to do so. The tensions these two courtiers authored had a direct effect on the work of Calderón in the 1670s, as I will explain later.

Despite Spain's turn for the worse and the economic crises it endured from 1680-1685, during the last half of the 1680s Spain experienced a small glimmer of hope for its economic future. Although there had been some hope to suggest that Juan José would be able to ease some of the economic woes of the 1670s, his efforts were not terribly fruitful due to his limited time in office. Therefore, Carlos II appointed Juan Francisco de la Cerda, the eighth duke of Medinaceli, as Prime Minister on February 22, 1680 (Pfandl 249). Medinaceli was a noble with high social standing and was capable of handling such a crisis. This is shocking due to Carlos's incompetence and Mariana and Carlos' tendency to appoint prominent positions to the most charming candidates, not the most qualified. However, by April 1685, when Medinaceli left his post, the economy had stabilized: a first sign of hope.[46] Don Manuel Juaquín Álvarez, the Count of Oropesa, filled Medinaceli's position in the court and imposed rigorous tax reform throughout his tenure. Although he filled the position of Prime Minister from Medinaceli's departure in

[46] Medinaceli vacated his role as Prime Minister just before political failures, both foreign and domestic, surfaced. See Pfandl, Ludwig. *Carlos II*. Translated by Manuel F. Galiano, Madrid, Afrodisio Aguado, 1947.

1685, Oropesa was still not officially Prime Minister in December of 1688 (Pfandl 277).[47] Carlos' first wife, Marie-Lousie, died on February 12, 1689, flooding the court with renewed concern for the Habsburg future with no heir to Carlos II.[48] Shortly thereafter, Carlos married Maria Ana of Neuberg, notorious for her brash nature and fits of violent rage. Pfandl cites Maria Ana as being the head of Oropesa's opposition explaining that once Maria Ana learned that Oropesa had looked elsewhere to find Carlos II a second wife, she became enraged with him and fiercely opposed him for the remainder of his tenure as Prime Minister (279-280). Additionally, Oropesa's reforms had applied to the social and political elite, making him more than one powerful enemy. With so many negative claims and acts working against Oropesa, the Duke of Arcos became the catalyst for Oropesa's removal, writing to the monarchs as well as being permitted an audience with them to discuss his concerns about Oropesa (Pfandl 280-1). Considering the situation regarding Oropesa at once apparently made Carlos II ill and threw Maria Ana into fits of panic forcing Mariana de Austria to step in to remedy the situation. In June of 1691 Oropesa received a letter informing him of the end of his time as Prime Minister (281). Whatever hope had come with Medinaceli's correction of incredulous inflation, and Oropesa's initial tax reforms, would diminish at the turn of the 1690s.

Louis the XIV kick-started another war of aggression in 1688, later named The Nine Years War, Oropesa's replacements, who had participated in driving him out of court, fell short

---

[47] It is unclear when he was officially named Prime Minister.

[48] It has been suggested that she was poisoned by the Count of Mansfeld and Oropesa, but there has been no evidence to come to light to substantiate those rumors (Pfandl 248-249). It is important to note, however, that those rumors would not be forgotten by those who opposed Oropesa, and his opposition would only grow stronger.

in replacing him, no heir came from Carlos' second marriage, and the European vultures had begun to circle hoping to divide Spanish territories for themselves upon Carlos' death. Spain was no longer among the European elite of nation states, and although other states united against France in fear of French hegemony, they, along with France, had in common the desire to grab a piece of the Spanish territories as the empire crumbled. It is clear to see that war shaped the politics of the last third of the century (Storrs 14). Even if Spain could have continued its uphill swing established in the 1680s, one problem remained a constant: there was no direct heir to the Spanish throne after Carlos II. He would never produce an heir, his half-sister María Teresa died in 1683, and Margarita Teresa passed in 1673 at the age of twenty-one. This fueled the European fight for the Spanish throne, and would inspire the plays written by Bances Candamo in the 1690s, just as political tensions of the 1670s had influenced Calderón.

With such a tumultuous century having unfolded, it should not be shocking to learn of the internal strife that swirled in the Habsburg Court at the end of the seventeenth century; it was not anything new. Spain had seen its era of illustrious kings and a prosperous, empire and composite monarchy with an international economy. Felipe III's ascension to the throne marked the beginning of the last century of Habsburg reign, and despite a still powerful *armada*, and influential political model, Spain slowly spiraled in decline.[49] Amidst the political and economic tensions, turmoil, war, and decline of the Habsburg Monarchy, one constant remained: the theater.

---

[49] See J. Elliott's *Spain, Europe and the Wider World 1500-1800* for a detailed historical break down of Spain's influence on other European powers, chiefly England, and their decline as Europe's leading force.

Court theater hit its boom in the 1620s with two official productions per week on Sunday and Thursday (Shergold and Varey 15).[50] Usually something new was staged along with a repeated favorite. Cost for the smaller *particulares* was supposed to be limited to 200 *reales* according to 1622 documents, but had reached 300 by 1623 (19-20). However, since the court play was an extension of hospitality and a reflection of the economic state of affairs in Madrid, and by association Spain, court productions frequently ran over budget. Although it did not rival war expenditure, court spending had reached a new high (Storrs 113). This, combined with the multiple economic crisis of the seventeenth century, frequently left artistic contributors unpaid. This however, although significant to those left unpaid, is a small factor in the scheme of theatrical production of the 1600s. Even if service were refused to be provided again in the future, this did not seem to have stopped production. The enticement of being able to perform, construct, paint, and/or collaborate on court production(s), coupled with the courtiers' desires to take part in court entertainment, left the court play center stage. In an era of changing confessors, multiple marriages, French princesses marrying Spanish princes, multiple childhood deaths—including those in direct line to the throne—economic crises, and royal deaths that left Queen Consorts to rule as Queen Regents—as Mariana did—*la comedia* thrived.

To be clear, not all theater was able to maintain such a strong foothold in Spanish culture. Although theater is deeply rooted in Iberian cultures, the *comedia de corrales* began to see a decline in frequency of productions in the mid-seventeenth century. Arguably, between Calderón's death in 1681, and as the Habsburg Court sped toward another economic crisis and war in the 1680s, there was theoretically less interest and not enough money to pay for court *and*

[50] These productions included the *particulares* represented in private chambers. Also, in addition to weekly productions, plays were staged for celebration days and festival weeks.

public spectacle. Of course, the flaw in that argument becomes glaringly apparent for two reasons. The first, there was no lack of interest in the theater. The second red flag here is the amount of money contracted to be spent on the court's ostentations representations. It is true that: "The demands imposed by the almost constant wars fought by Carlos II cannot be compared with the demands facing Spain in the Thirty Years War. Nevertheless, they were substantial. Carlos II's subjects therefore continued to be asked to supply men and money in a way that is only now beginning to be fully acknowledged by historians" (Storrs 14). This comparison in spending makes it possible to theorize that perhaps they justified such lavish entertainment expenditures for the court thinking that their strain had lightened compared to past years. However, this seems reckless knowing the economic crises Spain endured during Carlos II's lifetime, and the attempts at currency and tax reform, particularly in the 1680s. Storrs confirms although lightened, the economic burdens were still "substantial" (108). It is safe to say, however, that theater had become deeply rooted in Spanish culture, and in particular, Spain court culture, and the enjoyment of the arts would endure in the court space, even if it suffered setbacks in the public sphere.

Constant scrutiny from religious orders aside, the only real "threat" to court theater in the seventeenth century was royal death. As was the custom, plays were not represented during periods of mourning. This could have been as short as thirteen months, as was the case after Carlos II's first wife, Marie-Louise, died in 1689, [51] or as long as six years,[52] which was the case

[51] Although the public corrales were closed for a shorter period following Marie-Louise's death in February of 1689, there was not a documented court production from December 1688 to January 1690 (Shergold and Varey 255-256).

when Felipe IV died in 1665. Although I have spoken about Jesuit opposition in the previous chapter, and there I also mentioned that the royal council had provided their objections to the theater to Mariana on numerous occasions, these were not significant threats to the theater of the court. After all, the Retiro and other court spaces had "[become] the setting for court festivities and allegorical dramas which again contrasted sharply with the painful realities of the outside world" (*Wider World* 274). The play as spectacle, and specifically the *comedia* of the seventeenth century, had become too fundamentally rooted in court life and Spanish culture to be eradicated so easily. Deeply tied to political contexts of the final decades of the century, theater reigned as court entertainment as the Habsburg Monarchy crumbled around it.

Factions Divided: Political Tensions of the 1670s

For the remainder of the chapter I will address two political situations and their manifestation in court plays. The first is the role of Felipe IV's illegitimate son Don Juan José, in Peninsular politics. The second is the preoccupations surrounding the lack of an heir in the 1690s, which will be addressed in the final section. The initial political tensions of the 1670s however, stirred as Don Juan pursued a position in the court in Madrid. Although, in seventeenth-century Madrid "political division […] frequently centered on issues and policy" (Storrs 162), Don Juan's posturing for a place in the court brought to a head the inevitable tension that festered between himself and Queen Regent Mariana as she strived to protect Carlos

---

[52] This goes against current speculation about when theater was brought back to the court after Felipe's death. The *corrales* did reopen shortly after Felipe's death, but later in this chapter I will explain that court representations were prohibited through 1671.

II—and his entitlement to the Spanish Crown—from the interests of her illegitimate stepson.[53] These tensions will emerge in the 1670s in Calderón de la Barca's *La estatua de Prometeo* and *Fieras afemina amor.*

The years following the death of Felipe IV were filled with a mounting concern for the future of the Royal Court. At Felipe's death in 1665, young Carlos II of Spain, rightful heir to the Habsburg throne, was three years old, which left Felipe 's wife, Mariana, to rule as Queen Regent for the young prince. Although this was as Felipe mandated, and Mariana did carry large support, Quintero reminds her readers that although Spain accepted female rule, it also feared it (*Gendering* 22-24). Therefore as Carlos drew near the age of fourteen, the age at which Mariana was no longer supposed to rule as Consort, reservations not only grew about the capability of the physically and mentally impaired prince, but also about his close relationship with his Mother; her selection of favorites in the court (chiefly confessor Everard Nithard and noble Fernando Valenzuela); and her overbearing presence on her son. As these concerns began to become more problematic, Don Juan José of Austria had already garnered a growing sector of support hoping for a more prominent role in the court in Madrid. This provenly created political tension within the court as well as directly between Mariana and Juan, as Mariana had no greater source of

[53] "Protect" is arguably the most politically correct term I could produce in this context. It would not be inappropriate to speculate she was more controlling of Carlos than protective, as that is clearly what courtiers of the 1670s thought. They feared her influence over her young son who was supposed to assume his title in 1675. However, this is clearly a matter of perspective and a debate for which this project does not have room. What the Royal Council saw as controlling or overbearing, Mariana may have titled protection. Regardless of how one labels her actions toward Carlos II, she was attempting to protect the crown, and therefore, by extension, Carlos.

political challenge than Don Juan of Austria. Quintero explains that in the royal court the "roles for men and women are repeatedly renegotiated, and this negotiation frequently goes hand in hand with negotiations of political power" (*Gendering* 12). This observation may be the most poignant and accurate statement to define the years following Felipe IV's death. As Mariana's role became both officially and symbolically redefined, Don Juan saw an opportunity to redefined his own role in the political sphere. These renegotiations, or attempted renegotiations, of political roles fueled the tensions and negotiations of political power until Don Juan José's death.

As the Habsburg Court carried on to its end at the turn of the century, maintaining theater as one of its great pastimes and forms of cultural expression, these two worlds, the political and the theatrical, collided. This is particularly apparent in the manifestation of the political conflict between Mariana of Austria and Don Juan of Austria in Calderón de la Barca's *La estatua de Prometeo.* This play, written for the court in the early 1670s, represents the struggle between two major political factions of the era, led respectively by Mariana and Juan, as well as reflects Carlos' position at the center of that conflict and his limited role is aiding the advancement of either faction as he continued to be pulled in two directions by his family, their political concerns, and those of the court.

The transition of Mariana from Queen Consort to Queen Regent was a rather seamless one. First of all, there was no institutional reinforcement of a male-only successor-ship. It was not uncommon in the Iberian Peninsula for noble women to rule in the absence of their husbands and was therefore considered logical and openly supported by contemporary royal councils that Mariana rule the interim between Felipe's death and Carlos' coming of age. During this time Mariana ruled the political sphere, reigning with little opposition, most of which was directed at

her court favorites, and not directly at the Queen Regent. Second, Felipe's testament bestowed upon Mariana the titles of "governor and tutor" for the young Prince Carlos, and granted Mariana the authority to reign as Queen Regent with "all the faculties and power that I can give her [...] from the day of my death in the same manner and with the same authority that I do" (Mitchell 178).[54] Felipe left little doubt in the rights and authorities he passed to his Queen going so far as to clearly declare: "she is entitled to use the greatest prerogatives and royal power that belong to the dignity [of kingship]" (178). Therefore Mariana assumed her new title and position as Queen Regent the day Felipe IV died on September 17, 1665, and was to rule until November 6, 1675, Carlos' fourteenth birthday.

Therefore, women such as Mariana "were able to use their importance as the mothers or future mothers of heirs to the throne to influence the court" (Quintero, *Gendering* 36), and although Mariana's transition happened smoothly and without grave issue or cause for concern, as Carlos' fourteenth birthday drew near, unease brewed in the court. Concern grew for Carlos and the tight grasp Mariana had on him (Mitchell). Carlos had a tendency to bend to her every whim, something that greatly concerned the Regency Council, among others. This is a problem that Carlos would struggle with throughout his entire reign; it is not that Carlos did not make his own decisions or have his own will. Rather, he "failed to impose his will" (Storrs 166), thereby making it easier for Mariana to impose her own. Therefore, by the early spring of 1675 "efforts to monopolize the king's attention and direct it away from his mother and her supporters began immediately" (Mitchell 180). Carlos himself eventually reached out to his half-brother, thirty-two years his senior, with a strong political and military history, and requested Juan's presence at Court. Carlos writes that his birthday promises itself shortly and in order to deal with matters of

[54] This is Mitchell's English translation of excepts of Felipe IV's testament.

the State he writes: "necesito de vuestra persona a mi lado para esta función y *despedida* de la Reina mi Sra. y mi madre y así miércoles a diez y tres cuartos os llamo en mi ante cámara y os encargo el secreto"[55] (5; emphasis added). Although Juan did present himself at court, and it was noted that Carlos seemed happy to receive him, Mariana then spent two hours with Carlos in private quarters, from which Carlos left apparently crying, and Don Juan was asked to leave the Palace. These events clearly demonstrate the tight grasp Mariana had on Carlos as well as the conflict Carlos faced being stuck between two opposing political entities, and their interest in the Court.

In the last years of the decade the tension would continue, Mariana asked for a two year extension of her regency claiming that Carlos was not ready to rule at the age of fourteen. While she was likely not wrong in her claims, this also garnered her two more years as acting head of the monarchy. In 1677 Mariana was exiled to Toledo and Juan was appointed Prime Minister with Carlos' brotherly, and kingly support. However, dying in 1679, Don Juan could not implement any significant changes, and Mariana returned to oversee her court, as Juan's death left the Royal Court without any real political leadership. It was those moments leading up to Carlos' fourteenth birthday in 1675 that shaped the political sphere that was at work when *La*

---

[55] "Cartas del Rey a Don Juan". 27 October 1675. *Documentos varios sobre la intervención del Infante Juan José de Austria en el gobierno de Carlos II*. Sala Cervantes, Biblioteca Nacional, Sheet 5. Accessed 12 June 2015. There are two copies of this letter in Madrid. What appears to be a first draft, (document 5) and a second copy (document 6). The copy presents with some small grammatical corrections and is dated October 27, 1675. Making normalizations, I have quoted here what appears to be the undated original draft that claims on the reverse side to be from the desk of Carlos II.

Estatua de Prometeo was written and staged for the court, and as important as the work itself, is how it came to be staged.

The Prometheus-Pandora story at the center of *La estatua de Prometeo* was certainly not new to the Habsburg Court, as it even occupied the ceiling of the Hall of Mirrors in a five-scene fresco (Greer 128). Margaret Greer theorizes: "The fresco's depiction of a woman as a central figure in human civilization would certainly have pleased Mariana and may have been a factor in the selection of the Prometheus-Pandora story for the celebration of her birthday with one of the first court spectacles of the interregnum" (129). However, Elliott confirms there were strong ties between the courts in Vienna and Madrid (*Wider Worlds* 101), and as I mentioned in chapter two, Greer hypothesizes that the artistic trends in Vienna sparked the inclusion of the Prometheus-Pandora story in this play (*Play of Power* 129). (Remember, nine copies of *Benche vinto, vince amore ò il Prometeo* were sent to the court in 1670, with Mariana obtaining four of those copies, perhaps provoking Mariana to ask Calderón to write the work (Greer 129)). This patronage is testament to the fact that "'real queens,' whether contemporary or historic, had a profound influence on the production of the *comedia* in a variety of ways" (Quintero, *Gendering* 37). Not only is this true in Greer's thought that Mariana may have asked Calderón to write the play after the manuscripts from Vienna arrived, thereby providing her patronage, but *Beche vinto* was staged in the court in Vienna in celebration of Mariana's birthday in 1669. She therefore served as inspiration for the play that was used as part of the court festivities during the Vienna celebration of her birthday. However it is Calderón that controlled the artistic he took in creation of his script. There is no disagreement on Calderón's deviation from classic mythology. It is usually one of the first observations scholars make, and Anne Pasero in her article "Male vs. Female: Binary Opposition and Structural Synthesis in Calderon's *Estatua de Prometeo*"

explains that Calderón seems to rely on the previous works of Boccaccio and Pérez de Moya, but still deviates heavily from even their works (110).[56]

In Calderon's play, Prometeo creates a statue in the image of Minerva for which Prometeo receives praise for his creation and compliments on the reflection of Minerva's beauty in his work. This provokes jealousy in their twin counterparts, leading to a plot of destruction, pursuit of what the other has, and punishment. Prometeo's statue comes to life as Pandora and a questions of ethics comes into play at the end of the work as a debate surfaces in regards to Prometeo's potential punishment for stealing from the Gods. (He had stolen a ray, which brought his statue to life.) Pasero suggests Calderón's classification of Pandora as female rather than male is perhaps one of his most notable changes (110). As I tie Pandora to the representation of Spain, Calderón's writing of Pandora as female uses gender to link Pandora to Spain through its physical land, or the feminine *tierra.* As we know, land is classically assumed to be female. In this rewriting of Pandora as female, the audience encounters one of the most important artistic choices Calderón makes is his presentation of this play, but not the most frequently analyzed; that title is reserved for the function of duality in this work.

Wasting no time Calderón, immediately presents the audience with a duality: twin counterparts of both the protagonists and antagonists. Within the first sixty lines of the play's opening the audience learns that Prometeo has a twin brother, Epimeteo, and the audience will come to find out that despite their apparent differences, power unites the brothers (Blue 39). As the play unfolds, the spectator finds that most elements and characters in this play have a counterpart. The characters Minerva and Palas are twins, Merlin has Libia, knowledge and

[56] The works Pasero references are Boccaccio's *Genealogia deorum* and Moya's *Philosophia secreta*.

reason are represented by Minerva who serves as inspiration for Prometeo, and war is represented by Palas and Epimeteo. These dualities in the last several decades have proved to be the fundamental question of this play, and as Greer points out, as academics we tend to differ not on the presence of the duality, but on the identification of the axis of tension. The dualities that have comprised the work on *La estatua de Prometeo* have included reason versus passions, will against force, male versus female values or principles, and even nature versus culture. It is important to bear in mind that the material in these works do no present "'layers of meaning' arranged hierarchically from the superficial to the profound, but simultaneously present in an interrelationship of productive tension" (Greer, *Play of Power* 201).

Greer subscribes to a mind-body principle that places emotions in opposition to intellect. In his article "Desire and the supplement in *La estatua de Prometeo*", William Blue takes a pluralistic approach explaining: "We have in the men and gods in this play not good facing bad, not gods facing men, but rather a complication of all oppositions in one" (42). Still others, such as Pasero, remind us of the dualities, describing them as "pairs of categories" that "respond to a basic underlying polarization" (109). My approach argues a political duality or polarization: traditional rule versus progressive change. All of these have their set of obstacles to overcome. Mine here is that in discussing the representation of political tensions at the time, it is imperative to not get sucked into a strict one-to-one character association with real life figures of the court, and rather explore the variety of ties that reveal themselves.

We can begin by considering the dualities of the characters as they do serve on a micro level to bring to light the tension specifically between Mariana and Don Juan. Here we can link Juan to Prometeo, the progressive thinker who has produced his own creation, Pandora, or Spain as Don Juan sees it. This casts Mariana in the role of Epimeteo as he threatens to destroy

Prometeo and Pandora. Mariana, on more than one occasion, set out to eradicate Juan and his progressive push for political change from Madrid in an attempt to maintain a secure foothold in the political sphere. Although representative of the undoubted swirling tension between these two political figures, as I have warned against strict one-to-one comparisons, this analysis falls short when Epimeteo covets Pandora. While Mariana certainly wanted to keep Spain in the hands of the pure and legitimate Habsburgs, the Spain Mariana longed for was a more traditional model of the Spanish Monarchy that maintained the status quo. She did not covet the Spain Don Juan imagined with new changes such as a move toward a unifying regional currency.

Therefore it is possible to cast Don Juan as both creator and coveter. As Prometeo creates Pandora and brings her to life, and Epimeteo covets the creation, Prometeo covets Minerva as Juan coveted a Spain that could never and would never been entirely his.[57] Aligning Juan with this duality also supports the mind-body axis of interpretation set forth by Greer in her reading of the practical text. Epimeteo and Prometeo serve as compliments that represent an internal versus external struggle of man with and against himself. While Greer posits that it was most likely that seventeenth-century audiences would relate Juan with Prometeo (151), she also acknowledges that Don Juan can be seen as "a compound of Prometeo and Epimeteo" (152). I believe Greer is correct in her second statement; this work was written for a courtly audience, an audience that would know Don Juan both as a man with a strong military background, as well as a thoughtful intellectual and political leader. He was not just an illegitimate noble whose coupe on Madrid in 1669 threatened civil war for Spain. He was the careful politician that managed to bring positive

[57] Blue confirms: "Prometeo desires that which he can never have" (44), "that" being Minerva. William R. Blue "Desire and the Supplement in la Estatua de Prometeo." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 42, no. 1, 1990, pp. 35–52.

change most memorably to Cataluña. Juan represented a man of both *armas y letras* battling with his relationship with the Spain he desired to influence.

Any position Don Juan was to hold, particularly in Madrid would have to come with the approval of the court. Early events of the mid-1670s, showed Carlos' support for his brother, but clearly Mariana wanted no position of the court to be occupied by Juan as seen early in the aforementioned anecdote of Carlos calling Juan to court. Additionally, Carlos was never to be displaced from the Court, but he clearly would need significant personal and political support. Juan, when finally in the role of Prime Minister from 1677 to 1679, was maintained in that position at Carlos' orders. Similarly, Pandora, the allegorical representation for Spain, is brought to life by Prometeo using a ray stolen from Apolo. As it was common in seventeenth-century mythological productions to use Apolo to symbolize kingship, it becomes clear that as Prometeo's desire to bring his creation to life is reliant on Apolo's ray, just as Juan's place within the court will be dependent on the support of Carlos II.

Additionally, Calderón subtly expresses his allegiance, and therefore protects himself from potential criticism that he may be promoting the agenda of Don Juan by writing Prometeo as a man who wishes to reorganize the political system. Prometeo's fellow men live by two rules: "do not steal, do not kill" (Blue 40). Calderón creates a populous that resisted Prometeo's attempts to redefine the current political system, and "Prometeo peevishly turns his attention toward the gods" (Blue 40), and in creating the statue he is "recreating" (Blue 43). This reminds us of man's position as submissive to the gods, as Prometeo is reliant on their aid or support, and highlights the real-life dependence of Don Juan's assignments on the support of the royal court. Here I have linked Don Juan to Prometeo and the gods to the monarchs.

If we stray further still from these more direct comparisons however, it is possible to see the duality of the political tensions in the court, as opposed to a more limited character duality. In this regard it is possible to bring more characters to the table. After all, just as Don Juan's political stance and coups divided Madrid, in this play "Cáucaso shall be divided, therefore, into camps, each one following the dominant strain represented by either Prometeo the man of reason or by Epimeteo the man of action" (O'Connor 233). On one side of the argument progressive forethought is cast. Prometeo, Pandora, and Minerva align with this side of the argument while Epimeteo, Palas, and the allegorical figure of Discordia oppose them in an effort to maintain the status quo. This breaks with the more traditional dualities assigned to these characters, as Pandora and Discordia are not necessarily opposites, or even counter parts. Rather Discordia, which has plagued the court, threatens to cause mayhem wherever she goes. This threat extends to Pandora as well, highlighting, that even in support of Don Juan and a new political future for Spain, Discordia will always be waiting in the wings. That is to say, the Royal Court, regardless of its source of political leadership, will never be without her.

Pandora, however, "symbolizes both the union of opposites and at the same time the source of conflict in this play" (Pasero 112). As my reading casts Pandora as a referent for Spain, this highlights Spain as a uniting element that Don Juan and Mariana strive to control. Additionally, O'Connor confirms that Pandora, although created in Minerva's image, "can never rival the goddess' perfection" (233). O'Connor says that this serves as Calderón's commentary "on one aspect of the male-female antagonism frequently encountered in his plays" (233). I do not wish to claim O'Connor is incorrect in his analysis, as his claims do hold true if we analyze the relationship between Prometeo and Pandora. Prometeo does not love or covet Pandora, and therefore, as O'Connor explains, she cannot live up to the expectation of idealized perfection that

Prometeo has placed upon her. However, this commentary on perfection serves an additional purpose. As Pandora is the allegorical figure for Spain, we see that Calderón's commentary highlights that Spain, as an intangible entity to be ruled, will never be as good as imagined. Discord, is always looming, and the Spain Don Juan covets will be harder to rule than he can imagine.

Additionally, Palas threatens Epimeteo and convinces him to destroy the statue, asking him to pulverize it to dust. Epimeteo doubts he can accomplish this task, decides to steal the statue for himself, and attempts to deceive Palas. This plot to steal the statue receives a warning from Merlin not to underestimate the gods, but Epimeteo attempts to carry out his plan nevertheless. We see here that Discordia not only threatens the opposing political faction, but plagues her own players as well, highlighting the tension and concern that grew regarding Mariana's influence on Carlos as he came of age.

It is perhaps this plot to steal the statue that prompts Blue to read this action as done out of love. Blue states: "So great is [Epimeteo's] love for the statue Prometeo sculpted, for instance, that he defies Palas's direct order to destroy it" (37). My interpretation however, has been that this is done out of jealousy. O'Connor confirms that jealousy is fundamental in Calderón's work: "This mythological play underlines the role of hatred, jealousy and vengeance in the destruction of what harmony and peace we humans are capable of" (235-236). This is further proven by the fact that Epimeteo falls for Pandora, the manifestation of the statue created in Minerva's image. We become further removed from a character coveting Minerva herself. Epimeteo's desire for the statue is not adoration or love of its simple artistic nature. Rather, it is representative of the classical trends of René Girard's *deseo mimético*.

Although Minerva and Palas take sides in this political model, Apolo has had no physical presence in the first two acts of this play. Calderón writes Minerva and Palas as sisters of Apolo in this production, and so, nearing the end of this play Palas seeks Apolo's support to punish Prometeo for the ray he has stolen. The two sisters each argue their case to Apolo. Palas argues that Prometeo has committed a moral error in stealing, while Minerva proposes that stealing for the good of the community is not a moral error and posits the question: Is a crime committed for the good of the community acceptable, and can the individual still be considered to be just in his actions from a moral standpoint? Her argument is an effort to protect herself as it was Minerva who took Prometeo to the heavens for him to pick anything he liked as a thank you gift for his statue. Minerva effectively takes "Apolo's right to give fire to man" (Blue 48) as Mariana takes Carlos' right to reign from 1675-1677. Seeing both arguments as just, Apolo cannot decide between his two sisters, and tells them they must resolve the issue themselves in the mortal world. He only returns later to banish Discordia in order to express Jupiter's inevitable pardon. Apolo's actions reinforce that both a ruler's concern for his populous and a proper moral code are admirable attributes, as he cannot decide between the two, but *discordia* will always threaten the political situation. In addition, Apolo as the sun god evokes the imagery associated with Felipe IV, but his indecisiveness is representative of Carlos II. Apolo's role is this play is arguably as small as Carlos II role in the major politics of the court at the time, and his indecisiveness reflects a young king not ready to rule, and heavily influenced by those around him. The myth of Apolo both affirms and rejects the maternal bond (Slater 113), an experience witnessed in Carlos' struggle with his relationship with his mother. Just as Apolo "vacillates between the conflicting natures of Minerva and Pallas" (Pasero 113), Carlos was pulled in two different directions having to choose between his family members, unable to do so. Carlos both

supports Don Juan, and openly dialogs politically with his mother. Even in her exile, Carlos gave written formal consent for Juan to govern as Prime Minister while exchanging letters back and forth with Mariana, particularly concerning the issue of his marriage, an issue that only Mariana could resolve tactfully.

The curtain on *La estatua de Prometeo* falls *en medias res* (Blue 36), and the ending is not as neat or joyful as Chapman claims in his work "Las comedias mitológicas de Calderón". Although O'Connor does refer to a need in the shift of the scope of Chapman's claim, he only does so for his own purposes in evaluating reason's role in the work. To be forthright, the "joyous" ending leaves us questioning more than it actually resolves, something Blue notes as well. This was not uncommon in Calderón's work. On the one hand, the happy ending is obvious and easy; it can be enticing to label it neatly as a happy ending. It does check the stereotypical *comedia* resolution boxes: weddings, thanks, a godly—*deus ex machine*—imparting of peace, and our most toxic antagonists (Palas and Discordia) depart. However, as Blue notes, it feels a bit "contrived" (50). We are left a little uneasy. The moments of resolution and happiness are tainted by the lingering threat of tension. Blue cites Merlín's proposal to Libia as an example of this tension, and his analysis in unequivocally correct. Merlín tells Libia he lives in the shadow of her loathing and she returns the sentiment. They agree to marry due to this commonality of loathing, as opposed to love. Perhaps these lines are said in jest, but Blue notes that marriage, although capable of producing "conjugal happiness, […] may also produce conjugal war" (50). This leaves the audience with a bitter feeling as it sours the possibility of a traditional baroque happy ending.

The explanation for the successful execution of Calderón's political critiques can be found in an example of Pasero's interpretation of Pandora. Pasero notes that Pandora "continues

to function as the double or image of Minerva" (112). Although traditionally academics present Minerva and Palas as complimentary parts of a duality, Pasero's observation is not incorrect. Pandora does continue to exist as the image of Minerva. In doing so, this would have led to a basic reading of Spain (Pandora) created in the image of Mariana (Minerva), as the desired identification of Mariana—the monarch who commissioned this play—would be to the character serving as the model for wisdom.

There is further political critique to be digested when O'Connor comments on the appearance (not its existence in a pure form) of reason. Prometeo does not establish reason through law, but rather through sacred rights. "This reflection of the true rule of reason is significant for it reveals Calderón's pessimistic and realistic views concerning the ability we possess to conduct our affairs strictly according to reason's dictates" (O'Connor 231). We see Calderón questioning the ability of man to conduct himself without an overshadowing network of biases. That being said, while Calderón questions our abilities to conduct ourselves while adhering strictly to reason, that does not mean there cannot be peace in human relationships. O'Connor posits: "*La estatua de Prometeo* manifests reason's limits and acknowledges the need for some form of outside intervention in order to establish peace and harmony in human relationships" (O'Connor 236). The problem we then face is: if this was an intentional political commentary on Calderón's part, we are not presented with a clear solution. Perhaps that is done so as not to jeopardize Calderón's privileged position within the court, but I am left to wonder, is Don Juan the intervention that the court needed? He certainly would be "outside intervention" as he was not a legitimate member of the royal family, and therefore not a member of the court in Madrid, or its state of daily affairs in the early 1670s. Or, is Carlos II the subversive answer, as

he is both rightfully slotted to be king, but somewhat peripheral to the tensions between Juan and Mariana? Calderón leaves us to make that judgment for ourselves.

La estatua de Prometeo was a play before its time. Pasero notes the play's tripartite structure of creation, destruction, and redemption (114), and although coincidental due to the likely timeframe in which the play was produced, this structure mirrors the politics—and status of Mariana—from 1665-1679. She would experience her creation as Queen Regent in 1665. She then suffered two hits to her faction; these were Don Juan's coups on Madrid that would lead to her "destruction" so to speak as she was placed in exile, and her redemption upon returning to the court in 1669. Also allowing for a similar observation, O'Connor comments: "Once jealousy ceases, so does the desire for vengeance: harmony is restored within man" (235). Although I would never venture to say harmony is entirely restored once Don Juan dies, we can say there is a reduction of the internal strife of the court. Mariana's greatest opposition had been eliminated, which was the only way to restore harmony in this instance, as there is no hope of any sort of reconciliation between Juan and Mariana as there is for Prometeo and Epimeteo.

Almost all of the scholars mentioned here highlight the fact that these characters are more alike than they are different, particularly under the presentation of dualities. Although there are differences, and I support the elements that are representative of the divide between two political factions, we can say that Don Juan and Mariana are more alike than even they would have liked to admit. Don Juan, although arguably more progressive, and did have ideas for change, also adhered closely to Felipe IV's memory (Storrs) and the tradition that surrounded his father's monarchy. Additionally, Mariana was not completely averse to change. The 1680s underwent gross tax reform—something that was badly needed—done under the name and supervision of herself, Carlos, and their advisors.

My analysis has shown that Calderón's work, although mythological in theme, as many of his other plays, is also largely political. Through the careful tact of what Bances Candamo in the 1690s would later name *el decir sin decir* Calderón weaves masterfully the concerns and tensions for the politics in Mariana's court into the tensions and conflicts between his fictional creations. Calderón knew the court and all its members well; supported Mariana, Carlos, and the Crown officially; yet, provides us with the tools to analyze both sides of these political woes without overtly taking a side himself.[58] Designing his characters to divide amongst support of the status quo or that of progressive forethought, Calderón creates a timeless and universal work that posits two opposing political notions and leaves us to question their, and by consequence, our political future, making this work even more relevant that previously proven.

La estatua de Prometeo was not Calderón's only mythological play with political themes. Calderón's *Fieras afemina amor* is a tale of Hércules in a mortal world. Perhaps one of the largest links between these two plays is Calderón's humanization of mythological characters. Blue sets out for us that in *La estatua de Prometeo*, "Calderón has made two goddesses [Palas and Minerva] so very human in their jealousies, rivalries, ignorance, and desires that, except for the fact that they speak in recitative, the audience might forget their divinity" (38). We will find this same humanization to be apparent for Hércules in *Fieras afemina amor*. Instead of seemingly divine, Hércules is a brutish figure that has to come to terms with his beastly nature, including his appearance. Although we do not know for certain when *Fieras* was staged, common speculation has held fast to the likelihood of it being presented at court in January of

[58] Obscuring his personal opinion one way or the other keeps this work from jeopardizing his professional work and career, or from transforming the work into a piece of propaganda that only fueled Mariana's agenda.

1670. *Fieras* was written for Mariana's birthday in December, but held at her request until January to celebrate the birthday of María Antonia, Mariana's grandchild. María Antonia was born on January 18, 1669, and therefore, scholars have traditionally assumed this meant the play was represented at court on or about January 18, 1670: María Antonia's first birthday (Edward Wilson 17, Greer 157). However, Greer cites the costume accounts as justification to claim that the first production of this play was in 1672 (157). Greer also notes that the 1672 production was especially lavish, and the likelihood of repeating a play on such an ostentatious scale would have been minimal. If we are to follow the costuming accounts, the date of the production is listed as January 29, 1672 (157). Although compelling, this, however, is not the only reason, I support Greer's theory of a 1672 staging; I found further motives in the archives in Simancas, Spain.

The Archivo General in Simancas houses two letters written to Mariana in April 1672 that supplied her with advice on the status and prohibition of the *comedias*; the first is a letter dated April 3, 1672 from a member of the council formed specifically to advise her on the state of the *comedia.* This letter offers a preliminary opinion before the council confirms theirs in the subsequent second letter, dated April 15, 1672. This second letter states that the court theaters have been closed: "por decreto de Vuestra Merced de 22 de septiembre del '65 hasta el año pasado" (8). Although the *corrales* had been reopened not long after Felipe IV's death, we have clear evidence that theater was prohibited in the court until sometime in 1671. This timeline confirms Greer's hypothesis of a 1672 premier, and will call into question current theories about the premiere of *La estatua de Prometeo.* The author of the April third letter states that he is aware that the acting companies have formed for the celebration of the coming Corpus, and he

recommends "que cesan estas compañías por ahora" until she is further informed (3).[59] The council's letter then reads that "ha calificado no habiendo querido vencerse a que vuelvan las comedias a frecuentarse en Palacio" (2). Particular concern in both letters is paid to Carlos II's young age as they make reference to the prince "en sus tiernos años". Additionally, if Greer's theory is correct about the influence of *Beche vinto* on *La estatua*, this timeline supports her hypothesis; the manuscripts from Vienna arrived after a letter from Leopold I dated February 5, 1670 in which he informs the Madrid court he will be sending the manuscripts. Although possibly written in 1670, Calderón's interpretation of the work was not staged before 1671.

The timing of *Fieras afemina amor* is politically significant as it comes in the years that follow Don Juan José and members of his political faction succeeding in having Mariana of Austria's favorite, Nithard, expulsed from Madrid and removed from his position in the court after uprisings in Catalonia and Aragon in 1669. It would be awfully coincidental that the first plays represented in the court in 1671 and 1672—the first time royal court theater was permitted since Nithard's removal from court, for which Don Juan is largely held responsible—just so happened to deal with a brutish Hércules whose only interests were in war. I have already warned against the potential pit-falls of one-to-one relationships between a play's characters and real life members of the court, and their direct correlations, as sometimes they tend to be false. However, this is one situation in which we see clearly embodied in Hércules the popular traits and criticisms of Juan José.

This idea goes against other scholars' notions of Hércules as a representation for Felipe IV, such as Julio Vélez-Sainz posits in his article "Anatomía áulica y política de *Fieras afemina*

[59] If my calculations are correct, Easter in 1672 was on April 17. That would have made Corpus June 16 of that year.

amor de Calderón". The Hércules/Felipe IV parallel for which Vélez-Sainz argues is easily debunked if we consider how Hércules behaves, how he is dressed, and the personal challenges he faces in coming to grips with who he is. He is a young brute, dressed in a lion's skin who has a classic self-reflective moment in which he has to construct a new sense of self—a new *I*—upon seeing his reflection and having to remedy his outer appurtenance with his inner self. However, Vélez-Sainz correctly states that Hércules is a symbol of the Spanish Monarchy (5). The strongest part of Vélez-Sainz' argument is when he proposes Hércules and Apolo as representing two halves of Felipe IV. The stance is reminiscent of the dualities we saw in *La estatua* and man's struggle with and against himself. However, the argument still over-reaches. Vélez-Sainz does not take into account the politics of the time, but he cites others such as Edward Wilson who clearly suggests the possibility of a referent to Don Juan in this play, as I will detail below. The only space Vélez-Sainz gives to the possibility of Don Juan's reflection in this work is through citing Greer's interpretations only to propose an alternative. It is clear that the blatant similarities to Don Juan and Hércules cannot be ignored.

The basic premise of the play is not unfamiliar; the king, in this play Euristio, seeks a spouse for his daughter, Yole. Along the way we encounter familiarities of the Baroque genres: unrequited love, mythological figures, *engaño*, and the woman as an object of desire. The play opens with Hércules having already defeated the serpents, the Calydonian boar, Cerberus, and the bull of Achelous.[60] All of these acts he had done in the name of the king, with the exception of the last deed; this will serve as the plot's complication.

---

[60] For detailed descriptions of the creative liberties Calderón takes with his construction of Hércules as a mythological figure see the Introduction to Edward Wilson's edition of *Fieras afemina amor.*

In the first scene Hércules defeats the Nemean lion and captures Aristeo under the Euristio's direction. To his lackey he declares "Yo más gracias no quiero / del vencer que el vencer" (487-488). A career military leader and political administrator, Don Juan arguably led a similar life. After Felipe IV recognized him officially as his son in 1642[61] Don Juan José began to fulfill military and administrative posts for his father. Eventually, he would lead various rebellions, as the aforementioned ones of Aragon and Catalonia. As Calderón's Hércules will discover, perhaps there is more to desire in life than one's current station. Although Hércules will learn of the power of love, Juan José would never stray from his military and political path. He would, however, come to desire more recognition and a higher station from the crown, surrounding himself with his supporters, just as Hércules had Licas, to encourage: "Ya sé que eres galante cortesano, y que es muy justo / alabarte por hombre de buen gusto;" (513-514). Whether or not Don Juan José felt about himself in precisely the way Licas validated Hércules, it would not be a far stretch for a seventeenth-century audience to imagine this is how Juan José's camp felt about him. Many of his supporters felt Juan José was just in desiring a more prestigious and firm position in the court in Madrid, and marched with him on the capital city, representing an element of the political fire in Juan José that we see manifested in Hércules as he happens upon the palace for the first time in act I.

Upon arriving outside the palace of Héspero, Hércules exclaims: "Divina esfera, en cuya arquitectura / se [un]ieron la riqueza y la hermosura!" (527-528). He continues less than ten lines later with:

HÉRCULES: Y en los pensiles que coronan su muro

[61] Don Juan José was one of only two of Felipe's dozens of illegitimate children to receive such recognition. See John Elliott's *Wider Worlds*.

un árbol se descuella de oro puro
cuyas frutas no ignoro,
que todas son bellas manzanas de oro. (537-540)

For Hércules this observation will come with a warning from Hesperia's sisters that Hércules should not enter the palace due to the fact that the fruit is protected by the Hesperian dragon. Any who are successful in plucking an apple will be prosperous in love, though none have succeeded so far. Although this general warning is rather pleasant in the play, the explanation of the origin of the apple tree (sprung from the golden apple Venus won in the Judgment of Paris), and Hércules' demand to understand the situation is saturated with an undeniable tension. After Hesperia's sisters warn Hércules not to enter he hears Hesperia cry in the woods as she had fallen in an attempt to escape the lion. Hércules rescues her for which she thanks him. When he asks to know who she is she warns him to go and replies:

HESPERIA: Vuelve, pues, extranjero,
al camino, y no pretendas
saber más de que soy noble,
y pues que siéndolo es fuerza
ser agradecida, cree
que es solicitar tu ausencia,
sin que te albergue ese alcázar,
más que ingratitud, clemencia. (663-670)

These verses give the impression that Hesperia embodies Mariana of Austria and her disdain for Don Juan José, encouraging him constantly to stay away from Madrid and the royal court, and emphasizing that it is she that is noble—insinuating he is not, as he was the bastard child of her

late spouse. This potential correlation is particularly emphasized by the fact that Hesperia calls herself *noble.* This could simply refer to a character trait but has the obvious duality of being *nobility*. Hesperia however is godly, and therefore more than a mere noble. The word choice here by Calderón alludes ever so subtly in his mastery of literary decorum of our real-life female noble: Mariana. When Hesperia then tries to walk away Hércules detains her, to which she demands he not try to stop her from leaving. Hércules expresses his beastly nature and his loathing for women when he replies:

HÉRCULES: No fíes
tú que por mujer te tenga
respeto, porque no hay
cosa que más aborrezca;
y así, persuádete a que
o lo he de saber, o presa
te he de llevar donde nunca
a cobrar tu centro vuelvas. (705-712)

Don Juan José's disdain for Mariana is likewise paralleled in Hércules' proclamations it does not matter to him that Hesperia is a woman, as he hates women.

The palace however is not what Hércules will come to covet. Rather it is the entity for which he expresses an appreciation. What he desires is Yole, and although Julio Vélez-Sainz says it is Hesperia that is the copy of Spain (10), I find Yole to be representative of the Madrid and Spain that Don Juan José desired to run administratively. Upon killing the Hesperian lion and capturing Aristeo, Euristio offers Hércules three things: marriage to his daughter Yole, command of his military forces, and the kingdom of Lybia. Before having seen Yole, Hércules

states he only desires to command the military. He has openly declared that the only thing he knows how to do is defeat his foe, and that he is not made for love. Unbeknownst to Hércules, his doubts of love have provoked Cupid to make him dream of Yole. When he subsequently sees her in the flesh, he falls victim to his emotions, a feeling Yole does not return upon seeing Hércules dressed in the lion's skin. At this moment, Mariana's confessor—Nithard—can be seen as represented by the Hesperian lion. Don Juan José's pride in having Nithard removed from court manifests in the visual imagery of Hércules robed in the lion's skin. Upon tasting this glory, Don Juan José was as close as he had ever been to taking control of the court in Madrid. Paralleling Yole's disgust for Hércules, Mariana and her remaining supporters would have shared a distaste for Don Juan in the months following Nithard's expulsion. Although there were those that were skeptical of Nithard's presence in the court, many still supported the Queen Regent and joined her in opposition to Don Juan José and his faction, making Yole representative of not just the Queen Regent, but also the Madrid Juan wanted to win over.

The present tension between the figures representing Don Juan José and Mariana of Austria is not the only critique of Don Juan's interests in the court. Maintaining the illusion of respect for the institution of the king is Hércules as he expresses his perceived loyalties after capturing Aristeo. He states that from here on out his greatest glories are rooted in the king's royal demands. However, slaying the bull of Achelous had been done without the king's orders, and the play will continue with Hércules slaying the Hesperian dragon after Euristio's death. Vélez-Sainz posits that the triumph over the dragon "indica vencer sobre la maldad del mundo o superar la imagen de la suma vigilancia, del poder supremo" (7). After Euristio's death, one could claim that Hércules is free to kill the dragon, and overcome this "supreme power". However, Euristio already offered Hércules all he might possibly desire, and considering he had

killed the bull of Achelous without the king's orders, it would seem as though Hércules had no great deterrent not to kill the dragon earlier. Doing so now, as a sign of overcoming a "supreme power" seems a bit too brandish, and a bit late. However, if one considers the totality of Hércules' actions, slaying the bull and the dragon, and having completed other tasks as the king commanded or blessed, his character calls into question his loyalties to his king, thereby alluding to Don Juan's loyalties to the court and to the fact that Don Juan was questionably loyal at best to Felipe IV—and only when Felipe was alive. With Felipe IV now dead, Don Juan could be seen as unreliable in his political endeavors. After all, he was involved in the rebellions of Portugal, Aragon, and Catalonia. Likewise, Edward Wilson describes Calderón's Hércules as follows: "He revolts against the king, plunges the country into civil war, simply out of private pique and subconscious jealousy. From the point of view of the audience for which the play was composed, he is a disloyal rebel" (33). On the heels of Nithard's expulsion and amounting tension between Queen Regent Mariana and Don Juan José, Mariana's court audience in attendance would have held similar sentiments about Don Juan.

However, as I have said, Calderón de la Barca certainly would not have had the success he did without the respect for literary decorum. His mastery of these literary tools allows him to discuss politically hot topics. He is doubly protected by the fact that the political views embedded in *Fieras afemina amor* question Don Juan José and cast him in a negative light. Additionally, elements of a female heavy cast with ultimate control over their revenge and the punishment of Hércules would have pleased Mariana, and she would have potentially seen Yole as homage to herself and her skill in "political intrigues" (Edward Wilson 45). This is Calderón's most fundamentally important aspect of literary decorum; the characters that represent the real-life figures are not necessarily those we would most obviously and readily associate with those

situations, and these correlations are not always so simple and clear. Yole, as a tribute to Mariana, is a much more safe and obvious connection forcing the spectator to participate actively in their analysis of the production to see the more intellectual critique of the political situations playing out both on the royal stage and outside its palace doors. Edward Wilson wonders: "Did Hércules remind her and some of the spectators of the second Don Juan of Austria, her political enemy? If so, there can be no doubt about which camp the Royal Chaplain who wrote this play belonged to" (45). Plus, although the lion is the commonality between Hércules and Spain, Vélez-Sainz discusses the humiliation and degradation of Hércules, all of which is in plain view. Therefore if we link Hércules to Felipe IV, as Vélez-Sainz does, Calderón would have been questioned in relation to his dedication to the monarchy, and the monarchs. It is much more apparent that Hércules is a symbol of the Spanish Crown and royal power, and the lion is the symbol the two share. Therefore it is the symbol that unites the reality of the Spanish court with the fictitious plain in which the Hércules of Calderón's mythological creation exists. Wilson need not wonder of the possible political undertones of Calderón's play; Hércules, for the seventeenth-century court audience, in this depiction of his character, would easily and readily have been linked to Don Juan. This evolution, therefore, proves that these two worlds—that of the theater and the political turmoil that loomed outside of it—had become heavily intertwined by the 1670s, and would remain as such through the remainder of the seventeenth century.

Who Will be King?: The 1690s and Bances Candamo's Answer Delivered by Theatrical Propositions

When Marie-Louise died in 1689, it is almost as if you can hear the collective inhale through gritted teeth of the Habsburg Court. Although many already suspected Carlos would never produce an heir, as he was likely impotent, no wife to bring a baby to term complicated

whatever small hope to which courtiers had been holding on. That hope would be permanently extinguished when Carlos II's second wife, Maria Ana of Neuburg, did not bear a child either. These concerns did not suddenly manifest in the 1680s, however. This concern plagued Carlos' court for the majority of his life. As his physical and mental limitations, disabilities, and handicaps grew in number and continued to present themselves, urgency was felt in the court to find Carlos a wife. Conversations of the matter were already taking shape as Carlos neared the age of fourteen. By the time Don Juan José died in 1679, and Carlos approached his eighteenth birthday, this matter grew in urgency. It was precisely this topic coupled with Don Juan's death that allowed for and prompted Mariana's return to the court in Madrid after two years in exile in Toledo. Carlos had maintained contact with his exiled mother and needed her help in order to arrange his marriage—a marriage his mother and the Royal Council felt could not wait. Although originally promised to a niece who was nearly ten years his junior, he married seventeen year-old Marie-Louise, a match that did not require the court to wait for a young girl to come of childbearing age. Despite the rush to celebrate a marriage, Carlos never produced an heir. While the original thought might have been to rush to marry Carlos off so he could begin to have children, before missing his chance; that chance never existed. By the 1690s this was glaringly apparent, and the question became: Without a biological successor to rule in the event of Carlos' absence or death, who was the rightful heir? Who should be King?

Bances Candamo found his answer to this question in Carlos' great-nephews, of which Carlos had two viable options; the first was José Fernando of Bavaria, son of Maria Antonia and great-grandson of Mariana of Austria, and the other was Felipe of Anjou, the great-grandson of Felipe IV and his first wife Elizabeth of France.[62] Ignacio Arellano theorizes that the *loa* to

[62] This technically makes Felipe of Anjou Carlos II's great half nephew.

Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso suggests outright Archduke Carlos, Carlos II's second cousin, as the desired heir. However, it is my interpretation that the *loa* refers to the name Carlos itself, not a potential heir Carlos. Additionally, calling for a descendent, not necessarily the like-named cousin of Carlos, the *loa* reads:

> ROMA: Y Mariana divina
> a España alegre
> le duplique este nombre
> en descendiente. (337-340)

Rather, Bances seems to be paying respect the station of king and the name Carlos. We must bear in mind, the *zarzuela* and its *loa* were represented December 22, 1692 with the *zarzuela* being dedicated to Mariana for her birthday celebrations, and the *loa* being represented in honor of Carlos II's name day. Considering the context, it seems rather appropriate to make such a to-do about the name *Carlos* in honor of the king, citing the many Carlos' that have been, the many Carlos' that will be, and the great predecessors referenced by each letter of his name. It is not, however, a reference to a future Carlos in name, but rather symbolically.

Moreover, if we consider the dates of Bances Candamo's political trilogy, combined with the birth of José Fernando of Bavaria, I think it is much more likely that the infant José inspired Bances Candamo to repeatedly present a nephew-king relationship throughout his political trilogy. José Fernando was born October 28, 1692 and Bances Candamo's political works were represented in November and December of 1692 and January of 1693. While I do support the theory that José was more likely to be considered the next possible heir, being able to determine so does not impede the analysis of these works within their historical context. I will discuss each

of these three potential heirs in greater detail later, but as of now all that needs be known is that the most popular considerations for an heir to the royal throne were Carlos' great-nephews.

As we approach theses scripts we can assume Bances Candamo was genuinely concerned with the issue at hand and not trying to prod or provoke the monarchs as he is described as polite, courteous, and carried a general disdain for gossipmongers (García-Castañón 28). He is, after all, a *galán* of the court (29). In 1691 Bances Candamo was blessed with his own heir, his only descendant, and a male. Speculatively, perhaps this brought the idea of succession back to the forefront of Bances' creative mind. (He had addressed the topic in the past, as in *Quién es quien premia al amor?*, written at the end of the last decade. Álvarez García hypothesizes that Bances' target of the play is Carlos II, urging him to pick a successor.) Of his political trilogy, *La piedra filosofal* and *El esclavo en grillos de oro* are the most political. Santiago García-Castañón states that both works pertain to the genre of "aulic and political theater" but missteps in stating these plays "contain subtle political allusion" (29). While *La piedra filosofal* adheres more closely to the topics of literary decorum and *decir sin decir*, as outlined in chapter two, these works are far from subtle. Most overt in its ideas, presentation of a nephew-king paradigm, and in questioning who would be an appropriate successor is *El esclavo en grillos de oro.* It would not be hard to imagine that Bances Candamo's supposed resignation in 1694 (that I presume was much more likely in tune with what we would consider a forced retirement) was attributed to his inability to *decir sin decir* in *Piedra* and *Esclavo* and finds himself declaring, rather than tactfully alluding to, the hot topics he wished to address.[63]

---

[63] Maria Cristina Quintero specifically mentions that the topic of succession was ban by Carlos. For more information see her work: "Monarchy and the Limits of Exemplarity in the Teatro Palaciego of Francisco Bances Candamo".

Staged first among the works that comprise Bances Candamo's political trilogy, and the most overtly political of the group, is *El esclavo en grillos de oro*. There are conflicting conclusions about when *El esclavo en grillos de oro* was staged. Moir retains that it was likely staged at the end of October 1692 while Cuervo Arango believes it to have been November 20, 1692. In any case, it was staged by the company of Agustín Manuel de Castilla in the Salón Dorado.[64] This work tackles the issue of succession through a nephew-king paradigm where we see Adriano as nephew and heir to Trajano, Holy Roman Emperor. Trajano and Adriano have their present and future roles in the court threatened by the plotting Camilo who Adriano declares in an aside to the audience is his enemy: "A mi enemigo Camilo / he visto" (49-51). Camilo cites both his jealousy of Adriano, and Trajano's age, as motor for his plan to kill them both. Trajano learns of Camilo's plan from Cleantes and orders Camilo apprehended. He is as such at the same time Adriano is detained by Camilo's men and both are brought before the king and the *Senado*. Trajano decides Camilo should rule for a period of fifteen days, knowing the youth does not understand what fulfilling the title of King entails, and Adriano is freed, although confused by his uncle's actions. Trajano reassures his people and his councils that he will remain present in courtly proceedings during this time. The play unfolds throughout a series of events that test Camilo, as Trajano and Cleantes, an elder of the Roman Council, guide and teach him. Camilo tires quickly of his kingly duties, is jealous that Adriano may now marry Sirene, as she refused to marry above her station, and inevitably resigns from his position at the end of fifteen days, and before his coronation ceremony.

---

[64] Bear in mind that this audience was comprised of courtiers. Although the Buen Retiro came to host a more public audience, the Salón Dorado would have been home to an audience exclusively of the court.

El esclavo en grillos de oro has been read by others as an outright critique of Carlos' court, his ruling, and the role of the Count of Oropesa, Manuel Juaquín Álvarez, in the court. While as a scholar I am not opposed to evaluating the Count of Oropesa as potentially reflected in Camilo's character, these readings have also cast-type an ill-fitting direct relationship of the character of Trajano, Holy Roman Emperor, with Carlos II of Spain. Trajano is used to encourage Carlos to name an heir, but is also everything Carlos is not, and therefore an exemplary model for the court. This work, then, serves as an *espejo de príncipes* from which Carlos could have modeled his actions. The combination of the discussion about the heir while also providing exemplary elements in the text are two of three functions of this play. The first being that the play may very well have been an attempt to persuade Carlos to name an heir. Carmen Díaz Castañón agrees (44). The second function of this play is its role as an espejo de príncipes; that is it is didactic in "las artes de reinar" (649). Whether that instruction was directed at Carlos or was put forth by Bances Candamo as a suggestion of what the Spanish crown needs in a future monarch, thereby leaving a theatrical manual for the next young king, is up for debate. Finally, *El esclavo* presents the European view of Spain and potential acquisition of parts of its territories.

Bances Candamo begins by establishing the nephew-king paradigm for succession. From the opening moments of the production Bances Candamo highlights the nephew-king relationship as Trajano concludes his opening monologue calling for Adriano; his youth reinvigorates the aging Emperor:

TRAJANO: Tú, Adriano, llega, y enlaza
tu vida a mi vida, en este (*Abrázale*)
nudo: ¡ay sobrino!, con cuánta

terneza miro mis triunfos,
si en tu juvenil bizarra
edad, se está renovando
mi caduca edad anciana. (36-42)

The thought may be subconsciously planted that Trajano is aging toward the end of his reign, and Bances Candamo suggests for the audience his successor in the first minutes of the representation. Much of the remainder of the first and second acts is then dedicated to consideration of how exactly Camilo thinks he is going to be a successful king, what it will take to be a successful king, advice on the matter, and episodes that highlight Trajano's experience and wisdom and Camilo's kingly ignorance.[65] After establishment of the nephew-king paradigm the most noticeable change in tone or theme in the monologues of the late second and the third act is Camilo's relentless complaining that being a king is harder than he thought. These monologues and exchanges that offer guidance call to memory Spain's historical and political situation of the decade, and serve as a model for how to rule graciously.

The evaluation of the role of monarch, Camilo's potential, and the didactic or exemplar moments begin almost as quickly as the presentation of the nephew-king relationship. Lidoro, a centurion, questions Camilo's potential to the young man:

LIDORO: Lo digo
porque aunque estudiaste tanta
filosofía, y aunque

[65] Although there is a brief episode based in the idea of *ser y parecer*, those scenes by no means dominate the production, nor are they terribly "tricky" or confusing. We also never see an *encanto* in this play.

máximas tan elevadas
la política te enseña,
conozco la gran distancia,
que hay en sus operaciones,
de ejercerlas a estudiarlas.
Si no te cabe en el pecho
una presunción liviana
de ser monarca, ¿qué hará
el serlo, y cómo se hallara
con la posesión, que ya
no está en sí con la esperanza? (150-162)

This and other moments of doubt precede the three explicitly exemplary moments, but they begin to show the audience what would make a good ruler and the consequences of naming an inadequate successor. Trajano expresses such concern:

TRAJANO: Y solo una cosa siento,
que es dejar mal sucesor;
porque si es común proverbio
que los reinos se conservan
del modo que se adquirieron,
quien le consigue usurpando,
le mandará destruyendo. (650-656)

Knowing in that moment of Camilo's plan, Trajano turns his concern not to his well-being, or to the well-being of his nephew and heir, but rather to the well-being of the empire he presides

over. The audience begins to see from the first act how a monarch should behave, and that he prioritizes his populous over himself, providing a striking juxtaposition between Trajano's gracious figure as monarch and Camilo's covetous nature. Trajano then voices his doubts and frustrations about Camilo, calling attention to *how* an heir would learn to govern:

TRAJANO: ¿Qué sabe este loco joven,
de militares manejos?
¿Adónde aprendió las artes
del político gobierno?
¡Qué! ¿no hay más de ser monarca,
que después lo aprenderemos? (657-662)

These musings come in the middle of a 400-verse exchange between Trajano and Cleantes as the two characters model the idyllic form of the relationship between a monarch and a member of his council. Here we see that governing is an art, and Trajano's final question—despite its lack of specific qualities, attributes, or responsibilities of a king—reminds the audience that a monarch must be educated in "las artes de reinar" (649) before assuming that appointment. Nearly 1500 verses later, Cleantes details to Camilo the specifics of how the government functions in relation to its working parts:

CLEANTES: Yo
a vuestra instrucción atiendo
por el Senado; el Senado
viene a ser en vuestro cuerpo
la parte racional, vos
el material instrumento,

y cuanto el cuerpo ejecuta
manda el discurso primero.
El Príncipe es de las leyes
la viva voz; el Consejo
es la ley: luego a este debe
el Príncipe estar sujeto,
como por razón lo estamos
todos al entendimiento;
que, aunque es vasallo del hombre,
debe el hombre obedecerlo,
sin que del libre albedrío
pierda el absoluto imperio,
pues le manda, aconsejando,
y aconseja obedeciendo. (2120-2138)

By outlining the role of the *Senado*, the council, Cleantes himself, and the role Camilo would fill as monarch, this is the most explicitly instructional moment in the play, however it is made obvious that knowing how these relations function and fulfilling your role in those functions are two different entities. Camilo has the intellect to understand Cleantes' council, but like Carlos II he lacks the graciousness, tact, and experience to rule effectively. Elliott explains that Carlos II was incapable of what was expected of him, caged by court etiquette and decorum (*Wider World* 529). Bances Candamo places Camilo in a similar situation, and although he resists and wishes to make his own agenda "rules of court etiquette, once codified, were not easily susceptible to change" (529) as show in the Bances' exemplary episodes below.

As Trajano bestows upon Camilo his fifteen-day trial period as king, he leaves Camilo with advice and a warning: "[…] ya has conseguido / el Imperio; conservarlo / es más ciencia que adquirirlo" (1464-1466). At this point "las artes de reinar" (649) become a science. For the rest of the production the audience will observe that governing is in fact both an art and a science that takes graciousness as well as intellect and calculation. As I will explain below, these qualities are reflected in Trajano as both he and Camilo fulfill their duties in receiving commoners in the court to judge and resolve their problems. This section is the most overtly exemplary. Although the work as a whole is saturated in moments that offer advice to Camilo, Act II offers three concrete episodes.

The first citizen to come to them to ask for help is a man claiming to be an alchemist. He gifts Camilo a book that will show him how "hacer de cualquier cosa / el oro más acendrado" (1781-1782). Inexperienced and ignorant Camilo states that gold is of high importance to the Empire, such a book will be highly important, and consequently orders the man be paid 20,000 ducats. Before he can be paid Trajano interrupts and overrides Camilo's decision saying the man should be given an empty purse, for if he is the skilled alchemist he says, he already "sabe hacer oro" (1793) and "mejor es darle en qué echarlo" (1796). This effectively ends the ruse calling the man's bluff. Camilo expresses concern for his own blunder.

A woman, whose husband is guilty of murder, leaving her alone to care for her children, follows the false alchemist. She wishes the king's pardon for her husband in exchange for her monetary donation. Camilo pardons her husband and Trajano immediately rejects Camilo's decision. Trajano explains that a king might be able to forget any petty crime, but not murder or theft, as murderers are tyrants. This reasoning should hit closer to home for Camilo than it does. He is more concerned with how he looks making foolish decisions than the fact that Trajano's

speech here is describing Camilo's character. Fulfilling Quintero's observation that: "The fictional monarchies on stage embody and affirm […] what an ideal monarchy might look like, but at the same time the theater offers a long list of tyrannical and loutish monarchs who inspire sedition" (*Gendering* 5), Trajano serves as this ideal model, while Camilo had plotted to kill Trajano, and as a tyrant of the man more brutish and lazy than guided by teachings and decorum, he threatens the well being of the crown. As I mentioned above, however, Camilo with not continue to threaten sedition, and rather transform into a whining heir apparent who is disillusioned with the amount of work and intellectual thought his desired status requires.

The final lesson comes from the arrival of a man asking to expedite the start of his time in exile as he has spoken ill of the king. Camilo cuts the man's speaking short and orders him removed from Camilo's sight. Trajano yet again stops the proceedings: "qué haces, Camilo?" (1871), and further comments to Camilo that the man should be pardoned as Camilo's punishment does not punish the man and honor Trajano, but rather punishes Trajano. He explains that a man who speaks so poorly against the crown should be kept in Rome, as those who have heard his rants before know he lies about a good monarch. Were he to be exiled to a distant territory, those who do not know the king and his reputation so well may begin to doubt it upon hearing a newcomer's verbal bashing. At the end of these three exemplary exchanges Bances Candamo has effectively show that governing is in fact both an art and a science as Trajano balances intellect and analytical calculation of the situations in order to protect the well-being of the crown, the empire, and his populous.

As these three exemplary scenes have unfolded the audience has begun to hear Camilo's own concern over his capabilities. The young man did not wish to tend to his subjects imminently and assumed they would wait on him. He had to be pushed to fulfill his duties and

upon doing so, clearly does not measure up to his predecessor. Upon conclusion of these three episodes, Camilo's character will begin to echo the doubts and concerns the audience heard voiced in the first and second acts by Lidoro and Trajano. First he echoes Trajano's warning that governing is more difficult than acquiring the position itself as he states:

CAMILO: Solo todos me han dejado,
y el Imperio conseguido
no me parece, adquirido
tanto como imaginado. (1607-1610)

Hinting at precisely the fact that being king is harder than he thought, he confirms that it is not exactly what he had imagined. Next he will mirror Lidoro's original concern for Camilo for the fact that there is a significant *distance* between one's studies and one's actions. Camilo begins to genuinely consider the difference:

CAMILO: En nada acierto, con todos
mis estudios: cielos santos,
¿qué distancia en el gobierno
hay de ejercerlo a estudiarlo? (1901-1904)

Finally, he will provide the answer to Trajano's question "[…] ¿no hay más de ser monarca, / que después lo aprenderemos?" (661-662) when he confirms that he thought he was wise for the role of king, but "no deben ser doctrinados / de sabios, sino de reyes" (1958-1959). At this point Bances uses Camilo himself as vehicle to deliver advice. A royal heir should be chosen to succeed Carlos II and educated in the court, ideally, with a kingly example to which to look. More powerfully, this verse critiques Carlos II's station calling for the need of a new monarch in the royal court. Carlos, although he had his mother, the Queen Regent, to help guide him as

prince, I have shown in the previous section of this chapter that Mariana was overbearing. Carlos was incompetent and would never learn how to rule effectively, efficiently, or properly; he was brought up—and ruled—on the advice of the royal councils. He was not the king the court hoped for as he was schooled "doctrinado de sabios" rather than by his father's example. Despite that fact that Trajano explains "en todos los sucesos / de mis triunfos quede al mundo / se memoria para ejemplo" (748-750), in the actual Habsburg court, the death of Felipe IV proves that this statement is not enough in actual practice, or at least it is not enough with Carlos II. While Felipe IV certainly was in everyone's memory, and "Carlos wished to preserve his inheritance" (Storrs 166), Carlos did not have the capacity to recognize him as an example to follow and do so effectively.

The final concept *El esclavo en grillos de oro* addresses is a concern for and awareness of a global context. Ranging from the didactic theme to outside perceptions of the Spanish Empire, Bances Candamo brilliantly contextualizes his succession plot in a global framework. He begins by having Camilo address and call out the "española arrogancia" (248). This reputation of arrogance had been constructed and clung to throughout the seventeenth century. As the rest of Europe waited in the wings for Spain to crumble so they could pillage the pieces of the Empire, Spain held strong throughout the 1650s. It was not until the 1660s when Spain's attitude really became false bravado. Although the Habsburg Court may have felt justly in standing in such arrogance on such an illustrious history, that standing was fading.

Camilo will continue to be the vehicle through which the audience sees the European contextualization. As he unveils his desire to be king and his plans to kill Adriano and Trajano in an early Act I monologue he acknowledges:

CAMILO: […] pues no ignora,

que no entran bien los monarcas
(mayormente en las coronas,
que no son hereditarias)
mal vistos de la Milicia,
que es quien ha de conservarlas. (273-278)

Perhaps this is Bances Candamo's attempt at a warning that foreign rulers will have a tough time exercising command in the peninsula, but that would go without saying. *Aeque principaliter* alone made it difficult for rulers to effectively govern in lands they did not inhabit, and Bances reinforces the importance of *aeque principaliter* when Cleantes states: "[…] la igualdad / en paz mantiene los reinos" (2167-2168). From a functional perspective these lines aid Bances Candamo in constructing Camilo's indifference to the previous six lines as he self-justifies his ambitions:

CAMILO: Españoles son los dos,
y mi siempre Ilustra Casa
de los Camilos es timbre
de las primeras ancianas
Consulares y Patricias
familias más veneradas.
El más rico y poderoso
de Roma soy; ya me aclaman
por liberal la Milicia,
y por natural la Patria. (289-298)

These self-righteous justifications for the throne were prominent in two arenas in Europe at the time: among those European entities circling—hoping—to pick off a piece of the Spanish Empire and those families feeling as though they had the right to produce Carlos' heir. I have already discussed the case of Louis XIV invading the Netherlands years prior to Carlos II even having a chance to produce an heir. The French Court though serves as example again as Felipe of Anjou would inevitably be Felipe V of Spain. Their justification of course came through Louis XIV marriage to María Teresa of Austria. Due to the fact that Louis XIV's first born son, Louis the Grand Dauphin, and the Grand Dauphin's first son, Louis the Dauphin of France (Le petit dauphin), had to remain in France due to their place in line for the French crown, Felipe of Anjou—the second son of the Grand Dauphin—became the next logical heir from the French Court. Additionally, the aforementioned Leopold I's son Carlos was, in some minds, desirable as the heir. It was Leopold's standing as Holy Roman Emperor that gave the family the name and reputation it needed to insert itself into the conversation on the Habsburg succession. Finally, Mariana, who greatly desired José Fernando of Bavaria to be named heir (and he would be) found her justification in her place already in the court; José Fernando was a descendent of the union between Felipe IV and Mariana of Austria.

Finally Bances Candamo's uses Senador 1 to highlight that dividing an empire weakens it. At the beginning of Act II as Trajano is granting Camilo his fifteen-day trial period the Senador expresses such concerns:

SENADOR 1: Si el Imperio dividimos,
su poder enflaquecemos:
y pues la unión es principio
de todas la duraciones,

¿cómo hemos de persuadirnos
a que haya paz en un cuerpo,
mandado de dos arbitrios,
de dos impulsos guido
y hacia dos partes movido? (1368-1376)

The Senador here is referring to the shared power between Trajano and Camilo and repercussions of Camilo transitioning to power. The audience will see in Camilo's final lament that regardless, division already threatens itself outside of Rome much in the way the revolts and revolutions of the seventeenth century plagued the Spanish Empire.[66]

CAMILO: Que esto absorto.
Bretaña se me rebela,
las Islas hacen lo propio,
Clodio el laurel tiraniza,
y el ejército furioso
de Italia nos amenaza:
¿quién podrá acudir a todo
cuando aun para el donativo
no hay medios en el Tesoro? (3535-3542)

Camilo summarizes perfectly for the audience Spain's global context and cause for concern, with rebellion, Italy being a menace, and the many possible islands doing as they please. His complaints would be all too real for the 1690s audience. These short verses summarize nearly

[66] Recall Calderón's *La estatua de Prometeo.* Discordia will always threaten the political situation.

every major problem the Habsburg monarchy faced during Carlos II's life: revolts, revolutions, rebellions, difficulties that accompanied ruling lands the monarch did not inhabit, lack of a well-groomed and competent monarch to attend to the situation, and economic crisis that overwhelmed the court in Madrid. As the play concludes with Adriano being restored to his place in line as heir, these nine lines offered by Camilo resonate more strongly as an all-too present reality for the 1693 Habsburg Court.

After kicking off his political works on a particularly blunt note, Bances Candamo provided the court with *La piedra filosofal*, staged two months after *El esclavo. La piedra* was staged on María Antonia of Austria's birthday on January 18, 1693 at three in the afternoon by the acting company of Agustín Manuel de Castilla. María Antonia had died on Christmas Eve, just twenty-five days prior, but the court celebrated the birthday of Mariana of Austria's granddaughter nevertheless. Although Díaz Castañón argues that *El esclavo en grillos de oro* is Bances' masterpiece, *Piedra* exceeds *Esclavo* in a more careful execution of literary decorum and reminds the twenty-first-century reader of the work of Calderón and his *encantamientos*. *Piedra* allows us to understand how Santiago García Castañón came to his conclusion that Bances might be subtle in his treatment of political issues. However, proper contextualization of the historical-political scene of the 1690s allows us to uncover what Bances only partially veiled. Specifically explained here is Bances Candamo's treatment, once again, of the nephew-king succession paradigm.

In short, *La piedra filosofal* is a *comedia de fábrica* according to Bances Candamo's own classifications found in *Teatro de los teatros* in which de divides the classification of the *comedia* into those we still use today: *la comedia de fábrica* and *la comedia de capa y espada*. In *La piedra* Bances Candamo centers on Hispalo's ascension to the throne. The king, Hispán, is

looking for a successor in the future husband of his daughter, Iberia. Hispán seeks the advice of the old philosopher, Rocas, who recommends a challenge for three candidates that will allow Hispán to choose his successor and spouse for Iberia. Hispalo, as nephew to Hispán, is a natural candidate, and Numidio King of Numidia, as well as Tesandro King of Cerdeña, join Hispalo in the competition. Each is to undertake the task of building an aqueduct, a wall, or a bridge, and the first to finish will be the winner. Tesandro chooses to build an aqueduct, Numidio elects the wall, and Hispalo finds himself feeling stuck with the bridge which he cannot figure how he could possibly build, let alone quickly. Hispalo wins due to a Rocas *encanto*, leaving Hispalo confused and unable to distinguish reality from the *encanto*. Hispalo marries Iberia and pardon's Rocas for the *encantos* that Hispalo endured throughout the play, which breaks a previously presented prophecy.

In the midst of this there are two primary ways in which Bances Candamo addresses the question of succession. The first is in his presentation of the nephew-king relationship. Quintero notes the nephew element of Bances Candamo's work pointing out the uncle-nephew component of the Hercules-Hispanus/Hispalus relationship of the medieval Spanish myth that is mirrored in *La piedra filosofal* (*Gendering* 209). However, her observation of the paradigm ends there. The second is Bances' plot development of a three-man competition for the crown. The nephew-king relationship is presented to the audience in the first act, as usual. Hispalo declares in front of Hispán, and for the audience's benefit that he is the king's nephew:

HISPALO: [...]

Hispalo soy, tu sobrino,

hijo del ilustre Zeto,

tu primo hermano. Mi padre,

luego que recibió el pliego
en que a llamarme enviabas,
me envió a servirte, sabiendo
que este Reino dominabas,
[...] (767-773)

to which Hispán replies:

HISPÁN: Llega, sobrino, a mis brazos,
porque corone con ellos
tanto valor, que no en vano
acá en interiores ecos
anuncios de tu cariño
me estaba el alma latiendo.
Desde hoy se llame esta isla
la del león, en recuerdo
de tu hazaña, y el cadáver
consagrado quede al templo
de Hércules, como memoria
del antiguo león Nemeo.
Bésale a Iberia la mano. (833-845)

This exchanges is marked with an embrace, as is typical for Bances Candamo in the initial declaration of the nephew-king paradigm.[67] Additionally, future ascension to the throne is

[67] In *El esclavo en grillos de oro* this embrace will not be asked for verbally, but is rather executed in the stage direction.

marked by the imperative form of the verb *llegar*, as the present monarch invites his inevitable successor and kin to embrace him, symbolically "arriving" at an elite circle of present and future monarchs. So as to place emphasis on Hispalo as a preferred choice of heir, Hispán recognizes his daughter Iberia as heir, but she will need to be smartly matched. He explains thusly:

HISPÁN: Viendo yo que es mi heredera
mi hija Iberia y que a su blanca
mano aspiran cuantos reyes
en las vecinas comarcas
o tienen el mar por foso
o los escollos por valla,
quisiera cerrar la puerta,
con dejarla yo casada
[...]
En Hispalo, mi sobrino,
en quien se ve continuada
mi real varonía, quiero
que esta corona recaiga
[…]. (919-950)

Although in these last four lines Hispán expresses preference for his nephew, equally important is that Hispán reinforces the competition for his daughter's hand. Explaining "que a su blanca / mano aspiran cuantos reyes" highlights the both fictitious competition Bances created in his work, as well as the paralleled real-life competition for the Spanish Crown as the Habsburg Monarchy lived its final years.

In the first act Tesandro arrives from Cerdeña and Numidio from Numidia. They will come to represent the international competition for the Spanish Crown. This three-man competition is the means through which Bances Candamo reminds the courtly audience of the three most likely candidates for the Spanish Crown: the aforementioned Felipe of Anjou, Archduke Carlos, and José Fernando of Bavaria. Which of these three boys was the *rightful* heir to the throne is not an argument I wish to make here, for as I have shown there is a valid argument to be made for both José Fernando of Bavaria, which would have please Mariana of Austria as he was her great-grandson, as well as Felipe of Anjou, which certainly would have made Louis XIV desires and efforts to acquire large parts of the European territories under the Spanish Empire feel validated with his grandson as new reigning monarch of Spain. There are only two things I am willing to say definitively about this trio of royal boys, the first of which is that while it would be a heated argument to rightfully justify Felipe or José as the heir to the throne, Archduke Carlos certainly would not have been said rightful heir. As son of Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I and his third wife Leonor Magdalena, this Carlos had no direct bloodline tying him to the throne; he was a distant cousin.[68] His father's first wife had been Margarita Teresa, sister of Carlos II and daughter of Felipe IV and Mariana of Austria, which provided a stronger connection to the royal family; but Margarita was not his mother, and as far as Mariana would have been concerned, Archduke Carlos would not have been a viable heir to the throne. My second affirmation is that among the royal household in Madrid, with Mariana in presence as Queen Mother, the assumption would have been that José Fernando would be named heir. There

[68] Carlos IV, Holy Roman Emperor was second cousin to Carlos II and his strongest claim to the throne would not have been through Felipe IV or his offspring, but rather though Felipe III, who was Carlos IV great-grandfather.

is no doubt that Mariana considered José Fernando to be the heir they needed. The Baron of Lancier wrote of the high affection Mariana held for the Bavarian family and her new great-grandson: "Cette princesse a une si grande tendresse pour Vôtre Altesse Electorale et madame l'Electrice, qu'on ne le peut pas dire, et je doute fort si elle voudra laisser longtemps le Prince Electoral entre les bras de madame l'Electrice; elle voudra probablement l'avoir elle même auprès d'elle" (qtd. in Pfandl 293).[69] José Fernando as heir would retain a monarch with familial ties to Felipe IV, Mariana, and Carlos II while naming Felipe of Anjou king of Spain meant retracing the bloodline through Felipe IV's first marriage.

La piedra filosofal while seemingly "subtle" presents a precise context to a royal audience that would have seen through his attempt to *decir sin decir*. Although this work is not as overt as *El esclavo en grillos de oro*, it certainly is not hard to deduce what Bances' was driving at. He more closely adheres to Calderón's treatments and executions of *encantamientos* in his treatment of Rocas and Hispalo, and Hispalo's confusion. The test Rocas devises to examine Hispalo's character pulls the audience into the seventeenth-century labyrinth of *ser y parecer* and *encantos*, which occupies a large portion of this production. Even as the play closes, Hispalo expresses his doubts that Iberia is real. He refers to her as an illusion and a shadow. These doubts linger as byproducts of the enchantment. However, these literary recourses in Bances Candamo's creation of his script neither include nor shroud the characters of Tesandro and Numidio, their roles in the production, or their function. The presentation of the nephew-king paradigm, the plot line producing a competition among three male nobles for the hand of Iberia and the throne, and the final endorsed marriage of Hispalo, the nephew, to Iberia all

[69] Roughly, this citation from the Baron of Lancier says that Mariana is so fond of the new baby, José Fernando, that she may never let him go.

clearly outline Bances Candamo's treatment and assessment of the political situation of the time. Arguably, *La piedra filosofal* did not need to be as overt as *El esclavo en grillos de oro* considering its representation came on the heels of the former's staging just two months prior. The original 1690s courtly audience would have seen precisely the options the playwright had outlined for the court in his production.

Conclusions

Despite the hardships the royal court endured during the reign of Carlos II, they poured resources into theatrical productions and clung desperately to their fading image and reputation. As part of court culture, court representations remained ostentatious and playwrights Calderón de la Barca and Bances Candamo frequently incorporated political themes into their works. Raymond Williams tells us that: "A culture has two aspects: the known meanings and directions, which its members are trained to [and] the new observations and meanings which are offered and tested" (93). Although Williams is discussing "ordinary" or everyday culture of the populous, the same can be said for the culture of the court. I have shown through the historical-political context of the 1670s how court culture and politics were challenged and tested through Don Juan José's opposition to the status quo of the Habsburg Court. This opposition, in turn, was inspirational for Calderón's works of the early 1670s, which presented both sides of the dueling political conflicts, despite Calderón's own respect and support for the Crown. His treatment of the tension and opposition between Mariana of Austria and Don Juan José demonstrates his mastery of literary decorum and did not place him in a position where courtiers would have doubted his loyalties.

Bances Candamo, however, directly addressed the succession conversation with repeated presentation of his solution: the nephew-king paradigm. Although he has been heavily criticized

by early modern scholars for not living up to the caliber of work we find in Calderón, there is no doubt he was the playwright of his generation, and while he may not have executed the level of literary decorum Calderón did, he nevertheless masterfully weaved in a broader European context in *El esclavo en grillos de oro* and in the three-man competition in *La piedra filosofal. El esclavo en grillos de oro* additionally serves as an *espejo de príncipes*, modeling ideal court relationships and presenting the image of an ideal monarch as an example to be followed.

History will define the political relationships of a period. Research into the history of Spain during the seventeenth century is a testament to this claim. The turmoil and economic strife of the first half of the seventeenth century created a platform for change and reform. Spain's political situations of the 1670s and 1690s, as I have shown, were defined by the history that Spain endured during the first sixty years of the century. Therefore, it is impossible to separate the politics of the era from its history. Just as history affected politics, such a potent political climate had its effects on the royal theater. Therefore, historical-political contextualization of these plays permits an in-depth analysis of these works and their function. Traditional Baroque elements of *engaño*, *encanto*, *ser y parecer*, etc. are present and may be evaluated from a literary perspective, but within the specific political framework, its imperative these works be considered as productions on the stage of the Royal Court. These plays, evaluated as staged productions rich in music and scenography, will occupy the investigations of the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Scenography, Space, and the Spanish *Zarzuela*

In addition to less spectacular forms of entertainment, such as acrobatics (including tumbling) and puppet shows, royal pastime was centered in two major arenas in Early Modern Spain (Greer and Varey 11). In their extensive volume, *El teatro palaciego en Madrid: 1586-1707 Estudio y documentos*, Margaret Greer and John Varey confirm that the first was hunting, and the second, and no less important, was the *comedia* (11). Although certainly common in England, and not altogether uncommon in Spain, the monarchs did attend the public theater. However, Kazimierz Sabik notes: "Era [la] ilusión, la admiración, que buscaba y apreciada más el público cortesano y también el pueblo [...] y fue el teatro *de corte*, la 'fiesta teatral', el medio que [...] fue capaz de satisfacer mejor que cualquier otro esa necesidad" ("El teatro de corte" 608, emphasis added). In other words, court *comedias* were appreciated by both the royal and the public audiences. Rather than the monarchs attending theater in the *corrales*, there was a trend in Spain in the seventeenth century of the public attending representations in a royal space: the Coliseo del Buen Retiro.

Court drama was already well established by the seventeenth century. This is not only my perception and the work of other scholars, but also the opinion of many of Mariana of Austria's royal counselors who note in 1672 in a letter to the widowed queen: "comenzaron las Comedias, o en los años de los […] Reyes Católicos o poco después en el tiempo del Señor emperador Carlos 5º, tomaron entera forma en el del Señor Rey Felipe 2º" (6-7). Although firmly rooted in

court culture by the time Lope begins his efforts to seek royal patronage in the early seventeenth century,[70] there is a new era in court theater when young Mariana arrives at the court in Madrid in 1649 that is perceived as formal and festival theater (Becker 353). The works "de gran espectáculo fueron escritas para ser representadas en determinados festejos reales" (Greer and Varey 17), and court theater continued to mark occasions such as births, marriages, weddings, political celebrations, and the naming of kings and queens (their name days) as well as anniversaries, health recoveries, and visits of other princes from abroad (Lobato).

Court premieres served as a type of advanced screening of the work, as it was not unheard of to repeat works both in the court and in the *corrales*. This placed courtiers in a privileged position at the forefront of artistic production and consumption. This notion of privilege is especially important in Spain as it defines, in a variety of ways, the evolution of court theater. The royal theater in Spain diverged greatly from and presents itself as more original and innovative than some of its European contemporaries, particularly through the evolution of the Spanish *zarzuela*. This musical performance was inspired by the Italian opera, but evolved more in Spain than in any other court influenced by Italian production, such as France or England. This is not to say that Spain's history of rich and ostentatious representation does not share some commonalities with other courts in Europe at the time, as the court in Madrid was connected to that of Vienna, as I demonstrated in chapter three, influencing the thematic nature of these productions. England, as I have mentioned in previous chapters, also shared Spain's zeal for ostentation. Therefore, this chapter traces Spain's royal theatrical roots, and situates Spanish royal theatrical production in relation to the production and performance of its contemporaries—

[70] For more on Lope's royal ties see: Wright, Elizabeth. *Pilgrimage To Patronage: Lope de Vega and The Court of Philip III, 1598-1621*. Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp, 2001.

most notably, England. I show that the spaces in which these works were staged, and their production elements—such as the evolution of music and scenography—defined Spanish court drama. I prove that royal Spanish drama is its own genre of *comedia* performance by: demonstrating the fluidity of the Coliseo del Buen Retiro; showing that the play coexists as a separate performance from that of the monarchs (part of the court spectacle) and outlasts the regal performance; and by exploring the multimedia composition of court plays. Subscribing to a subjective paradigm allows me to contextualize these works as they were, not as scholars presume they aught to be.

The theatrical year in the Spanish court began on Easter (Shergold and Varey 38), and Sabik notes that from 1614-1636 court theater's themes included the chivalric, pastoral, and mythological motifs and genres. We also see thematic elements of honor and virtue. Although both Lope and Calderón dominated court theater in the early decades of the seventeenth century, their works were quite different, and Calderón was the "principal proveedor del repertorio del teatro palaciego" by the late seventeenth century (Sabik, "El teatro de corte" 605), and during the first fifteen years Carlos II's life. Matthew Stroud refers to Calderón as a court dramaturge (41), and although not incorrect, as he was a playwright for the court, there is no literature to-date that officially names him as such. That is to say, he was a playwright for the court, but he was never Court Playwright. Calderón's works celebrated themes of love, allegory, and *lo mágico* in addition to his inclination for mythological themes, as Sabik confirms ("El teatro te tema mitológico"). Not to be forgotten is Lobato's observation and confirmation of political themes that inundate Calderón's work alongside *lo mitológico* (261). By situating themselves in such a privileged relationship with the court, and by dominating courtly theatrical production as Calderón does, these two playwrights demonstrate that "la manipulación del teatro palaciego es

también una manera en que el noble ambicioso puede aspirar al poder, no tanto por el contenido de las obras representadas, sino más bien por el mero acto de controlar las diversiones de los reyes, de adularles y de reforzar su amor propio" (Greer and Varey 78). The notoriety and presence Calderón cultivated in these earlier years would carry him in the court throughout his career.

However, Calderón dies in 1681 leaving nineteen more years of Habsburg court theater for which to account. Lobato names Baccio, Antonio de Escamilla, Manuel Vallejo, Manuel Mosquera, Matías de Castro, Juan Acacio Bernal, Roque de Figueroa and Sebastián de Prado as common court playwrights in the palace, while Sabik calls our attention to Juan Vélez de Guevara, Juan Bautista Diamante, Agustín de Salazar y Torres, Melchor Fernández de León, Pablo Polope, Marcos de Lanuza (who is the Count of Clavijo), and Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo; Sabik notes that Polope is the inferior artist of the bunch ("El teatro de tema mitológico" 784). Bances Candamo achieved the most notoriety and was the most skilled of the court playwrights after Calderón, although the latter's influence in the court was celebrated well after his death, and occasionally overshadowed Bances Candamo's work. The *autos* staged for Corpus in 1691, for example, were Calderón's *El maestrazgo del Toisón* and *Psiquis y Cupido*. This came at the recommendation of the Corpus committee after Bances had submitted *El gran químico del mundo* and *Las mesas de la Fortuna* for consideration. The committee acknowledged that Bances' autos were the best of the contemporary pieces that were submitted, but recommend to the king the works by Calderón due to his popularity (Moir xxix).

While these playwrights helped shape Spanish theater, the evolution of Spanish court drama was also shaped by Italian influence. Most scholars acknowledge Italy's pervasive artistic influence on performance-based production in much of Europe (Egginton, Greer, Varey, Kernan

and Sabik among others). Most notably, this artistic diffusion emanated from Italy to Spain, Austria, France, England, and even Poland. In his comparison of Elizabethan and Jacobean theater, Alvin Kernan states that in approaching these studies it is "helpful to begin by reminding ourselves of the normally close relationship which existed in Renaissance Italy, France, Spain, and England between the courts which focused and displayed the magnificence of the new princes and the artists—architects, musicians, painters, poets—whose art objectified the wealth, taste, style, values and power of the new national states" (15).[71] Not only did the Italian influence impact royal works staged, but Sabik also confirms that this influence was infused into Spanish court culture stating that the entire "fiesta principesca" had Italian roots ("El teatro de corte" 601), and it was, according to Profeti, the Italian actors that came to Spain that "exportaron de Italia una manera nueva de "vender" teatro por parte de los profesionales: venderlo a los nobles, a la Corte, a la Iglesia" (qtd. in Lobato 265). However, some of this influence would take decades to reach its full impact. As the Italian opera was developing in the first half of the seventeenth century, playwrights such as Lope de Vega were writing at the order of the Queen in Spain, and the Spanish *zarzuela* was decades from its solidification as its own genre. Contact and exchange of the European courts with each other not only disseminated the Italian influence, but also brings attention to artistic commonalities. Along with the Italian influence—particularly on

[71] Although Kernan maintains that the close relationship between theater and court strengthened the political conservatism, catered to royal interests, and paid the monarch nice compliments, that is not to say we have not seen in Spain subversive trends or playwrights who question the court's future. Most recently, in a question and answer session after his talk entitled, "Acting Up: Cervantes and the Possibility of Activist Theater in Early Modern Spain" Cory Reed put forth that theater can simultaneously present and question ideology.

scenography and music—Spanish drama had similarities to that of England. Comparing the two illuminates Spain's place in European court drama—a necessary comparison if I am to establish Spanish court drama as its own genre. The royal court in Spain molded artistic elements, tropes, and trends into the Spanish Baroque court performance.

Baroque theater was dependent on patronage and operated under the assumption that the return offering would be an entertaining spectacle (Kernan 15). Kernan is referencing English theater here, but Spanish royal productions also lived and survived under this condition. These works in Spain were meant to entertain and leave the audience in awe of its aesthetics. Such entertainment began rooted in courtier participation in Spain. Many works of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century were performed by "damas y meninas de la Corte", and occasionally boasted princely participation (Sabik, "El teatro de corte" 601-602).[72] In 1614, for example, Prince Felipe played the role of Cupid before the King (Shergold, *Spanish Stage* 250). However, as theater evolved in Spain in the seventeenth century, there is a near total transition to professional acting (Varey, "The Audience" and Lobato) with few exceptions, such as *El nuevo Olimpo*, staged in the Salón Dorado on December 21, 1649 by "la infanta y sus damas" (Lobato 257).

As theater had become firmly established as a preferred pastime in the Spanish Court in the second half of the sixteenth century, impacted by the events of the court and the lives of its members, theater was deeply influenced by the crown in England as well. The court masque is the court theater of Renaissance and Baroque England (Limon 261), and Elizabethan and Jacobean Theater and the relationship of the "theater to them [the monarchs] and their courts"

[72] Sabik cites the prince's participation in the dance of the first intermission of Lope's *El premio de la hermosura* in 1614 in Lerma.

operated under the Renaissance norm that theater is just as closely tied to the court as other arts of the time (Kernan 15).[73] However, Alvin Kernan explains that these two theatrical classifications are seriously divided in both moral and social attitudes, as Elizabethan theater is typically "romantic" and "optimistic" while Jacobean works are more "urban" and "satiric" (15). This classification model would not find its way to Spain, as we define Spanish theater by the playwright or within the court it was produced. We do not, however, classify and link a genre of theater to the monarch.

Additionally, it is interesting to note that under consideration of Kernan's definitions of Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedy, there are parallels of nearly all the mentioned elements that defined these tragedies, remodeled and present in the Spanish *comedia*. These commonalities point to similar thematic interests of their respective playwrights and audiences. Elizabethan tragedy presents "sinners against the background of an assumed natural stable moral and social order, which inevitably reasserts and rights itself" (Kernan 15). This is more closely aligned with mid-twentieth-century theory on Baroque Spanish theater whose works can be read for the reassertion of an order and reigning ideology. Contrarily, Sabik calls attention to the propensity of Calderón to introduce socio-moral difficulties and problematizations (607), perhaps more reminiscent of Jacobean tragic theater that "shows existential heroes struggling to express their 'virtu' in a corrupt social order against a dark background of metaphysical doubt and moral uncertainty" (15).

---

[73] The philosophical and social changes which contributed to our literary terminology did not happen in 1603 when James I became King, but rather in the 1580s and 90s as the court of Elizabeth broke down. Alvin Kernan's: "The court and the public theatre under Elizabeth and James" in *Opportunities for Research in Renaissance Drama*, vol. 23, 1980, p. 15.

Although England's theatrical models at the end of the sixteenth century centered in tragic drama, England's approach to the widely implemented play-within-a-play reveals a court-actor tension that would manifest in Spain as well. An interesting characteristic of Shakespeare's plays in particular is that: "All of Shakespeare's internal plays are given a noble or courtly setting" (Kernan 18). For example, *Love's Labour's Lost* presents an internal play presented for the King of Navarre and the Princess of France, and the play-within-the-play of *Taming of the Shrew* is staged in what is meant to be the mark of a play in the court represented to a false noble: the character Christopher Sly, a tinker. The subjects of these plays are noble, therefore, the setting is the court or the great house, and Kernan explains that the players were both amateur and professional. The courtly setting of these plays-within-the-plays juxtaposed to public players allows the internal plays to offer a view of the relationship between theater and aristocracy. In the case of Shakespeare there is "a basic antagonism between the courtly world and the common players" (18). I argue the same relationship in Spain had developed its own antagonism based in finances. Although an honor to play for the court, and some troupes were asked to play for the court on repeat occasions, the court in Madrid had a habit of not paying actors, and other artists, or paying them with great delay. One letter from 1689, for example, asks for payment that was three years overdue (Shergold and Varey, doc. num. 119).

Unfortunately, much of the information about Spanish court spectacles was lost in the 1734 Alcazar fire and the destruction of the Palacio del Buen Retiro during the Napoleon Era (Shergold and Varey 35). Nevertheless, palace festivals "fueron uno de los determinantes principales de la creación de textos literarios concretos que en otro caso nunca hubieran tenido quizá la posibilidad de existir" (Lobato 257). This was perhaps partially due to the fact that it was not possible to have so many works represented in the *corrales*, as Lobato notes. Despite

document and manuscript loss, documents from 1679-1680 that have survived show "la importancia que se daba a las representaciones dramáticas en la vida palaciega, y nos permiten vislumbrar detalles de la vida de los actores, dramaturgos, músicos y pintores que se dedicaban al desarrollo de las fiestas regias de los últimos Austrias" (Shergold and Varey 25). That is to say, that despite the fact that much of the material documenting court productions was destroyed, enough remains to underscore the importance of theater in court life and court culture. Spain's cultural development surrounding the creation and evolution of theater and its presentation was undoubtedly influenced by artistic practices in Italy and shares some commonalties with English theater. However, Spain did not merely copy its predecessors and contemporaries, but built upon, expounded upon, and transformed these cultural artifacts and influences into a type of performance that was uniquely its own.

Performance in the Royal Court

There are a variety of notions of and approaches to what constitutes performance in the broadest terms, and some scholars have chosen to narrow their focus on the explanation of what constitutes a theatrical performance, and even court performance specifically. For example, John Varey's article titled, "The Audience and the Play at Court Spectacles: the Role of the King", focuses on the relationship between the audience, the king as part of that audience, and the actors. Maria Galli Stampino focuses on the relationship between the staged performance and the court life. Jerzy Limon brings forward the notion of the specificity of the time, site, substance, and audience of a play. Most broadly, Richard Schechner focuses on defining elements of our lives *as performance* versus something that *is performance*. Finally, Henry Sayre considers a variety of media, including theater, to define varying performance traits.

It is the intersection of these particular works that demonstrates the different performances

of and within court life. Performance was not just limited to the staged plays the court hosted. It also accounts for how a play in the court is a part of an ongoing staging of life (Stampino 12). Stampino suggests there is a boundary between the performance and everyday actual court. However, "the palace spectacle is a heightening of the metaphor which the Court as a whole plays out, […] we must always remember that the Court itself is theater" (Varey, "The Audience" 405). This, therefore, includes the performance of the court, particularly of the monarchs, as royal spectators in a royal space. Beginning with the broad performance theory of Sayre and Schechner, I prove that the adaptable, transformative, nature of the plays and the etiquette driven behavior of the monarchs and courtiers in attendance coexist as distinct performances in the Spanish royal court. These performances include elements we would not expect them to include, such as ruses and pranks played at the audience's expense. This forces the question: what is *not* performance? Court drama challenges our attempts to encapsulate and delimit performance, as we have two almost unrelated performances. One is that of the play on the stage and the performance of the actors, and the other is the royal performance of majesty. In these two performances the play is based on representing another reality, while the monarchical performances are based on their station. We cannot separate these two performances, but rather I examine how these two types of performance come in contact with each other in order to understand the coexistence of these performances and their product: court drama.

To begin, in his work "Performance" Sayre defines the difference between what we have considered "performance" and what we can define as "artistic performance". The former has a more ordinary usage and is defined as: "A specific action or set of actions […] which occur on a given occasion, in a particular place", while the latter "is further defined by its status as the single occurrence of a repeatable and preexistent text of score" (Sayre 91). That is to say, for

example, a king's ceremonial performance, his entrance, attendance and exit of the theater as part of court festivities is "performance", and I would argue so despite its repeatable nature and the preexistent text defined and bound by the norms of court etiquette. The plays represented before him, however, are "artistic performance", based in a playwright's manuscript, and repeatable to royal and public audiences alike. Richard Schechner terms these performances *as performance* and something that *is performance* in his text *Performance Studies: An Introduction.* "There are no limits to what 'is' performance" and it is classified by social convention and cultural circumstances (a play); on the other hand, nearly anything can be studied "as" performance even if cultural norms do not deem it as something that traditionally "is" performance (the king's role as such at a play) (Schechner 38). Schechner's approach to performance leads the reader to similar demarcations in performance, but Sayre's terms provide a more clear delineation in terminology as it applies to court theater. There is no question that the ceremonial performance of the monarch and the plays are all performance, but Sayre's terminology allows us to easily delineate between the play and the monarch as two separate performances within the court, as our own cultural morns already consider a play *artistic* performance.

While the staged play and the performance of the monarch's majesty coexist as court performance, we find under Sayre's theory that a play has many performances: the play itself and all of its interpretations. Sayre writes: "The work itself is not only distinct from its actual or possible realizations but in fact *transcends* them. That is, it anticipates, even *authorizes*, its many occurrences and somehow *contains* their variety" (Sayre 91). This idea summarizes the potential of a theatrical performance while resonating with the theoretical approaches I explained in chapter two. Thinking back to the concern of a uniform audience, my approach in proving how

an individual spectator remains as such by using Egginton's theory that our own knowledge base defines our experience is further strengthened by Sayre's explanation here. The work itself makes possible the repeat performance at the same time it opens the door to a varied representation. For example, in 1724 the Bourbons restaged *Fieras afemina amor* (López Alemany and Varey 246), a work I reference from the court of the 1670s. In their restaging, the major change that was made was the rewriting of the music that was part of the production. Not only did they rewrite the music; they turned the play into an opera. The mere existence of the work creates a platform in which the Bourbons restaged the play, and tailor it to the musical trends of the period, as "music was one of the most […] flexible […] special effects in performances" of the era (Porras, "Musical Scenes" 97). This then proves that the staged play, including all its possible realizations, outlasts an individual monarch's performance of majesty. While the monarch's performance is constant and should be consistent (think, court etiquette) the play is trans-dynastic, giving court drama special meaning as performances created for the stage outlast the regal performance of the monarch for which they were created.

However, Sayre will explain that the idea of a "transcendent" original has been replaced by the possibility of plural performances (94). This conclusion seems quite clearly influenced by works such as Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in which a copy will never contain the aura of the original. Baudrillard implies the existence of the duplicate undermines the original, as if the copy tarnishes the original's exclusivity. In the case of theater, this last interpretation would, of course, be linked to an objective view, defined by Sayre as the view held that an observer would want to know the author's intentions and would reject other interpretations. The relation between intention of an author/composer and the interpretations of performers has been the crux on which the idea of performance has rested in

literary studies, and literary history has been naturally disposed toward the more objective view of the work (Sayre).[74] However, taking a more subjective approach, I argue that in its distinct realizations, while a subsequent play's performance will never be exactly what the original was, a new realization becomes something *entirely* new, and each performance exists as something different for each consumer on the basis of the unique knowledge base.[75] While works like Baudrillard's leave the feeling that everything that imitates the original is somehow less than the original, I argue that Sayre's statement that the work transcends and contains the variety of realizations possible gives way to the idea of a "new" and, even subjectively "better", original.[76]

While literature creates its own reality and has to try to avoid a confusion of "realms", it must also "not confuse its own workings with 'life, reality, and history'" (Sayre 98). However, this is precisely what theater does do at times. In his article "Reality is Bleeding: A Brief History of Film from the Sixteenth Century", William Egginton refers to those instances in which the reality of a play and the reality of the audience's world come in contact and can be mistaken for one and the other as a "bleeding" of these two worlds. Egginton states that "the filmic technique of presenting the medium […] as if it were the object—reality itself" is illusionism, a technique he traces back to the sixteenth century (210). One can reference the example of a late sixteenth-

---

[74] Sayre's work notes that we have moved past this approach.

[75] For more on the role of the individual's knowledge base, see chapter two's section: "Maravall, Greer, and Egginton: Approaches to the Golden Age and Their Applications to Theatrical Analysis".

[76] Under a subjective view Sayre tells us the consumer of art does not know art, but knows what they like.

century *comedia* performed in the court in Denia, with the Duke of Lerma in attendance.[77] Elizabeth Wright explains that the play was interrupted to announce Turkish invaders in Ibiza (56). Sunrise revealed that the attack had been a ruse after Lerma and "five companies of soldiers [had] set out for the coast, and the area remained on alert until dawn" (56). The audience, and Lerma, discovered this was a tacit used to incite fear in the audience. Limon explains that in the cases in which spectators are pulled into the action and are engaged in varying degrees of interactions "one can hardly speak of […] spatio-temporal barriers established between the stage and the auditorium" (Limon 259). Although Stampino claims that performers refer to a reality that is different or "other" from the reality that they represent with their presence, the example involving Lerma seems to be a clear exception. This is further supported by Varey's consideration of the "difficulties inherent in an attempt to delimit the theatrical experience" ("The audience" 399) and his explanation that while actors used disguises such as costumes and speech to delineate between themselves and the audience and their normal roles in the society, there was no clear-cut division between entertainment and audience (400). This creates space for illusionism in the staged play. Therefore, when considering what performance is, one should think of the potentially disruptive forces of the "outside" that are encouraged to assert themselves.[78] This could be anything from staged interruptions, to music and scenography, as well as the space of the Salón Dorado or the Buen Retiro, and the diverse audience. In the case of the interrupted *comedia* Lerma attended, one can see that the particular audience in this case provided the means by which the actors could successfully execute this ruse. Egginton posits: "The spectators […] may feel free to doubt the validity of the actions they see represented on the

[77] Title of the work is unknown.

[78] Sayre introduces the idea of the relationship between art and what is "outside" it.

stage, but can in no way doubt the existence of the stage itself, or the fact that they are present in the audience watching the performance" (228). However, I argue they can doubt if the reality they are seeing is *still* the reality of the play. Egginton explains that the fact that "realities started to bleed into one another almost immediately should not surprise us, since the very path that led us to question our knowledge of Reality guaranteed that we would never find a definitive answer, because […] *that Reality was never there*" (228). For example, Egginton argues that reality effects "in which the spectator experiences the spectacle as if it were the actual reproduction of some real event" is a natural product of audio-visual technological advances and cites Orson Wells inciting panic for radio listeners that Earth was being attached by Mars (209). However, for the people of Denia that reality *had been there*. Denia was the same town Francis Drake raided in 1587 (Wright 56). This real raid occurred during a *comedia* performance during which nineteen people died in an attempt to exit the *corral* in a stampede (56). This likely cultivated a real-life fear of an attack mid-performance that could have been exploited.[79]

Although there was etiquette and courtly norms to be followed, it is not necessary for the actor to follow or bring to fruition the author's intention, an idea Grotowski agrees with.[80] Instead, what we must ask is that the audience and artist(s) come together in "tuning" themselves with each other (Sayre). For example, in the example above of the interrupted *comedia* during which the audience was fooled in order to elicit a desired response, it was the responsibility of

---

[79] Wright, too, expresses similar sentiments.

[80] Author intention may not have been highly regarded anyway as playwrights, with the exception of Calderón, were not integral in the staging of a work. This would certainly have been true in the *corrales,* as once an *autor* had a text in hand, he may do with its interpretation as he please.

the audience in this case to tune themselves to the reading of the actors.[81] Although, according to Sayre, actors pretend to be someone else in a different time from the real event, cases like this one, in which the lines between fiction and reality are blurred (for Egginton they bleed into one and the other), force the audience and actors to tune themselves to each other in ways in which other representations may not demand.

The production of this *comedia* is what Limon would refer to as *audience specific* as it relies on Lerma's attendance. A play is not only audience specific, but also time, substance, and site specific (Limon). These four attributes, or specificities, are more often than not defined by the court, courtiers, and the events of their lives. Therefore, I argue that court drama is more specific than other dramatic subgenres. As *loas*, *bailes*, and *fines de fiesta* celebrate the specific purpose for a court festival, they are typically more specific across these four domains than the *comedias* themselves. Court drama, therefore, addresses an audience that is transcendently important, as court drama borrows its transcendence from the court as it defines its specificity.

Limon's work on specificity is more apt at describing the unique nature of a work or its "originality". Limon puts forth that the more specificity a production has, the more inseparable it becomes from the time, space, signaling matter, and the participating audience (Limon 262). The court works referenced in this project are highly specific, but how specific they are depends on the precise conditions of the work in question. In the prior example of the interrupted *comedia* threatened by a fake Turkish attack, the work is incredibly audience specific as that performance is unique to that audience on that day, and dependent on Lerma's attendance and position to lead a defense. Additionally, it is possible that many that remembered the real 1587 attack were still

[81] This is an extreme example in which the actors arguable went too far with their ruse. Nevertheless, at daybreak the disband audience became aware of the performers' intent.

alive, making this ruse all the more impactful for this audience. Today, for example, we would not be able to use the same methods in inciting fear in the audience. We would not be able to use a noble's station, and certainly not Lerma's station, as part of the ruse. Rather, the production would have to be adapted for a contemporary audience. Therefore, that representation of this *comedia* gives it a unique token of originality that is reliant on its audience specificity.

Two other works, among others, highlight the specificity involved in court production: the *loa* for *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, and the January 1691 production of *Donde hay agravios no hay celos*. *Cómo se curan los celos* and its accompanying pieces, including the *loa* had their premiere on December 22, 1692 in the Coliseo (Greer and Varey 227). Written to be staged in the Coliseo specifically, this production has a relatively high *site specific* standing. That is to say, the Coliseo offers unique staging possibilities that differentiate it from other royal spaces. However, its specificity here is not as intense as it could be. I claim that *Cómo se curan los celos* and its accompanying pieces are not as site specific as other representations because we could, theoretically, replicate or reconstruct the seating arrangements and staging elements of the Coliseo for any of its three types of audiences. There is a certain exclusivity and originality the work has in being staged in the Coliseo that could not be recreated in the Salón Dorado, for example, but we could attempt to reproduce these condition today in contemporary theaters. Therefore there is some site specificity to the production, but by being able to recreate the dimensions and seating for the Coliseo, and staging elements we lower some of the specificity produced by this production. What made this representation site specific was its potential to additionally offer scenographic possibilities not available for example in the Salón Dorado in 1692. For example, the 1680 production of *Hado y divisa* called for more manpower to run the *bastidores* (dozes of individuals) than could have comfortably fit alongside the portable stage in

the Salón Dorado. The audience, time, and substance specificity are much more strong in *Cómo se curan los celos*, which was staged in celebration of Mariana's birthday for the royal court.

The time specificity of the *loa* is unique to Mariana's birthday and Carlos' name day. Although these events were repeatedly celebrated every year, this *loa* is audience specific. It is not meant for our consumption; it was designated for the royal court (audience specific) in those moments of the year (time specific). Linked to its time specificity, the substance of the *loa* reinforces that these festivities were dedicated to Mariana and celebrated Carlos II name day and pays oral tribute to Mariana, Carlos, their reign, and that of the Habsburgs with music typical for the era. The *loa* references Carlos on his name day and the Habsburg name as the greatest of royal names. These details define the *loa* as incredibly substance specific.

On the other hand, such adaptations as *Donde hay agravios no hay celos* were highly site specific. This play was written between 1635 and 1636 by Rojas Zorilla, and was repeated on various occasions, including as a *particular* in the Queen's chambers on January 31, 1691 (Greer and Varey 227). This *particular* differs from the January 29, 1637 premiere in the Palacio de El Pardo as it would have had to be adapted to the Queen's quarters.[82] The play was limited by the resources and spatial restrictions of the Queen's chamber. Were this exact adaptation then taken and staged in the Coliseo, it would feel incredibly lackluster and out of place. Staging for the *particular* would have been marked for the Queen's quarters, scenography would have been limited, there would have been no use of *bastidores* or *tramoyas*, as they would not have been available in private chambers, there would have been no frontispiece, limited costuming, and few

[82] The date of the premiere is confirmed by the *Instituto Almagro de teatro clásico* in their project to produce four edited volumes of the complete works of Rojas Zorrilla (279).

actors. Therefore, this particular adaptation is highly site specific as it was specifically designed to be represented to the Queen in a private setting. The play would have to be readapted for a representation in the Coliseo. This adaptation applies not only to the staged work, but applies also to the king and/or queen and their royal performance as monarchs. This need for a monarchical adaptation then shows that, although more constant, their performance makes possible various renderings or interpretations depending on the physical space the monarch occupies. *Particulares* did not require the same ceremonial entrances and exits that festival performance did with their processionals that ran throughout the Palace. Therefore, this need to adapt court performance is called for in relation to court drama as well as in relation to the way in which the magnificence of the monarch is constructed, thereby making the performance of the monarch site specific.

The time and substance specificity of Early Modern theater varies greatly. There are instances in which I have shown in previous chapters that the topics many of the political works navigate incredibly universal notions and complications. That makes these works less time and substance specific. However, the ways in which these characters relate to or mirror specifically the life and times of the period in which they were produced increase their standing as *time* and *substance specific*. There are certain instances, however, that take this moderate standing and dramatically intensify it. For example, the *loa* for *Cómo se curan los celos* we have seen was represented for Carlos's name day and deals entirely with the illustrious past and hopeful future of the monarchy. This *loa*, even presented just six months later, would be out of place as its purpose and recognition of Carlos's name day makes it incredibly time specific. It exists solely for that moment of the year. Additionally, the celebration of Carlos as monarch renders the *loa* quite substance specific. It deals with a specific subject matter, relevant to the given audience

that exists in that time. I argue that it is for this reason that "casi siempre se prepararon nuevas loas, entremeses y fines de fiesta para las grandes ocasiones" (Shergold and Varey 31). Considering the purpose of the Spanish *loa* in serving to call the court audience's attention to the work they are about to see, to honor the monarchs, and call attention to the reason for the festivities that has a correlation to the calendar, *loas* will almost always be more *time* and *substance specific* then the plays that follow them.

The varying specificity of these representations is both what allows us to be drawn to universal themes, and creates an intangible essence that separates us from the uniqueness of both the premiers, and repeat performances, of the Early Modern era. Original creations made a platform for repeat performances, reinterpretations, rewritings, and therefore a variety of realizations. Despite this malleability, court etiquette was ridged in the Spanish Court and the part the monarchs played as spectators and consumers of these artistic performances was dictated by this etiquette. The ceremonial performance of the monarchs, therefore, was less subject to change and coexisted in conjunction with the artistic performance on the stage. Their performance, however, was also site specific as they construct their own magnificence in relation to the space they occupy.

The Monarch as Spectacle and Plays for "His" Solace

Each person judges a performance based on their idea of the ideal representation of the work (Sayre 91). That is to say, if we take the case of productions staged in the Coliseo del Buen Retiro during the reign of Carlos II, the royal audience will have come to expect use of particular tropes and trends that we associate with Baroque Spanish theater: *engaño, ser/parecer*, mythological themes, etc. They will also enter under the presumption that a production in the Coliseo will be staged on a grander scale, in perspective, with the use of stage machinery, and

with music as customary in these late seventeenth-century productions. This imposition of an ideal is also applied to the ceremonial performance of the monarchs. As Spain was regarded as a court with rigid etiquette (Greer and Varey 21), courtiers in attendance would have come to expect a certain ceremonial standard for the royal family's entrances, attendance, and exits.

Part of the courtier's duty is to participate in the festivities by performing their title, station, or role in the court. Varey states that royals are included in the action either "as the recipient of gifts, or, more specifically within the action of the piece, as judges of the merits of a case" ("The audience" 400). The "gifts" in these cases are the plays themselves, as nobles could be brought into the action as patrons and dedicatees. Varey cites *Officium pastorum* as a work that brings the duke and duchess into the action when they are addressed in the dedication, as was true for all dedications and *loas* that acknowledged the patron of, or figure celebrated in, the royal court. Nobles as patrons and as judges of the merit of the case invite the monarchs to fill a role similar to their real life role and title.[83] These dedications, however, focus on the monarchs as part of the artistic performances, and the ways in which they are drawn into the action of the spectacle. Yet, as I have begun to argue, their attendance presented them in their own performance.

Greer and Varey posit that "el Rey era el verdadero espectáculo" (19). Already heavily studied, "early modern courts were a space where theatricalization of everyday life occurred" (Stampino 12). Therefore, the everyday court is a performance that shares a space with theater

[83] However, these were not the only instances in which courtiers participated in the action of a production. As I have mentioned, there was a time when the *damas* of the court represented a piece. Dance was frequently used as a method of audience participation. I have reference Prince Felipe's acting in 1614, and I have mentioned the interrupted *comedia*, which elicited audience participation in an unconventional fashion.

during court festivities. The monarchs become a point of interest—another performance which courtiers can consume while attending the theater.[84] The staging of plays was contained as an element within the entire festival spectacle. This spectacle's beginning is marked by "the ceremonial entry of the monarchs" and concludes upon their exit (Varey, "The Audience" 405). Of course, if there is any doubt of this, one need only consider Sayre's classification of performance versus artistic performance to acknowledge that the monarchs execute their roles as performance.

Regardless of the audience in question or whether or not scholars choose to define that audience solely as the king or as the larger court, we can agree that nobility performs their title. Greer and Varey state that "en toda representación palaciega los reyes constituyen un autoespectáculo y el cortesano mira indistintamente al actor dentro del cuadro escénico y al Rey, al parecer tan teatral y consciente de su actuación como el actor propiamente dicho" (77). That is to say, the monarchs are performing just as much as the actors they have come to watch. They may participate, or be included in the action of the artistic performance, but their attendances and commissioning of the play as artistic performance coupled with the performance of their roles as monarchs (ceremonially and otherwise) is bound by court etiquette.

Part of this etiquette dictated seating arrangements and, in turn, the monarchs' performance as a visible monarch in a closed space. During the representation of the staged play, ladies of the court sat on the ground floor before the king, and ambassadors, were they to attend, sat in boxes (Varey, "The Audience" 402). "Cuando el Rey ocupada su balcón, o luneta, se ponía a veces un

---

[84] This performance of nobility is clearly not limited to the station of king or queen. All nobles in one way or another perform their nobility and may be patrons or recipients of dramatic performances as gift or celebrations in their honor.

tablado en el suelo debajo de él para que los criados pudiesen asistir a la representación" (Greer and Varey 29). Eventually other courtiers were allowed in the king's balcony, but only those with a royal invitation (Greer and Varey 30). Male guests were not allowed to sit in the presence of the king. To remedy this, attendees, such as ambassadors and cardinals, had to stand, or be seated behind a screen or divider (Greer and Varey 20). No male member of the court was allowed to have a direct view of the king, nor he of them, and should the multiples levels of the Coliseo be used, no one could be in a higher position than the king (27). In their edition of their *Estudio y Documentos* of palace theater from 1586-1707, Greer and Varey only specify that it is the male courtier than may not have a direct view of the king. This point in particular is quite interesting. In an age when we live subjected to media produced for the male gaze as Laura Mulvey describes it, this performance of the monarch, is designed for the *female* gaze of the court, while male courtiers are performing their role for display to the whole court, but not in direct view of the king. That is to say, the king is the only court member performing for an exclusively *female* view.

The king, however, was not the only monarch in attendance. The theater festival was represented in court spaces and directed toward the king and his family (and afterward, on occasion, to the public) (Lobato 252). While Lobato includes the royal family in her approach, Varey posits that "entertainment is devised for his solace, and centered on his person" ("The Audience" 401). "His solace" is that of the king's, and treats entertainment as though it is the exclusive right of the king to enjoy its pleasantries. This statement, however, generalizes and belittles the role of the queen and the presence of other courtiers in attendance. First of all, we have to be willing to make room for the strongest female presence in the court: the queen. In times where a queen ruled as regent, as Mariana did, much of the theater staged for the court

celebrated her birthday or was commissioned at her behest; therefore, Varey's statement would have to be amended to state that entertainment is centered on *her* person. For example, *Fieras afemina amor* is written for the celebration of "los siempre felices años de la serenísima Católica Majestad Doña Mariana de Austria" (Edward Wilson 56-57) and *La estatua de Prometo* is likewise represented for "los años de la Reina Madre nuestra Señora" (title page of manuscript and Greer 93). Both are works of the 1670s, a time at which Mariana and her advisory councils were nervous that Carlos II was too young to attend theater; in April 1672 a theater council expressed: "tendría mayor inconveniente el que se fuese naturalizando la aplicación del Rey mío a este divertimiento en sus tiernos años" (2). Lobato recognizes this female presence in discussing Calderón's works in the Palace: "Dada la afición de las personas reales a ese modo de divertimiento, en especial Felipe IV y la reina Mariana de Austria, que de algún modo protagonizaron y asistieron a algunas de las mejores obras palaciegas de Calderón" (Lobato 259). With a young prince with mental limitations who may have had little to gain from the lessons presented in the theater—and by the Court's concern that he was too young to be exposed to or educated by theater—the theater of the 1670s centered on Mariana at its reinstatement in the court in 1671. The court of Carlos II celebrated his name day, his marriages, with theater, and performances were dedicated to Carlos. However, Mariana's impact, presence, and influence in court theater would not diminish, as we see in *Cómo se curan los celos*, staged on December 22, 1692 for "la fiesta a los años de la Reina Madre".

Lobato notes that the courtly audience was not limited to just the monarchs. Kernan reminds us that playwrights were concerned and familiar with "the circumstances of court performance" (17), which included a larger audience of courtiers, including advisors. Although Varey is focused on the solace of the king, I find it would be a stretch, for example, to say

Bances Candamo's political trilogy was created for the "solace" of Carlos II. This trilogy dealt with a topic that the king had ordered not be discussed: succession (Quintero, "Monarchy and the Limits").[85] I imagine the reminder of his sterility would not bring enjoyment to the king. Bances Candamo's works deal with concerns that would have resonated with a larger royal audience, as they did when Calderón's plays dealt with the political tensions between Mariana and Don Juan José in the 1670s, such as *Fieras afemina amor* and *La estatua de Prometeo*. Referring to the love subjects have for their queen in Spain the *loa* for *Fieras afemina amor* proclaims: "Y yo uso gozoso de ellas / a fin de que todos hoy / las flechas del amor sientan" (305-307). Likewise, the *loa* for *Cómo se curan los celos* expresses exaltation of the Habsburg name in Spain: "hoy España aplaude / el nombre mayor de los nombres reales" (33-34). Although other scholars, including Varey, have discussed how the monarchs are brought into the action of the play with dedications, verses of tribute, and songs that reference the monarchs, their power, and their nobility, these citations for the *loas* bring the greater court into the action of the play as citizens of Spain, which proves that these works were destined for larger audience. Although scenographically, the work may have centered on the monarch for their enjoyment from the physical placement of their seat in the theater, these plays were not centered on *his* "solace". That is not to say these works were not written for the monarchs; they were. To prove this, one only need reference the title pages containing the dedications, or my multiple references to the plays that celebrated Mariana's birthday. It is my argument here though that works staged in spaces, such as the Salón Dorado or the Coliseo, were intended for larger royal audiences, and were written for the solace of the *court*.

There is little, then, in court drama and court festival that is not performance. To say as

[85] For more on Carlos II and the question of succession, see chapter three.

John Varey does that the monarch's performance begins with their ceremonial entrance only defines their performance within the royal theater spaces and attempts to contain court drama and the associated spectacle of the monarchs in theater spaces. Rather, the monarch's performance as it exists purely in relation to court drama begins the moment they choose to commission a work and continues in their option to oversee any of its production, their attendance, and their exit. The performance of their regality adapts to the space they occupy. The play as formal artistic performance for the consumption of an audience begins as the opening music begins and/or as actors take the stage.[86] These performances contain elements of life outside the artistic performance, and the court drama as such draws its transcendent nature from its royal audience.

In his article "The Audience and the Play at Court Spectacles: The Role of the King", Varey more accurately captures this plurality when he states that the play "is not presented for itself alone, as in the commercial theaters [...] but exists only to give pleasure to the royal audience" (405), but apart from this, he focuses entirely on the subject of the king. I have no doubt the playwright is writing with his audience in mind. That audience, however, is the members of the royal court. Varey concludes his article by proposing that the purpose of the occasion overrides the vehicle. Considering the information contained in the extensive and multiple *Estudio y documentos*, and confirming theater as a firmly rooted pastime of royal court, we can safely posit that the purpose does not override the vehicle, but rather, theater is as deeply rooted in royal identity.

Theater Spaces of the Court

There were twelve principal spaces in which plays were represented in the court. Each

[86] "Formal" I delineate here as an official performance as opposed to a rehearsal or the composition of its parts.

offered a varying degree of intimacy, lavishness, and frequency of use. These spaces were *el Salón grande*, *el Salón de los Reinos*, *el Patinejo*, *el Saloncillo*, *el Saloncete*, *el Cuarto de Príncipes*, *el Cuarto del Rey*, *el Cuarto de la Reina*, and *el Coliseo del Buen Retiro* in the Palacio del Buen Retiro, and *el Salón dorado*, *el Cuarto del Rey* and *el Cuarto de la Reina* in the Palacio del Alcázar.[87] The various performances—artistic and otherwise—that took place primarily in private chambers, the Salón Dorado, or the Coliseo. Performance in these spaces—whether of the staged play or of the monarch—did not occur in an enclosed domain. It has become clear that performance was not rare in the court. Rather, in this section I show there are different spaces that hosted theater, that these spaces varied in their potential to host a lavish performance, and the Coliseo threated the well-being of the *corrales* as court theater abounded.

In her chapter "Literatura dramática y fiestas reales en la España de los últimos Austrias" María Luisa Lobato explains that there are two types of festival spaces, and that both have the presence of the king and his family in common. That is to say, the monarchs and the royal family occupy both spaces. Díez Borque calls these spaces the "espacio lúdico de la fiesta" and the "espacio lúdico de la representación". The "espacio lúdico de la fiesta" is the space that hosts the performance of the court as part of weeks long celebrations. This term is more generalized and includes the multiplicity of spaces that hosted a court festival. The "espacio lúdico de la representación" is the space of the theatrical performance that took place over a limited time, presented as a part of a celebration of something that happened to the royal family or one of its

[87] There are three other royal spaces not part of these two palaces for which Shergold and Varey have found evidence of theatrical representations. They are *San Lorenzo del Escorial*, *el Pardo*, and *la Zarzuela*. Shergold, N. D., and J. E. Varey. "Introducción." *Representaciones Palaciegas: 1603-1699: Estudio y Documentos*. Boydell & Brewer, 1982, pp. 13–39.

members. For example, for the large celebration of Corpus Christi in 1676, the holiday was celebrated with *autos sacramentales* with a stage that was made for the occasion, and a procession that took place inside the Palace (Greer and Varey 14).[88] The *autos sacramentales* then take place in the space of the representation (likely a public space outside the palace walls), while the procession takes place in the space of the celebration. That is to say, the "espacio lúdico de la representación" is specific to the spaces that hosted plays.[89] They are examples such as this one that support Díez Borque's division of these two terms, and Lobato respects that delineation. However, in the court, the representation space is actually part of the festival space, and therefore by default exists as both. It is the representation space, a subset of the festival space, that I will investigate here. The space of the representation is not limited or confined to one court space, hall, room, or quarter, but rather existed as a plurality of spaces that could be used at the court's discretion.

Particulares most often took place in the king or queen's chambers: *el Cuarto del Rey* and *el Cuarto de la Reina* (Shergold and Varey 14), and as I have mentioned, they were private representations for the monarchs. However, the staging for larger representations of the royal theater of the palaces took place in the Salón Dorado of the Alcazar and the Coliseo in the Retiro Palace (Varey, "El influjo"). While these were the sites for the grander performances of the

---

[88] Which *autos* were represented is undocumented. We know, rather, that *autos* were represented due to a document that exists discussing the "tablado para los autos", along with other items needed for the performance, and for the processional that ran throughout the palace. These other items included bread and wine, likely used for the Eucharist (Greer and Varey, doc. 17c).

[89] Lobato reminds us that it was these types of representations for which the court spent vast sums of money.

court, the Salón Dorado and the Coliseo were still quite different in their size, theatrical potential, and function. They also differed greatly from the *particulares* in their financial commitment to a work.

The allowance of the public into a royal theater—as was the case with the Coliseo—intensifies the exclusivity of strictly royal theater spaces making the most privileged, or exclusive, spaces the most private. Private chambers that hosted *particulares* are the most privileged space; its exclusivity is reserved for the monarchs. The Salón Dorado offered the next most privileged space open to courtiers and elite guests at royal invitation. The Coliseo's most intimate representations that hosted an exclusively royal audience, and their guests, boasted a similar exclusivity and privilege to that of the Salón Dorado. The Coliseo's opening to the public, however, makes it the least privileged royal space and theater. Such representations allowed a non-royal public access to, and enjoyment of, representations in a royal space to which said audience would have normally been denied access.

The spaces that hosted the *particulares* and the lavish representations of the Coliseo mark two spatial extremes. The private quarters of the monarchs is the most intimate, and the Coliseo was the largest and grandest. They therefore represent two financial extremes as well. There is documentation from 1622-1623 stating the court was not in the habit of paying more than 200 *reales* for a *comedia* (Shergold and Varey 19-20). Although I cannot say when this trend was established, there is evidence from 1603 to show they were paying 300 *reales* per *comedia* or *particular* (Shergold and Varey 20). It seems as though this habit began to be applied to *particulares* at this time as the same documentation cites the two performances per week cycle that was common of the *particulares* as well. Additionally, documentation for *particulares* does not mention payment for scenography and music, (Shergold and Varey 14) thereby rendering

them significantly less expensive to commission. On the other hand, the multiple *estudios y documentos* done by John Varey and his colleagues (Greer, Shergold, and López Alemany) provide evidence that the court is paying hundreds of thousands of *reales* for opening productions and plays represented during court celebrations. For example, in 1680, amidst an economic crisis, the court promised 617,372 *reales*, which was later reduced to 582,722, for a production of *Faetón*, staged in the Coliseo. A current value for this amount of money is nearly impossible to calculate due to the frequency with which the court reassigned the value of their currency in the seventeenth century. However, for reference, once the Coliseo opened to a larger audience, the court charged four *reales* for entrance and a seat in 1656 (Shergold and Varey 28). If Greer and Varey's estimate that the Coliseo could have held at least 1,500 spectators is correct (29), the court earns 6,000 *reales* for any given production represented to a public audience. Not to mention, lavish celebrations, such as this production of *Faetón*, were represented for an exclusively royal audience. In other words, the court made no money off this production.

These court expenditures not only covered the actors, and occasionally provided discounts to the landlords of the *corrales*, but "hay que tomar en cuenta que gran parte de los gastos consisten en el pago de materiales" (Shergold and Varey 23). The money promised for materials could not always be paid: "Los pintores, doradores y mercaderes se quejan en 1682 de no haber podido cobrar el importe de los servicios suplidos hacía dos años" (Greer and Varey 33). I have no confirmation whether or not the production from two years prior was the lavish representation of *Faetón* or another, but the inability, or refusal, of the court to pay its artists for their work underscores the frustration and tension that existed between the court and its artists. Neither as private as the chambers of the monarchs, nor as lavish as the Coliseo was the Salón dorado.

The Salón del Alcázar had been used for ceremonies and plays from 1623 (if not sooner)

(Varey, "The Audience" 401), and underwent renovations and refurbishment from 1636-1640 (Shergold and Varey 15). Part of these renovations was to gild the ceiling of the Salón, thereby giving it its new name: el Salón Dorado (16). The space was smaller and more simple than the Coliseo (Shergold and Varey), and hosted productions that still made use of stage machinery, but were portable and able to be disassembled (Greer and Varey 20). Stagings here reflected the nature of the room; they were far less complex than those in the Coliseo and there was less space for individual bodies (Varey, "El influjo"). Research done by Greer and Varey confirms that the measurements of this room during Carlos II's childhood describe the room as 128 by 33 pies castellanos in 1672, roughly 23% smaller than it had been as the Salón grande in 1626 at 165 by 33 pies castellanos. This was due to various reforms including that of the royal bedroom to the east of the Salón (20). This space only ever hosted a royal audience, and their guests, and was never used to represent plays to the general public. This and the scenographic potential of the Coliseo are the two largest differences between the Salón Dorado in the Alcázar and the Coliseo in the Retiro Palace.

Construction was started on the Coliseo in 1638 and completed in 1640 (Varey, "The Audience", Greer and Varey 23, Shergold and Varey 16).[90] The Coliseo was the first permanent theater in a royal palace in Madrid and was purposely constructed in the Italian style (Varey, "El influjo" 715). It was also less intimate than the Salón Dorado (Greer and Varey). Due to the portable and simplistic nature of the plays that took place in the Salón Dorado, and the frequent lack of depth in the *corrales* that was needed in order to use stage machinery—both front to back, and below the stage—the most complex staging with the most elaborate scenographic conditions

[90] This hurried construction would affect the building's longevity. This may be why the Bourbons used the Pardo for their weekly performances.

took place in the Coliseo. The cost of these productions varied based upon the complexity of the staging, and in such stagings "era necesario poder poner en movimiento los bastidores, y hacer uso de las máquinas de vuelos típicas de las obras cortesanas" (Varey, "El influyo" 721). The more lavish and complex the use of this scenographic equipment and its supplemental parts, the more costly the production was.

By the reign of Carlos II, the Coliseo had be opened and made available to the public for productions. This availability was provided at the discretion of the monarchs, but was available nonetheless. There were differing types of performances in the Coliseo represented to different audiences. There were spectacular plays written (or newly produced) for royal occasions, such as birthdays; performances written for the enjoyment of the court—as court entertainment; and there were public representations (Varey, "The Audience" 402). Each of these catered to a different audience: formal ceremonial representations catered to the reception of royal personage, ambassadors, and other guest of rank which could have included clergy; private representations and celebrations were played for the royal family and the court's members—a more exclusive audience than the last; and public representations occurred when the Coliseo opened its doors to the general public and public acting companies (Greer and Varey, and Varey, "The Audience" 402). The monarchs did not attend public productions in the Coliseo and the use of the Coliseo for such productions bridged the gap between public and royal representations, as they were open to the public to view in a royal space and with the scenographic effects the royal audience enjoyed regularly.

For representations to a small royal audience, seating arrangements in the Coliseo would have been similar to those of the Salón Dorado, making use of the main floor of the Coliseo, and not filling any of the balconies or boxes. This was the case for *Hado y divisa* in 1680 (Varey,

"The Audience" 402). Representations of the like, therefore, offered similar spatial relations between the stage, the actors, and the audience in both rooms (Greer and Varey 22). Varey confirms that despite the differences between the two theaters, primarily as a portable versus a permanent theater, "el efecto visual en el publico era el mismo: a través de la boca se veía el espectador un cuadro escénico lujoso e inestable, capaz de cambiar a la vista del auditorio" (Varey, "El influjo" 716). The visual effect may have been similar, but spatial relations changed when the Coliseo opened to the public. Every balcony, floor, tier, and box was filled. Therefore, it becomes clear that these spatial relations were quite different than the more intimate seating arrangements the royal audience enjoyed in both the Salón Dorado and the Coliseo (Greer and Varey 24).

The Coliseo was architecturally and spatially grander than the Salón Dorado and was much more lavish than the *corrales,* but the Coliseo did share some characteristics of the *corral*, such as a patio. While elements from the *corrales* could be used in the court, scenographic elements from court productions were rarely used in the *corrales*. For example, such intense consideration and attention given to the perspective of the set was characteristic of the court:

> Concluye Shergold que, aunque en estas acotaciones hay cierta mezcla de elementos escénicos de los corrales y de los teatros palaciegos, probablemente éstas son obras escritas para representarse en el Coliseo del Buen Retiro. Se funda en su aserto que no se hizo ningún esfuerzo específico para introducir la escena en perspectiva en los corrales del siglo XVII, así cualquier obra teatral que requiere el uso de la perspectiva debe asignarse al teatro palaciego. (Varey, "El influyo" 718)

For example, the 1672 production of *Los celos haces estrellas* began with the curtain lowered, and the proscenium and curtain had been painted in perspective to display the heavens,

mountains to the sides, and a winged angel flying just above the stage, as depicted on the curtain. Once the curtain lifted, the set and backdrop open the stage to a more dramatic set constructed and painted in perspective that gave the illusion of the worldly terrain of the set meeting the heavens of the proscenium.[91] The proscenium, curtain, and set for *Afectos de odio y amor* may have been constructed in similar fashion and function to those of *Los celos hacen estrellas*, although, to this point, I have been unable to uncover sketches of the sets. *Afectos* begins before the curtain is raised. Six lines of the play are exchanged between Auriestela and Arnesto before the stage direction notes that the curtain is then to be run to reveal Casimiro seated on the stage, crying. The curtain, therefore, could have been used to reveal the set as much as it revealed Casimiro in his vulnerable state.

These two plays demonstrate a differing dramatic function of the curtain in the court than that to which today's contemporary audience is accustomed. While the curtain lifting, and the lights simultaneously dimming, have become signs of the start of a play, court theater of the seventeenth century used the curtain to reveal sets in perspective as part of the spectacle itself, thereby supporting the theory that these plays were meant to awe *visually* as much, if not more so, than they were to entertain through the performance of the script. The curtain, then, was a tool at the disposal of the scenographer and playwright that could be used to dramatically reveal

---

[91] Set sketches also show plans for garden scenes whose perspective was highlighted by the construction of rows of pergolas swimming in lush vines. For published copies of the sketches of the sets, proscenium, and curtain of *Los celos hacen estrellas* see Shergold, N.D. *A History of the Spanish Stage from Medieval Times until the End of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford University Press, 1967.

characters and the artistry of the visual elements of a representation. This function was exclusive to the court as the *corrales* did not represent plays in perspective, lacked the depth to do so, and did not have a curtain at the front of the stage. This further proves that the Coliseo existed as a unique and singular space to attend theater. Although not as exclusive as other royal spaces, the Coliseo served the royal family, courtiers, ambassadors, clergy, and the public alike. The Coliseo offered a unique opportunity to take in a play in a royal space, which, at times, threatened the livelihood of the *corrales* and their landlords.

Once the doors to the Coliseo were opened to the public, the *corrales* experienced a significant effect to their finances (Greer and Varey); if the acting companies were putting on plays in the Coliseo, there was no one to perform in the *corrales.* If the *corrales* were closed, the court and the *corrales* were not in competition with each other. Lobato states: "Las razones de apoyar desde palacio a los comediantes fueron pues premiar su trabajo y también contribuir a solucionar las penurias económicas que atravesaban las compañías cuando los teatros se cerraban durante tiempo por luto de la familia real o por controversias de los teatrófobos" (265). That is not to say that the problems and impositions that the *corrales* suffered gave way to court theater. Rather, court theater was already well established and offered a theater space, when necessary, and with the compliance of the monarchs. On occasion, the court supplied the *corrales* with funds in order to remain open in the public sector, as was the case in 1686 when Carlos supplied funds to the *corrales* when they were struggling to stay open (Shergold and Varey 28). However, Spain's royal court actually challenged and provoked financial issues for the *corrales* after the Coliseo del Buen Retiro opened to the public, and when both spaces were open for productions. When public acting companies played for the court, landlords in Spain frequently asked for discounts on their rent or compensation for funds lost (Greer and Varey 27). Sometimes the court

granted these petitions, other times they were denied. Spain's court was not the only European court to support players and playhouses in times of need and distress. "When plague interrupted playing in the public theaters, the King's Men received large direct subsidies of thirty or forty pounds from the Treasurer to help them survive a difficult season" (Kernan 16). The Royal Court in England offered their courtly protection of players and stepped in to protect them from enemies (Kernan). However, unlike Spain, England does not seem to have incited hardship for the public theater as a consequence of promoting and hosting theater in a royal space.

Nevertheless, the royal space of the Coliseo became the coveted place to play. Therefore, Shergold and Varey explain that playwrights of the seventeenth century realized that royal theater offered greater possibilities in earnings, and the possibility to have their works staged with greater theatricality than the *corrales* (Shergold and Varey 31). Additionally, there was the desire to represent to the king the *autos sacramentales* the started the theatrical season with the best acting companies there were, and so companies were retained in Madrid (Shergold and Varey 30-31). Since it had already become a preoccupation in the *corrales* the amount of spectators that entered without paying (Shergold and Varey 25), "una vez que se utilizara el Coliseo como teatro público, sacando el arrendador y los comediantes su cuota, era necesario prevenir que todos pagasen la entrada" (30). This included soldiers and servants of the court (30).

The spaces that hosted representations in the Spanish court do not produce the dichotomy and binary of strictly public versus private spaces as the royal space did in other European courts, such as in Italy. Stampino discusses the performances of the Italian court noting that "although the sociological concept of the 'public' exists, more and more its representation retreated to the enclosed domain of the court. Power does not have to be embodied in a single

human being any longer; consequently the ruler can retreat to this privileged dwelling place and displays himself more rarely but more lavishly only under specific circumstances" (Stampino 17). However, as the Spanish court adapted and grew their number of theatrical spaces, we see that the Italian case of private versus public space is not defined by the same parameters and norms as the Spanish court. Lavishness was exclusive to the court, but theater for the sake of entertainment of the court and the monarchs was by no means a rare display in the Spanish court that only occurred "under specific circumstances". I have shown that the success and draw of the Coliseo actually threatened the *corrales* as court theater thrived. Playwrights such as "Calderón wrote plays to be performed either at the Royal Palace or at the Coliseo in Buen Retiro Palace. Unlike the public plays, all these works are based on mythological stories and make significant use of Italianate staging with perspective scenery, sumptuous costumes, and music" (Stroud 41). That is to say, Italy was a great source of inspiration in Spanish scenography, as I will present in the next section, but the theater of the Spanish court was not uniform in either audience or representation. Representation did perhaps "retreat" to, and certainly flourished, in court spaces, but it did not occur in a uniformly enclosed domain as Stampino proposed the Italian court was.

Scenography and Music in the Court

These productions were highly collaborative and therefore I have investigated not only the prior scenographic elements, but also the artists and their collaboration. Due to the visual spectacle and multimedia productions these plays were, this collaboration is another defining characteristic of court drama. The fusion of the multitude of artists that come together in order to stage a court production brings to light the collaborative nature of these productions, thereby strengthening my theoretical approach to shared agency and shared intention outlined in chapter two. Sayre explains that masterpieces such as Hamlet are not the same masterwork in every

representation, but rather are a vehicle for investigating the lives of a representation's performers. As a play relies on what is outside of it, I argue that this expands outside the scope of just the performer and may tell us something about the individuals who came together artistically to stage a production, and those who commission it; there are too many individuals involved in the production of a representation to limit the scope of such an investigation to the actors. The plurality of artists might be surprising. From scenographers and painters to the stylings of the opera, seventeenth-century Italian visual arts, artists, and performance had a tremendous impact on the lavish seventeenth-century Spanish court spectacle.

First and foremost, court festival drama not only represented a play, but all of its accompanying pieces as well. Theater was often a multi-part performance that was meant to entertain as much as awe aesthetically. As painted scenery, lighting, costuming etc. all played a part in the visual representation of a performance, a court festival was comprised of its own performance pieces. "The *entremés* has its own play-within-a-play, but itself must be read within the context of the entertainment as a whole. […] It is the *fin de fiesta* which is designed to draw the audience back to the […] performance, and thus comes full circle, back to the beginning of the *loa* and to the reality of royal personages viewing a court entertainment" (Varey, "The Audience" 404). Therefore court festival is a cyclical journey that both begins and ends grounded in the reality of the court celebration and its motivation.

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the actors that took the court on this journey were frequently other members of the court, including servants. In order to differentiate between acting courtiers and non-acting courtiers those that were acting changed their dress, and assumed a more rustic language (Varey, "The audience"). Eventually, there were groups of actors that became linked to the palace, although not exclusively, (Lobato 270). Playwrights

maintained a relationship with public actors while composing works for the court (Lobato 270). This constructed a theater community that transcended the public/private or royal/common theater spaces, much as the Coliseo did. By writing for the court and maintaining ties with the public actors that frequently represented in royal spaces, playwrights and actors became a central functioning mechanism in these relationships thereby fostering their own artistic community.

As we well know by now, Spanish scenography has its roots in Italian performance (Greer and Varey, Shergold and Varey, Sabik). Calandrini states that it is through performance/entertainment that the Parma and Farnese courts (and others) become famous in the first place (qtd. in Stampino 16). The greatest influence the Italians had on Spanish courtly theater as spectacle was advancements in scenography and music. Cosimo Lotti and his successor Baccio del Bianco are the most predominant scenographers in the Spanish court in the mid-to-late seventeenth century. Both hailed from Italy. While Cosimo Lotti is the famous "escenógrafo de la fiesta de la corte" in Spain (Sabik, "La escenografía" 1688), Torelli, Vigarani, Giovanni, and Burnacini dominated Italian scenography (1686). Italian scenography permeated all of Europe; Sabik speculates that a bored upper class had an insatiable thirst of something new and varied, making room for performance and its growth. However, it would not just be the upper class or royal court that enjoyed the influences of Italian scenography. The ecclesiastic and polymath Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz said that the ways of Italian scenography would be useful in Spain to appeal to all audiences (qtd. in Sabik, "La escenografía" 1686).

Italian scenography did not only influence large European powerhouses, such as Spain and England, but influenced places like Poland as well. Italian scenography arrived in Poland thanks to King Ladislao IV, and it developed in his court between 1635 and 1648 (Sabik, "La escenografía" 1690-1691). Ladislao attended many theatrical representations while he traveled in

Italy, and thought to bring back the style to his country. In Spain, however, Italian scenographers and composers, such as Lotti, traveled to the court in Spain and brought with them their craft for the admiration of Spanish courtiers. Spain is also more original than other regions due to its creation and adaptation of "sus propias y genuinas formas teatrales: la zarzuela y comedias mitológicas y novelescas. Así, pues, el teatro de corte español del siglo XVII defiende sus originalidad e independencia no haciendo concesiones, sino en el terreno de lo escenográfico, tan sólo sirviéndose para su poesía barroca del soporte de la también barroca escenografía italiana" (Sabik, "La escenografía" 1694).

For court festivals that Italian scenographers like Cosimo Lotti and Baccio del Bianco staged, it was incredibly rare that a playwright wrote the whole festival (Lobato 263). Not only did the playwright of the major work not write the festival in its entirety, but they often did not know what other works would accompany the play (263). Frequently collaborations in writing were due to certain authors being invited to write (Lobato). Therefore, it is possible that in order to compose the written word of the *loa*, *comedia*, *entremeses*, *mojigangas*, and *fines de fiesta* alone could call on five separate writers. Even that is an underestimate that assumes that a writer drafts their entire section and does not call on others to supply poems, sonnets, song lyric, or other pieces of the like. Then one has to account for choreographers for dances and *jácaras*, and composers of musical compositions, and our tally climbs to seven just for the creation of the written pieces, dance, and music numbers. A work then called for scenographers, painters, carpenters, seamstresses, and some productions even required the acting troupe to cast a student double (Greer and Varey 51). For a full-scale production it would be inconceivable to have a artistic team of less than twelve, not including the acting company. This still vastly underestimates lavish festival productions of the Coliseo for which many more stagehands and

artists were needed. For example, the 1680 production of *Hado y divisa* called for thirty-six people to assemble and operate the *bastidores* (Shergold and Varey, doc. 43, 125-126). These productions were highly collaborative, incorporating the scope and expertise of each artist, and arguably technicians to assemble the proscenium, sets, or operate the machinery that had undergone technological advances to produce Early Modern special effects.[92] These effects are reflected in the stage direction of these works.

Stage direction itself varied greatly between manuscripts written for the court and the *corral* in terms of volume and reference to the staging possibilities of the Coliseo. Court plays were typically accompanied by enormous stage direction,[93] while the stage direction of public plays was usually limited to entrances, exits, and most (although not always all) *apartes*. By considering these stage directions I conclude two things. First, this was done because playwrights and scenographers (both wrote stage direction) knew what sort of scenography and special effects they had at hand. They could provide the artists with their vision of the artistry and visual performance for these plays. The second is that moments of discovery and awe were more feasible in the court due to the curtain at the front of the stage. These observations highlight that the artist collaboration that I have argued for here was not only happening, it was *ingrained* in the mind of fellow artists. Whether the playwright, scenographer, or *autor* was writing stage direction, they were thinking of their fellow artists and how to utilize their skills. Whoever wrote the stage direction was thinking of the work in perspective before they ever have the consideration of other artists. They were imagining sets before they were constructed. They were designing costumes before the materials could be purchased. This is the creation of a multimedia

[92] Not surprisingly, controversies and personal rivalries arose (Greer and Varey 60).

[93] Calderón is a noted exception.

production and putting it to paper before fellow artists can create the plays as such. Let us consider an example.

Two hundred lines into Bances Candamo's *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso* the stage direction reads:

> Retíranse a un lado, descúbrese en el doro la fachada de una casería de arquitectura rústica, y delante de ella un portal emparrado donde se verá Angélica, dama bizarra, de india, coronada de plumas y piedras y vestida de campaña; a su lado Medoro, joven galán, de africano, y Bato viejo, de pastor; Belzoraida y Nicanora, de indias, cantando, y un coro de pastores y pastoras danzando. Por la puerta de la casería, que estará abierta, se descubren adentro adornos rústicos. (120)

This stage direction, at first glance, is vast. This clearly outdoes the simple "sale" or "aparte" that accompanied public productions. Before the end of what should be the first sentence, marked in the text with a semi-colon, we see the incorporation of stage machinery, thinking in perspective, and costuming. Lisarda, Armelina, and Astolfo step aside for the unveiling of a rustic structure. The opening stage directions set the scene in the forest, which means with this stage direction, there was the need for the stage machinery to change and unveil this set. Standing before this rustic façade is Angélica, framed in an arch. This called for sets in perspective—a luxury of the court. She is "vestida de campaña", and by the end of the next sentence we will have two other costumes: Bato dressed "de pastor" and Medoro "de africano". The next phrase brings in music and dance, and the stage direction ends intensifying the perspective by stating that the door to the structure is open revealing its rustic interior. This deepens the perspective past Angélica and the arch, past the façade, to reveal the interior as a tertiary reference plane. With both the stage direction, and my explanation, we see proof of the multimedia spectacle these plays were.

Perspective, music, dance, and costuming come together in one single stage direction representing the plurality of artistry that existed on the court stage.

Once artists were ready to bring these visions to fruition, the proscenium was one of the more difficult problems to address scenographically. It served to frame the stage and visually hide the stage machinery, as is did in 1672 for *Los celos hacen estrellas* (Greer and Varey 20), but posed challenges due to the different architectural construction the varying theaters (Varey, "El influjo" 722). However, once difficulties were over come, and the proscenium was fitted to the specifications of the stage, multiple representations for different audiences could be represented, reusing the same scenographic elements (Lobato 262). This allowed the public to enjoy the talents of scenographers such as Lotti or Baccio del Bianco, and the play with all its moving parts.

This scenographic flair not only included staging in perspective, but also, the use of *bastidores* and *tramoyas*. The perspective was executed in the construction and painting of the sets and frontispieces. Matthew Stroud speculates that: "Perhaps because [Calderón] had the luxury of writing for the court theater, many of his plays incorporated music and extravagant staging using the most modern machinery available" (40). I do not doubt this statement's validity, but I have shown how finances negatively affected the *corrales* after the Coliseo opened to the public, offering playwrights, such as Calderón, more financial gain and stability in maintaining their ties to the court—not to mention, the scenographic potential the court offered. The machinery available made possible moving set pieces, multiple sets, staging the heavens, mountains, palace gardens, or the urban environment. The most common scenographic elements utilized were clouds and the trapdoor (Varey, "El influyo 716), and the descriptions we have of what the spectators saw speak to just how many scenographic components fit in a representation

in the Coliseo (Greer and Varey 47). To Varey's comment that clouds were one of the most common scenographic elements, I would add that anything heavenly, or anything that ascended or descended flying, was quite common. For example, in *Cómo se curan los celos*, Astolfo's first entrance reveals him suspended on a winged horse in the air. He is slowly lowered, dismounts, and the horse prop exits flying, in no small thanks to the stage machinery.

These multimedia plays incorporated music, architecture, painting, dance, etc. in such opulence that was not seen in the *corrales*; they drew the attention of their audience for their spectacular elements and enjoyed enormous success for "la variedad de los efectos escénicos como la riqueza de los trajes" (Sabik, "El teatro de corte" 605).[94] Costumes in the court could be expensive (Greer and Varey 51), even more than the 4,543 *reales* for a dress for the 1672 production of *Fieras afemina amor* (doc. 16, 120). The same production spent 11,565 *reales* on lace for twenty of the women's costumes and 24,380 *reales* for lace for the men's costumes (doc. 16, 114). The clothing itself was a spectacle, not only as a lavish piece of art, but also when it provided the audience the opportunity to observe the curve of the female form (Quintero, *Gendering* 181). Much of Spanish theater, public and courtly, offered different opportunities for disguises and cross-dressing, but María Cristina Quintero notes that this is especially common with characters that portrayed the role of a queen on the stage. Plays of the like offered costumes such as manly dress, military armor, and animal skins, and "the costumes worn by actresses playing monarchs were at times meant precisely to emphasize their" physical form and body

---

[94] Sabik cites that this opulence is further testified by those who left testimonies of their attendance "El teatro de corte en España en la primera mitad del siglo XVII (1614-1636)." *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas 18-23 agosto 1986*, 1986, pp. 606.

shape (Quintero, *Gendering* 181). For example, the play *Afectos de odio y amor* was represented at least four times in the court between 1680 and 1687 (Shergold and Varey 240-252) and represents the character of Cristerna as a warrior, mounted on horseback, and in full military garb when Casimiro first sees her. Theatrical costumes in general would provide a visual code that signified status and gender, but both status and gender would have been a fluid construct, constantly problematized in the *comedia*" (Quintero, *Gendering* 181).

In *Afectos de odio y amor*, this fluidity is represented in the juxtaposition of Cristerna's masculine dress and her queenship. For critics of the theater, seeing the curves of the female form would have been quite offensive (181) and costuming thus becomes a means through which actresses, as real women, are visually consumed as objects of desire. For example, Cristerna is described as wearing:

CASIMIRO: Una hungarina, o casaca,
en dos mitades abierta,
de acero el pecho vestido
mostraba, de cuya tela
un tonelete, que no
pasaba de media pierna,
dejaba libre el vestido
de la bota y de la espuela. (411-418)

She is described as wearing military garb, but in such a way that highlights her physical form, noting her chest, and later, her legs. The actress playing Cristerna would have been completely covered, as this description shows, but the way in which Casimiro describers her dress is seemingly erotic as her cape *opens* to show her armored chest, and her overskirt does not fall

below mid-leg. Although practical for battle to have a shorter overskirt, this syntax highlights a woman in an overskirt that did not reach the floor. This costume reveals as much as it covers. Perhaps equally as titillating, Lisarda opens *Cómo se curan los celos* dressed in the French manner and "de corto". This reference to a shorter dress likely means the dress would have hit just above the ankles and spectators would have been able to see her stocking covered ankle. Although Cristerna is "a robust defender of the rights of women" (Quintero, *Gendering* 186) and is linked to Queen Christina of Sweden who "was considered an able legislator and ruler, and also a woman who possessed a remarkable intellect" (184), these examples place emphasis on the natural female form. Even when presenting a woman in men's military fashion, which would promote the images associated with male attributes of the time, its juxtaposition to the female form simultaneously celebrates her intellectual and activist attributes and undermined their existence.[95]

While I have already discussed machinery, aesthetics, and the artists, one of the most important developments in Spanish royal performance in the seventeenth century was the expansion of music's role in staged productions and the development of the *zarzuela*. As early as 1629 completely sung works such as Lope's *La selva sin amor* are written (Sabik "El teatro de corte"). At this point, sung Spanish plays are not *zarzuelas*, but have been influenced by the Italian opera, and are represented by professional actors (Sabik "El teatro de corte"). As the century continued to unfold, the equilibrium between poetry, music, and visual arts, "se ve cada vez más nivelado por la preponderancia que adquiere el componente escenográfico" (Sabik, "La

[95] For more on the commonalities between Cristerna and Queen Christina see Quintero's *Gendering the Crown in the Spanish Baroque Comedia* and Ruth Lundelius' "Queen Christina of Sweden and Calderón's *Afectos de odio y amor*".

escenografía" 1685).

The Spanish *zarzuela* developed under a parallel process to the Italian opera, although roughly seventy years separated the early seventeenth-century beginnings of the Italian opera and the late seventeenth-century development of the Spanish *zarzuela*. While the aforementioned letter to Mariana confirms *theater's* origins in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, music in the peninsular court has medieval roots with musical poetry being a popular predecessor to the developing theatrical readings of the late fifteenth-century. Daniele Becker proposes that music in seventeenth-century drama was used primarily to cover the sound of the stage machinery, in addition to being used to comment on the appearance or disappearance of a "protagonista de marca: rey, princesa, [o] dios" (Becker 353). Although music was used to mask the sound of the limited machinery in the *corrales*, this comment by Becker seemingly belittles the historical roots music has in peninsular theater of the late fifteenth, sixteenth, and early seventeenth centuries. Margaret Greer adds:

> Use of music in Spanish theater was not an invention of the court plays. Music was closely associated with Spanish drama, both religious and secular, from its earliest roots in medieval liturgy and court pageantry; the association continued as the theatre developed a more extended and coherent shape in the Renaissance. Many of Juna del Encina's dramatic works conclude with a sung *villancico,* as do several of the plays of Torres Naharro. Gil Vicente goes far beyond this using

> music extensively and often to great expressive effect in a number of his dramatic works. (16)[96]

Greer's research proves that music in Spanish *drama* had its own roots, and was enjoyed in its own right.

In the late sixteenth century, performers already were being paid for tumbling and dancing for the court (Greer and Varey). By the 1610s, music was a fundamental part of court performance, as Sabik explains in the article "El teatro de corte en España en la primera mitad del siglo XVII (1614-1636)". Greer elucidates that while popular comedy was evolving at the beginning of the seventeenth century in Spain, music in Italy's court theater was radically evolving into what would eventually lead to the creation of the Italian opera (17). However, Daniele Becker points to a French influence as well, stating that Isabel de Borbón brought to the Spanish court the chorus ballet of France and this contributed to the music scene in the court spectacles of Spain (353). Sabik's research indicates that *La gloria de Niquea* in 1622 is the first attempt at lyrical theater in Spain (603). Evolved from the Italian opera that was born in the Italian aristocratic courts, the *zarzuela* emerged in the late seventeenth century in Spain, after Florentine, Roman, and Venetian opera had all established themselves in Italy between the late sixteenth century and the 1640s.

In order to establish a timeline around the heightened development of music in Spanish court theater, it is important to note that 1649—and the arrival of young Mariana of Austria to the court—marks a new era for musicality (and dance) in court theater. Court theater was used

---

[96] For examples that demonstrate Gil Vicente's musical evolution, refer to *Four Plays of Gil Vicente* containing the works: *Auto da alma*, *Exhortação da guerra*, *Farsa dos almocreves* and the *Tragicomedia pastoril da Serra da Estrella.*

more frequently that before to mark occasions such as births, marriages, weddings, political celebrations, and naming of kings/queens; the 1650s show an intent by playwrights to create a bigger role for music, and we see clearly defined strategic uses for its inclusion in order to mark a representation of Gods, for example, or even allegorical figures for entirely inanimate objects. Music expanded to include: accompaniment to a soloist singing, dance, chorus singing, and preliminary symphony chorus (Becker 354).

Between 1657 and 1661, all styles of musical theater begin to come together, and Becker cites the number of births and marriages that occurred during this period as responsible for this. Music permeated staged dramas, and Becker explains that often "algunos se cantaban 'dentro', otros desde arriba, otros bailando, otros en estilo de ceremonia, otros de *Vox Dei* breve que contesta a las preguntas de los protagonistas" (355). Specifically "la obra de Solís es buen exponente de lo que debe ser una 'fiesta grande de música' palaciega" (356). However, Solís is not the only one that should call our attention in these four years. Becker names 1659 the "año de novedades" in which Calderón and Diamante bring together components that will be the future *zarzuela* (356). Diamante gets closer to the *zarzuela* than Calderón.

At this time Juan Hidalgo was the musician of the Court, and from 1661 to 1675 Diamante led the creation of a new literary genre. Diamante's attempt was to adapt what he deemed the best of the Italian lyrical theater. This new literary genre is what Daniele Becker calls the *zarzuela primitiva* (356). It is not referred to as a musical genre because it was still not nearly as musical as the Italian opera; Calderón, for example, was still putting on "las grandes comedias de música" (356).[97] Daniele Becker notes that during this timeframe nobody seemed to

[97] The operative word is *comedia*. He is not writing *zarzuelas*, but rather *comedias* with musical incorporation and accompaniment.

be particularly concerned with the argument of the play, but rather they were consumed with the visual spectacle that was the performance as pure entertainment. While the spectacle as entertainment had grown remarkably throughout the mid-seventeenth century in the court, Margaret Greer more eloquently explains a stylistic change: "Contrapuntal writing was replaced by solo voices with a simple continuo accompaniment, preferably played by the singer himself, and composers strove to find a middle way between speech and song" (17). This led to the introduction of the recitative—a style of "singing" where in the singer takes on the typical rhythm of ordinary speech with no repetition of lines. This is all not to say that there was not any concern for the argument of the work, but rather, a heightened concern for providing a work in which the poetics and the music complimented one and the other.

Other works, such as Agustín de Salazar y Torres' *También se ama en el abismo*, also show a heighted interest in musicality. In the introduction to O'Connor's edition of *También se ama en el abismo* he notes that while works such as Salazar y Torres' *Thetis y Peleo* were only 3% sung *También se ama en el abismo* is 16.67% sung (42). The former relies heavily on sung responses or the repetition of sung dialog, apparent in the first act (O'Connor, Introduction to *También se ama* 42).[98] Additionally, *También se ama en el abismo* serves as a proper model for the *zarzuela primitiva* as is adheres to Louise K. Stein's definition that "the zarzuela used predominantly common sorts of music, with simple plots and language" (259). This focus on simpler language is a key difference immediately noticeable, and while O'Connor compares the mythological themes of Salazar y Torres' works to those of Calderón, the language these two use

[98] Thomas O'Connor speculates that part of the lack of the development of the musical components in *Thetis y Peleo* was probably due to its last minute substitution for Calderón's *Fieras afemina amor* in 1672. Most of the sung elements are contained in the *loa*.

is entirely distinct, with Salazar y Torres implementing more simplistic language in conjunction with his musical integration, and Calderón with his elevated language complete with its influences from Góngora. Consideration and categorization of these works as *zarzuelas primitivas* does not mean that music was not used or is not present in other works. Seventeenth-century works had a long tradition of using what Yuri Porras calls "musical reference" ("Musical References" 662). These references refer "to the literal or metaphorical designation of music, musical instruments, songs, dances or musical concepts that in their sum, contribute to a performance" (662).[99] For example, in Calderón's *La estatua de Prometeo* song is rather frequently used to delineate a difference between God's or other-worldly characters, and mortals, as it does in Minerva and Prometeo's first conversation in *La estatua de Prometeo*.

Her first lines being sung mark Minerva's presence, which breaks the unsung conversation of Libia and Merlín. Upon hearing her sing and noting her presence Prometeo remarks "Blando acento, / que a mí me paras, y al viento, / ¿quién te a pronunciado?" (474-475). It is easy to assume that referring to Minerva's voice as "blando" may be in line with our typical assumptions of how seventeenth-century women are stereotypically described. However, I am of the opinion that "blando" refers to the elegance her singing voice, its light nature, and by association her presence as a goddess. After Prometeo's question, Minerva responds with a simple "yo" (476). Prometeo then confirms the trend that a god's presence is delineated with music when he responds with:

PROMETEO: ¿Quién eres, o tú, beldad

[99] Porras distinguishes these from "musical scenes" that include all the characteristics of musical references, as well as "the practical, structural, technical and/or ideological effects music may have on receptors during a given scene and throughout a work" ("Musical References" 662).

de tan no esperado asunto,

que lo que a un monstro pregunto,

me responde una Deidad? (477-480)

Minerva has uttered four words at this point: "No las dispares" and "yo" (473 and 476). Her words certainly do not self-proclaim her as a deity. It is therefore Minerva's singing, her talent for song, and her beauty that have revealed her godliness to Prometeo. Her beauty alone is not enough to classify her as a deity for Prometeo; we have seen too many classic beauties at the center of nearly every Early Modern play, mortal and godly alike. It is her beauty coupled with her song that shows Prometeo her divinity. This trend was so common by the time Bances writes *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso* he has to specify that Astolfo is not a god in the lines of the *zarzuela.* Since the work is completely sung, and Astolfo's first entrance has him descending from the heavens on a winged horse, Armelina immediately takes note of his "humana voz" to clarify his mortal nature for the audience (22). However, Calderón's work does not approach the intensity of musicality that emerged in the 1690s.

Despite the fact that in the mid-1680s the *zarzuela*—or rather, the *zarzuela primitiva*—did not undergo any significant changes, in the 1690s poets like Clavijo (el Conde) and Zamora changed the course of the *zarzuela* uniting music, poetry, and the zeal for entertainment (Becker 359). In the work of M. Fernández de Léon the *zarzuela* takes on a more libretto tone, and in Clavijo it has attained the status of full musical genre (359). Music has even invaded the minor genres: the *loa*, *baile*, *fin de fiesta*, etc. Although musical drama was booming, Bances Candamo is still writing politically charged works, and is mostly dedicated to spoken theater, with *Cómo se curan los celos* as a noted exception.

Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso serves as a magnificent example of the multiplicity of functions some of these works have. Although quite political, it is this work as a *zarzuela* that pertains to Bances' ideas of the theater as entertainment. It is here that this musical work bridges the gap between Bances Candamo's seventeenth-century theoretical approaches to theater and the nature of the work as a performance and spectacle because *Cómo se curan los celos* was meant to entertain, and serves as an example of theater created for the pure enjoyment of the court. As Ignacio Arellano explains, this work: "arranca de una historia ariostesca con muchos detalles conocidos por el público. El asunto viene a ser un soporte para la espectacular musicalidad de la fábula" (55). The elements that contribute to the plot structure that are presented in this *zarzuela* here are extremely simplified, and as Arellano states, the details are for the most part common knowledge, at least for the baroque courtly audience. Arguably this was a natural consequence of extracting details from Ludovico Arisoto's 600 plus page work and reconstructing them in ninety-five page *zarzuela*. However, this would have also created space for the elements of the spectacle pertaining to music and scenography to occupy their own terrain, complimenting the poetics of the *zarzuela.*

Due to the number of *zarzuelas* and other works that incorporate music as a means to a specific end (such as character delineation), as well as its historical development over more than two centuries of theatrical representations, music played a foundational role in court drama by the late seventeenth century. It was implemented far more meticulously and methodically than simply serving to cover the noise of the *tramoyas,* as it frequently did in the *corrales*, or to mark the entrance or exit of prominent figures, as Becker has previously noted. Rather, by the 1690s music had carved its own niche in court drama as the Spanish *zarzuela*.

Conclusions

The subjective paradigm that departs from the literary analysis of the text creates a scholarly space in which one can investigate the supporting art, performance, and collaboration that allowed for plays to be staged. Although Sayre aggressively states: "Performance […] has come to refer to a kind of work from which the authority of the text has been wrested" (94), I do not see the need for such a tense dichotomy between the text and the supporting artistic pieces to a performance or the performance itself. Sayre's statement does not reflect his own view of performance, as such a view has undoubtedly become outdated, and the text itself could be analyzed "as" performance according to Schechner's guidelines. Rather, the subjective approach provides a stage in which the authority of the text could be preserved and represented, or the performance authorizes its varying possibilities and representations. Sayre reiterates that if we take all of the varieties of performance into consideration, "performance can be defined as an activity which generates transformation, as the reintegration of art with what is 'outside' it" (103).

Therefore, under such a paradigm, this chapter investigated the evolution of the Spanish *zarzuela* and scenography in the royal court of Carlos II of Spain, commenting on Italy's influence on theater and music in Europe, as well as England's similar and differing theatrical traditions to those of Spain, thereby situating Spain in a European framework. Additionally, this chapter showed how the king and queen are part of the ceremonial performance of the court in the "espacio lúdico de la fiesta". I focused specifically on their presence in the "espacio lúdico de la representación" as contained within the "espacio lúdico de la fiesta". All courtiers perform their role and title as members of the court with royal dedicatees serving as a secondary spectacle unfolding alongside the staged plays. The monarchs specifically perform their majesty in

accordance with the space they occupy as the performance of the play simultaneously develops, and likewise adapts to the space in which it is represented.

The royal performances and evolution of the music and scenography that comprised a play's representation primarily took place in the private chamber of the monarchs and on the stages of the Salón Dorado and the Coliseo del Buen Retiro. While private quarters were the most privileged spaces offering small and private screenings to the monarchs, the Coliseo del Buen Retiro was a fluid space that oscillated between royal and public use. Neither space was entirely public—as the *corrales* were—or as exclusive as the private spaces of the royal palaces. I have show the Coliseo existed as a particularly unique space that was able to host the most lavish representations for varied audiences.

By defining the fluidity of the Coliseo del Buen Retiro, the performance of the court as containing both the play and the performance of the monarchs, and demonstrating that court drama is characterized by multimedia spectacle, I have proven that court drama is its own genre. The court play is trans-dynastic and outlasts the performance of a king or queen's majesty and is adaptable in differing time periods. Since court drama's similarities in form, style and scenographic matter are unique in the court, it can be safely set it apart from the public *comedia*.

CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Playing the Court: Court Theater During the Reign of Carlos II of Spain (1661-1700) is an interdisciplinary project addressing a long-neglected dimension of Early Modern Peninsular Studies: court theater. My thesis explored theoretical approaches to theater, the political tensions that defined the reign of Carlos II, their influence on court theater, and the performance components of court productions, including the role of the monarch(s). I explored the frameworks of imagined communities and agency in order to understand how the theater functioned within the Habsburg court, and I juxtaposed the role of the king as spectator to that of the individual consumer of public theater. From there, my archival research exposed the political conflicts during the 1670s between Queen Regent Mariana of Austria and her illegitimate step-son, Don Juan José, as their opposing factions vied to dominate the terrain of courtly politics in Madrid. This led me to consider the political anxieties produced by the topic of succession in Bances Candamo's political trilogy (*Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, *La piedra filosofal*, and *El esclavo en grillos de oro*) of the 1690s as well. My research illustrates how politics and royal theater production in the 1670s and 1690s were linked thanks to theater's status as a facet of royal Baroque identity, as well as the court playwright's unique position as a courtier. My project concluded by investigating the evolution of the spatial and scenographic elements of court theater production; music and the evolution of the Spanish *zarzuela*; and the performance of the monarchs that coexisted alongside court drama. The plays investigated in this

project exemplified the Habsburg monarchy's attempt to maintain an illustrious image in the face of decline.

The second chapter of this dissertation waded into seventeenth-, twentieth-, and twenty-first- century theoretical approaches to theater to more appropriately place court theater in contemporary scholarly dialogues on Baroque drama. I began with Lope de Vega's 1609 text, *Arte nuevo de hacer comedia en este tiempo*, thereby demonstrating its limitation, both as a theoretically tenuous text, but also in its possibility to elucidate court theater. The approaches to public theater that Lope presented in *Arte nuevo* classified theater as mass media for the *vulgo.* Although some of Lope's Aristotelian views did emerge in both court drama and the theater of the *corrales*,[100] his treatment of the public and his proposed methods for eliciting enjoyment were out of date by the time court drama and its multi-media visual spectacle had nearly edged out public theater in the mid- and late seventeenth century.

I subsequently evaluated Padre Ignacio de Camargo's 1689 text titled, *Discurso Teológico, sobre los teatros y Comedias de este siglo.* My juxtaposition of this work with Bances Candamo's *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos* (1689-1694) is representative of the dialogue that occurred throughout the century around the functions and influences of theater, and culminates with Bances' attempt to defend it and delineate drama's characteristics at the time. Bances' work stood as refutation of Camargo's claims that theater was a damaging pastime that should have been considered illicit. Bances' theory highlights specific strategies that playwrights should make use of, such as *el decir sin decir*, which was rooted in an already

[100] As I referenced in chapter two, Garrido Gallardo notes it is possible these Aristotelian views may have been perverse and have already become the norm in Spanish societies by the early seventeenth century.

established tradition of literary decorum, and proposed that theater could be used as both entertainment, as a way to influence the king and as a means to guide him in the monarchical arts (what Quintero called "the art of kingship").

I was then led to answer two contemporary theoretical questions. First, how do our contemporary philosophical ideas of agency and authority dialogue with Early Modern court drama? Second, how do I remain an individual as a consumer of drama? My work with agency proves two exceptions to the current models on shared agency, shared activity, shared intention, and authority. I began by debunking the notion that activity creates authority in a unidirectional relationship. That is, I showed that the claim that authority only exists because of the activity is false. However, in the case of the monarch, whose authority comes from their nobility, it is their authority that authorizes the activity. This is a contention that philosophical studies have not adequately questioned or considered to date. I then disproved that shared agency exists only when there is a case to be made for shared intention. Using the multi-artist web of court drama production, I proved it is a flaw to assume group success indicates shared agency and shared intention.

Chapter two concluded by proposing William Egginton's 2016 book *The Man Who Invented Fiction: How Cervantes Ushered in the Modern World* as the answer for Spadaccini and Taléns' question about how to retain an individual experience during situations of consumption for a multi-member audience. Egginton's work on the individual's knowledge base permits the conclusion that each attendee will have a unique experience as a receptor of theater due to their personal life experience and exposure to previous works or situations. This, therefore, overrules the idea that uniformity radiates from the monarch. Additionally, my work in chapter four proved that theater was not created for the king's "solace", but rather for a larger

court audience. The idea that theater existed for the sole entertainment of the monarch and was an exclusive right of his station crumbles with the notion that each individual has the power to construct their own meaning from the *writerly text* that is defined by their personal experiences.

In order to properly contextualize the political issues of the 1670s and 1690s, the third chapter of this project opened with a historical review of Spain in the seventeenth century. My research examined how Calderón de la Barca's works *La estatua de Prometeo* and *Fieras afemina amor* reflected concerns and fears over the political terrain of the 1670s. Not surprisingly, the tension between Mariana of Austria, Don Juan José of Austria, and their respective political factions was so prominent it influenced Calderón's works. In analyzing *La estatua de Prometeo*, I argued for the duality of progressive forethought cast against the status quo, as Palas and Epimeteo are divided against Minerva and Prometeo. This is emblematic of Don Juan's opposition to Mariana and his coups on Madrid. My work with *Fieras afemina amor* likewise draws parallels between the dramatic work and the real-life tension of and around the court. I showed that Hércules' brutish character would have been reminiscent of courtiers' view of Don Juan. Additionally, Hércules' loyalty to the king also mirrors trepidations and doubts about Don Juan's loyalty to the crown after the death of Felipe IV.

While it is important to recall that court politics and court drama were intertwined in the late seventeenth-century Spanish court in Madrid, the greatest impact this research will have is on redefining and establishing new dates around court theater in the 1670s. The letters my archival research uncovered suggest that after the death of Felipe IV, theater was not reinstated in the court until 1672. This confirms Margret Greer's hypothesis that the 1672 lavish production of *Fieras afemina amor* was likely the premiere. This will call into question previously estimated premiere dates such as 1670 as the estimate for *También se ama en el abismo* by Agustín de

Salazar y Torres. Additionally, these letters show the court's concern for Carlos II's exposure to theater at such a young age. This concern was likely supported by preoccupation for Carlos' intellectual and emotional development as opposed his age alone. These letters are indispensable documents that help shape our chronological understanding of theater's place in the court.

Of course, Carlos' intellectual, emotion, and physical development would never be that of a stereotypically ideal monarch. He was not a man of *armas*, he lacked the intellectual prowess to govern independently, and he was constantly ill. These physical shortcomings included his inability to father an heir. Without an heir to the Habsburg crown, the concern for whom would ascend the thrown upon Carlos' death provoked fear in the court. Immersed in an environment saturated in these preoccupations, Bances Candamo wrote *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, *La piedra filosofal*, and *El esclavo en grillos de oro* in which he suggests a nephew-king paradigm for succession. As Carlos II had two great-nephews—José Fernando of Bavaria, son of Maria Antonia and great-grandson of Mariana of Austria, and Felipe of Anjou, the great-grandson of Felipe IV—Bances' proposition calls attention to Carlos' options. Apart from succession recommendations, *El esclavo en grillos de oro* served as a type of *espejo de príncipes* modeling proper and wise kingship while mirroring Spain in a global context. *El esclavo en grillos de oro* is particularly important because it not only presents a character model for Carlos to follow and a solution for whom to choose as heir, but it also address, and thereby summarizes, the major problems Spain faced during Carlos' reign: war, revolts, revolutions, rebellions, problems inherent to ruling lands not inhabited by the royal family, a lack of a well-groomed monarch to lead the country, and economic crises that overwhelmed the court in Madrid.

Calderón's approach to the tensions between Mariana of Austria and Don Juan José of Austria demonstrates his mastery of literary decorum. Although his works could be argued as polemic from either side, his loyalties were not doubted. However, Bances Candamo's execution of the material put forth in his political trilogy reflects the fear felt by the court over political concerns, doubts of their king, and the question of succession. This fear seems to have overridden Bances Candamo's literary decorum and tactic of *decir sin decir* as he expressed fear and concerns of his contemporaries outright.

Chapter four of this project then delved into questions of space, scenography, music, and the performance of majesty in order prove that royal Spanish drama is its own genre of theater performance. I did this by: showing that the play coexists as a separate performance that outlasts that of the monarchs, who are part of court spectacle; by demonstrating that the Coliseo del Buen Retiro does not exist in the court as a closed domain; and by exploring the multimedia composition of court drama and Spain's originality in technological and musical advances for court productions. As I established in the introduction, I was concerned with the *writerly text*, which thereby authorized me to subscribe to a subjective paradigm and to contextualize these works as they were.

Despite the malleable state of court drama and its ability to be readapted, the performance of majesty was rigid and bound by the norms and etiquette of court life. The performance of the monarch, therefore, was not as subject to change as court plays were. Since the performance of majesty happened in the "espacio lúdico de la fiesta" and in the "espacio lúdico de la representación",[101] and because it co-exists alongside court drama, I support that court

[101] Again, terms coined by José María Díez Borque. For this dissertation's evaluation of these terms, See chapter four's section: "Theater Spaces of the Court".

performance is a part of the royal Baroque identity. This is further proven by the trans-dynastic nature of the work to outlast a single monarch, yet connect different reigns as *Fieras afemina amor* does when it is represented in 1724 as a *zarzuela.* Despite an attempt to slash the arts under Bourbon rule, court theater was so deeply rooted in the royal Baroque identity that *Fieras afemina amor* was not only restaged, but also transformed by its new musical accompaniment for the bespoke royal experience. Therefore, court drama is trans-dynastic.

Although there were multiple spaces in which the court hosted court drama, my research in chapter four focused primarily on the private quarters of the monarchs, the Salón Dorado and the Coliseo del Buen Retiro. I established that private quarters hosted *particulares* for the king or queen, making these chapters the most exclusive space for court drama. These productions were simple, made no use of a stage, and offered no scenography. These works were also presented with few actors. The Salón Dorado, however, could accommodate a portable stage, limited stage machinery, and more simplistic versions of the lavish productions put on in the Coliseo. The Coliseo, on the other hand, was able to hold as many as 1500 visitors, and boasted the most lavish and ostentatious court representations with full use of perspective, stage machinery, and other scenographic elements. This space was eventually opened to a public audience, thereby permitting access to royal representations to people that might not otherwise have had the luxury of a royal invite to a royal theater. The fluidity of the Coliseo protects it from scholarly binaries of the exclusively royal versus the public space. It simultaneously served both, and the Coliseo functioned as Spanish Baroque society needed it to: as an incubator for scenographic, technological, and musical innovation.

Court productions were exceptionally collaborative. Artists worked on sets, painting, costuming, lighting, perspective, stage direction, acting, dance numbers, song, etc. Due to the

number of artistic resources available, stage direction was quite detailed for court productions and made use of all it could. Influenced by the Italians, the Spanish stayed at the forefront of innovation in court drama, and by the 1690s they had created their only musical performance: the *zarzuela*. Works like *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso* show how deeply music was rooted in court spectacle. After decades of musical development, and its implementation as a way to announce godly characters, for example, *Cómo se curan los celos* was part of the effort to rewrite the understanding of music's function in these works. Musical function was so ingrained in court drama, *Cómo se curan los celos* had to revert to using words and costumes to delineate deities from mortal characters, as song no longer served as a tool to distinguish certain characters from others; rather, music had become its own sub-genre.

My work, therefore, has proven that court drama is its own genre defined by the spaces unique to the court, scenographic resources, collaborative artistry, and its connection to the performance of the royal family as nobility who has authorized court drama's existence in the court. The relationship between court drama and the royal family proves that court drama and performance are a part of royal Baroque identity. I have shown that court theater and politics are intrinsically linked; while Calderón used his works to comment on political concerns of the 1670s, Bances Candamo used his plays to shape and to educating Carlos on the craft of kingship and to offer solutions to the court's fears regarding succession and the Habsburg dynasty. Moreover, court drama is its own genre because it borrows its transcendence from the majesty of the crown that authorizes its performance and with which it coexists.

Transitions versus Continuity: Theater under Bourbon Rule

The fears over the future of Carlos II and the continuation of the Habsburg dynasty proved to be right. Mariana died in 1696 with the hope that José Fernando of Bavaria would

succeed her son. However, José Fernando died in 1699 at age six. As courtiers had feared, with no offspring to take over the crown, Carlos was the only remaining Habsburg with a right to his own crown by 1700. Carlos II of Spain died on November 1, 1700, five days shy of his thirty-ninth birthday. At seventeen years old his great-nephew, Filipe of Anjou, succeeded him and became Felipe V of Spain. The Spanish Court was now controlled by the Bourbons.

It seems like the biggest change that impacted the theater in the first years of Felipe V's reign was his approach to finances. Margaret Greer and John Varey note that it seemed to be the expectation and custom to ask for a set sum of money for a festival—including the plays—before it was to take place (76). The allowance was supposed to cover the festival, and petitions or complains that arose against the amount were dealt with according to each case (76).

Despite innovating adaptations such as the 1724 production of *Fieras afemina amor* as a *zarzuela*, Bourbon rule threatened the livelihood of court drama. More specifically, it threated the livelihood of the originality that was *Spanish* court drama. After Carlos II's death, and throughout the first decade of Bourbon rule, theater productions were few and far between for the court (López Alemany and Varey 15). Disappointingly, they were even more rare from 1710-1718 (15). Felipe V, not a large proponent of theater, did not even celebrate his marriage in 1714 with court drama (15). However, court drama would be reinvigorated after the arrival of Felipe V's wife Isabel of Farnese to the court in Madrid. Despite their marriage in 1714, it was not until 1718 that she commissioned an Italian acting company to play in El Pardo three times per week (15). Although this greatly exceeded the normal bi-weekly productions from nearly one-century prior, as expressed in the documentation from 1622-1623, the new queen hailed from Italy, threatening Spanish drama.

Ignacio López Alemany and John Varey explain that the style of theater that had been cultivated in Madrid did not please Isabel, thus why she hired an *Italian* acting troupe. Although she was a large supporter of theater, her roots were the same as the opera's and the very scenographers that innovated and transformed Spanish scenography into something entirely its own. This obligated Spanish acting companies to adapt to the styling of the Italian opera if they were to find work in the good graces of their queen (15). Even the adaptation of *Fieras* was not described by courtiers of the moment as changed, adapted, or tailored. It was staged after "arreglándola" or fixing it (Lopez Alemany and Varey, doc. 50). Unfortunately, after the death of Charles II, "La zarzuela palaciega ha perdido su legitimidad con los Borbones" (360).

Therefore, Spanish court drama becoming much more Italian than it had ever been, and only thirty years after its solidification as its own sub-genre, the *zarzuela* was replaced by the very musical genre that inspired its creation. Yet, there is something quite important in this artistic shift that provides a certain continuity with the Habsburgs: female patrons. It calls attention—once again—to the importance of the women in the court for the future of artistic production. Even though Spanish Baroque court drama was severely threatened by Italian influences that now did not just influence the court, but also ruled it, it was the women in the court—and their authority—that created a space for artistic creation in drama. That is to say, that after the death of Felipe IV, there was no greater advocate for court drama than court *women*. Female patronage, therefore, is also trans-dynastic and transcultural, providing a continuity for the royal court in Madrid when Carlos II could not provide a promise of continuity through an heir.

The Future of this project

This project has illuminated several possible paths and developments for its future growth, and it has inspired other projects outside of itself. The first is that part of chapter three has been pulled for publication as a contribution to a book under contract with Palgrave Macmillian. This essay focuses on the tensions between Mariana of Austria and Don Juan of Austria from a historical perspective. I have pulled *La estatua de Prometeo* as the theater example that demonstrated these tensions.

Secondly, I need to acknowledge this project's future as a book, which merits several changes and expansions. To begin, the letters I discovered in the General Archive in Simancas will need a bigger place in my work for two reasons. These letters confirm the reservations members of the court had about Carlos II. Their focus is on his age, but when we consider he was ten when those letters were written, and a mere three and a half years from the date at which his mother's regency was supposed to end, I find it hard to image that his age was their concern in him attending the theater. As I mentioned in this project, I think they were more likely concerned with his development for his age. These are the same tensions reflected in the body language of the image that opens this dissertation. Therefore, the letters are textual evidence of these concerns and would serve to reinforce the dynamics of the royal family presented at the onset of my work. Secondly, as I presented here, these letters change our understanding as to how long theater was absent from the court after the death of Felipe IV, and challenge some of the dates we have estimated for royal plays such as *También se ama en el abismo*, and *Fieras afemina amor*. I have been in touch with the archive and am waiting to see if they are willing to supply me with digital versions of these letters in order to confirm these citations with my initial

transcriptions. This confirmation is completely necessary should I venture forward to publish these claims.

In continuation, chapter three needs several changes. The first is that the amount of information available on Don Juan José and the communication he has with other nobles is far more expansive than I anticipated. It would be entirely possible to expand the historical context of these tensions through an evaluation of the texts and letters that are house in the Biblioteca Nacional. There was not time or space here to further explore this issue, but in the future I may be able to draw my own conclusions on this tension, the coups that shook Madrid, and Mariana's distaste for Don Juan with some of these materials I now have at my disposal. This would be particularly useful and exciting as many of these letters and journals I have not seen cited in our field. If they have been cited, they have been left to the historians.

Chapter three should be divided into three chapters, and has the potential to be its own book. There is no doubt the 1670s and 1690s each merit their own chapter with further exploration of these works and their implications. Additionally, I cut works from the 1680s from this project, including *Las belides*, represented in 1686 for Mariana's birthday and written by Don Marcos de Lanuza Mendoza y Arellano, also known as the Count of Clavijo. I would like to revisit this work in particular because it was authored for Mariana, by a nobleman. That is to say it was written by nobility for nobility, and it may be illuminating to see royal concerns expressed in this work and how trends of the 1680s are manifesting in the plays.

The same can be said for chapter four. Much work that has been done on court theater has narrowed in on specific elements. The challenge was then to compile *and* analyze this wealth of information. Each section of this dissertation could become its own chapter. My priorities in turning this into a book are to develop and deepen my work on the use of the Coliseo—including

the role of the *mayordomo*—and the *zarzuela*, including a more profound analysis of the works themselves. (The role of the *mayordomo* may have particularly interesting implications for my work on agency and authority as the *mayordomo* was in charge of seating assignments in the Coliseo.) This project now feels like the first half of a future project, as it should. It is clear to me that my research has provided me with much of the history, theory, and contextualization needed to properly analyze these works in the cultural context of the court. The next step will be to restructure the project and turn my focus more to the plays themselves.

It has become clear at the close of this project that the material available is immense and there are few scholars centering their focus on court drama. At the onset, resources seemed limited and might be to explain why so many scholars focus on the public theater of the *corrales*. However, I have found this is simply not true. It concerns me now that this hesitation may have come from a current lack of understanding on what court drama is, and that it does not fit many of the labels to which we have grown accustomed. There is a need for further integration of the studies that investigate theater *and* the circumstances of the court. Although Greer researched court drama, she limited herself to the mythological plays of Calderón. Stein and Becker focused on music, others on scenography. Court drama is its own genre, and it is time we stop compartmentalizing its pieces for limited gains.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, John J. *The Reconstruction of a Spanish Golden Age Playhouse: El Corral del Príncipe, 1583-1744*. University of Florida, Gainsville, 1983.

Althusser, Louis. "From Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, Norton, 2001, pp. 1335-1361.

Álvarez García, Belén. "Loa para la comedia de *¿Quién es quien premia al amor?*" *Loas completas de Bances Candamo*, edited by Ignacio Arellano et al., Kassel, Edition Reichenberger, 1994, pp. 189–211.

Arellano, Ignacio. *Historia del teatro español del siglo XVII*. Cátedra, 2002.

———. Introduction. *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, by Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo, Dovehouse Editions Canada, 1991, pp. 9-98.

———. "Lo trágico y lo cómico mezclado: de mezclas y mixturas en el teatro del Siglo de Oro." *RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2011, pp. 9-34.

Bances Candamo, Francisco Antonio de. *Cómo se curan los celos y Orlando Furioso*, edited by Ignacio Arellano, Dovehouse Editions Canada, 1991.

———. *El esclavo en grillos de oro; y, la piedra filosofal*, edited by Carmen Díaz Castañón, Caja de Ahorros de Asturias, 1983.

———. *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos*, edited by Duncan W. Moir. Tamesis Books Limited, 1970.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Translated by: Farrar, Straus, Giroux Inc., United Kingdom, Hill and Wang, 1990.

Bass, Laura R. "Introduction: "The Comedia and Cultural Control: The Legacy of José Antonio Maravall"." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2013, pp. 1-13.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. 1981. University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Becker, Danièle. "El teatro palaciego y la música en la segunda mitad del Siglo XVII." *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas 18-23 agosto 1986*, 1989, pp. 353–364.

Bell, Aubrey. Introduction. *Four Plays of Gil Vicente* by Project Gutenberg, 2009. Accessed 28 Jan. 2014.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, Norton, 2001, pp. 1051-1071.

Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us about X?" *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, vol. 110, 1995, pp. 343-49.

Bratman, Michael. "Rational and Social Agency: Reflections and Replies." *Rational and Social Agency: The Philosophy of Michael Bratman*, edited by Manuel Vargas and Gideon Yaffe, Oxford University Press, New York, 2014, pp. 294-343.

Browne, Terry. *Playwrights' Theatre: The Royal Court Theater and the English Stage Company*. Pitman, 1975.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *La Estatua de Prometeo*. MS, *Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes*, Madrid, 1715. Accessed June 2014.

———. *La Estatua de Prometeo*, edited by Margaret Rich Greer, Reichenberger, 1986.

———. *Fieras Afemina Amor*, edited by Edward M. Wilson, Reichenberger, 1984.

Camargo, Padre Ignacio de. *Discurso teológico sobre los teatros y comedias de este siglo*. Miguel Manescal, The National Library of Portugal, 1690.

Carlos II of Spain. "Cartas del Rey a Don Juan." 27 October 1675. Sheets 5-6. *Documentos varios sobre la intervención del Infante Juan José de Austria en el gobierno de Carlos II*. Sala Cervantes, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid. Accessed 12 June 2015.

Cascardi, Anthony J. "Authority and Illusion: En la vida todo es verdad y todo mentira." *The Limits of Illusion: A Critical Study of Calderón*. Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp. 121-29.

Chapman, W. G. "Las comedias mitológicas de Calderón." *Revista de Literatura*, vol. 5, no. 9 10, 1954, pp. 35–67.

Collection of Court Documents. 1680. Collection 11744, Box 1031 and 1032, Document 34. Patrimonio Real, Administración General de la Real Casa, Palace Archive, Madrid. Accessed 17 June 2015.

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio, comp. *Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España*. Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos, Madrid, 1904.

Demirel, Irfan Nihan, and Osman Altintas. "Relationship Between Art and Politics." *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, no. 51, 2012.

Díaz Castañón, Carmen. Introduction. *El esclavo en grillos de oro; y, la piedra filosofal*, by Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo, Caja de Ahorros de Asturias, 1983, pp. 9-116.

Díez Borque, José María, editor. *Actor y técnica de representación del teatro clásico español*. Tamesis Books Limited, 1989.

Díez Borque, José María. "Lope y sus públicos: estrategias para el éxito." *RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2011, pp. 35-54.

———. "Relaciones de teatro y fiesta en el Barroco español." *Teatro y fiesta en el Barroco*, edited by José María Díez Borque and José Alcina Franch, Ediciones del Serbal, Barcelona, 1986, pp. 12-40.

Domínguez Ortiz, Antonio. *Crisis y decadencia de la España de los Austrias*. 1969. Barcelona, Editorial Ariel, 1984.

———. *Golden Age of Spain 1516-1656*. Translated by James Casey, edited by John Parry and Hugh Thomas, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, 1971.

Egginton, William. "*Don Quixote*, Fiction, and the Politics of Irony." Don Quixote in the American West. University of Colorado, Denver, Denver. 23 Apr. 2015. Address.

———. *How the World Became a Stage: Presence, Theatricality, and the Question of Modernity*. State University of New York, 2003.

———. "Reality is Bleeding: A Brief History of Film from the Sixteenth Century." *Configurations*, vol 9, no. 2, 2001, pp. 207-229.

———. *The Theater of Truth: The Ideology of (neo)baroque Aesthetics*. Stanford University Press, 2010.

Elliott, John H. *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in an Age of Decline*. 2nd ed., Yale University Press, 1986.

———. *Spain, Europe & the Wider World, 1500-1800*. Yale University Press, 2009.

———. *Spain and Its World: Selected Essays*. Yale University Press, 1989.

Fothergill-Payne, Louise, and Peter Fothergill-Payne. *Parallel Lives: Spanish and English National Drama, 1580-1680*. Bucknell University Press, 1991.

García-Castañón, Santiago. "Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo." *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age*, edited by Mary Parker, Greenwood Press, 1998, pp. 28–38.

García Sanz, Angel. "Castile 1580-1650: Economic Crisis and the Policy of 'reform'." 1994. *The Castilian Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: New Perspectives on the Economic and Social History of Seventeenth-Century Spain*, edited by I.A.A. Thompson and Bartolomé Yun Casallilla, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 13–31.

Garrido Gallardo, Miguel Ángel. "El *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias*, texto indecidible." *RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2011, pp. 103–118.

Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel: Self and Other in Literary Structure*. Translated by Yvonne Freccero, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Greer, Margaret Rich. General and Critical Introduction. *La estatua de Prometeo*, by Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Reichenberger, 1986.

———. *The Play of Power: Mythological Court Dramas of Calderón de la Barca*. Princeton University Press, 1991.

———, and J. E. Varey. *El teatro palaciego en Madrid, 1586-1707: Estudio y Documentos*. Tamesis Books Limited, 1997.

Grotowski, Jerzy. *Towards A Poor Theatre*, edited by Eugenio Barba, Routledge, 2002.

Guevara, Juan Vélez de. *Los celos hacen estrellas*. 1672. Edited by John Varey and N.D. Shergold, Tamesis Books Limited, 1970.

Herrera Barnuevo, Sebastián de. *Carlos II y Mariana de Austria.* 1671, oil on canvas, Museu Víctor Balaguer, Barcelona.

Kernan, Alvin. "The court and the public theatre under Elizabeth and James." *Opportunities for Research in Renaissance Drama*, vol. 23, 1980.

Lea, Kathryn. "Speaking Franco: Francisco Franco and the Evolution of the Spanish Artistic Voice." *The Corinthian*. Accessed 1 May 2015.

Letter to Mariana. 1672. Collection 993, Document 1 and 2. Archivo General de Simancas. Accessed 11 June 2015.

Limon, Jerzy. "Performativity of the Court: Stuart Masque as Postdramatic Theater." *The Return of Theory in Early Modern English Studies*, edited by Paul Cefalu and Bryan Reynolds, Palgrave Macmillian, 2011, pp. 258–277.

Lluís Seguí, Josep. "Práctica artística y militancia política." *Guadalimar*, vol. 22, 1977, pp. 84-87.

Lobato, María Luisa. "Literatura dramática y fiestas reales en la España de los últimos Austrias." *La fiesta cortesana en la época de los Austrias*, edited by María Luisa Lobato and Bernardo J. García García, Junta de Castilla y León, 2003.

———. "Nobles como actores. El papel activo de las gentes de palacio en las representaciones cortesanas en la época de los Austrias." *Dramaturgia festiva y cultura nobiliaria en el Siglo de Oro*, edited by María Luisa Lobato, and Bernardo J. García García. Iberoamericana, 2007.

Lopez, Jeremy. *Theatrical Convention and Audience Response in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

López Alemany, Ignacio, and John E. Varey. *El teatro palaciego en Madrid: 1707-1724: Estudio y documentos*. Tamesis Books Limited, 2006.

Lundelius, Ruth. "Queen Christina of Sweden and Calderón's *Afectos de odio y amor*." *Bulletin of the comediantes*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1986, pp. 231-248.

Lynch, John D. *Spain Under the Habsburgs: Spain and America 1598-1700*. 2nd ed., vol. 2, New York University Press, 1981.

Maravall, José Antonio. *La cultura del barroco: análisis de una estructura histórica*. Ariel, 1975.

———. *Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca*. Seminarios y Ediciones, 1972.

*Mariana de Austria. *Documentos varios sobre la intervención del Infante Juan José de Austria en el gobierno de Carlos II*. Sala Cervantes, Biblioteca Nacional. Accessed 12 June 2015.

McKendrick, Melveena. *Playing the King: Lope de Vega and the Limits of Conformity*. Tamesis Books Limited, 2000.

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelion. *Historia de las ideas estéticas, I.* 1883. *Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, Obras completas Tomo I*, edited by Gerardo Bolado, Editorial de la Universidad de Cantabria, 2012.

Mitchell, Silvia Z. "Habsburg Motherhood: The Power of Mariana of Austria, Mother and Regent for Carlos II of Spain." *Early Modern Habsburg Women: Transnational Contexts, Cultural Conflicts, Dynastic Continuities*, edited by Anne J. Cruz and María Galli Stampino. Ashgate, 2013, pp. 175-196.

Moir, Duncan W. Prólogo. *Teatro de los teatros de los pasados y presentes siglos*, by Francisco Antonio de Bances Candamo, Tamesis Books Limited, 1970 pp. xv-cii.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *The Routledge Critical and Cultural Theory Reader*, edited by Neil Badmington and Julia Thomas, Routledge, 2008.

Neumeister, Sebastian. “Calderón y el mito clásico (*Andromeda y Perseo*, auto sacramental y fiesta de corte).” *Calderón. Actas del Congreso internacional sobre Calderón y el teatro español del Siglo de Oro*, 1981, pp. 713–721.

Pedraza Jiménez, Felipe B. “Lope de Vega: escritos sobre teatro. Del poeta al lector.” *RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2011, pp. 174–190.

Pfandl, Ludwig. *Carlos II*. Translated by Manuel F. Galiano, Afrodisio Aguado, 1947.

Porras, Yuri. “Musical References in Lope de Vega's *El castigo sin Venganza*, and Songs in Bath Theater Royal's Production of Punishment Without Revenge.” *Ehumanista*, vol. 31, 2015, pp. 662-673.

———. “Musical Scenes in Two Seventeenth-Century Versions of *El Eneas de Dios* (*The Aeneas Of God*) Attributed to Agustín Moreto y Cabaña (1618-1669).” *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 66, no. 1, 2014, pp. 97-111.

Quintero, Maria Cristina. *Gendering the Crown in the Spanish Baroque Comedia*. Routledge, 2012.

———. “Monarchy and the Limits of Exemplarity in the Teatro palaciego of Francisco Bances Candamo.” *Hispanic Review*, vol. 66, no. 3, 1998, pp. 309-329.

———. “Political Intentionality and Dramatic Convention in the Teatro palaciego of Francisco Bances Candamo.” *Revista de estudios hispánicos*, vol. 20, no. 3, 1986, pp. 37–53.

Reed, Cory. “Acting Up: Cervantes and the Possibility of Activist Theater in Early Modern Spain.” Association for Hispanic Classical Theater Annual Symposium on Golden Age Theater. Hilton Garden Inn, El Paso. 20 Apr. 2017. Address.

Rojas Zorrilla, Francisco de. *Donde hay agravios no hay celos. Obras Completas* edited by Felipe Pedraza Jiménez and Rafael González Cañal. 1st ed., Instituto Almagro de teatro clásico and Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2007.

Ruano de la Haza, José and John J. Allen. *Los teatros comerciales del siglo XVII y la escenificación de la comedia*. Castalia, 1994.

Rubiera Fernández, Javier. "*Arte nuevo*, 240-45: Lope contra Lope." *RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2011, pp. 191-203.

Sabik, Kazimierz. "La escenografía barroca italiana en el teatro de corte en España y en Polonia, 1622-1658." *Calderón. Actas del Congreso internacional sobre Calderón y el teatro español del Siglo de Oro*, edited by Luciano García Lorenzo, 1981, pp. 1685–1694.

———. "El teatro de corte en España en la primera mitad del siglo XVII (1614-1636)." *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas 18-23 agosto 1986*, 1986, pp. 601–609.

———. "El teatro de tema mitológico en la corte de Carlos II (texto y escenografía)." *El teatro español a fines del Siglo XVII historia, cultura y teatro en la España de Carlos II. Representaciones y fiestas*. Diálogos Hispánicos de Ámsterdam, vol. 8, no. 3, 1989, pp. 775–792.

Salazar y Torres, Agustín de. *'También se ama en el abismo' y 'Tetis y Peleo'*, edited by Thomas Austin O'Connor, Reichenberger, 2006.

Santo-Tomás García, Enrique. Introducción. *Arte nuevo de hacer Comedias*, by Felíx Lope de Vega, 1609, Cátedra, 2006 pp. 12-121.

Sayre, Henry. "Performance." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 2nd ed., University Of Chicago Press, 1995.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction.* 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006.

Shakespeare, William. *Loves Labour's Lost*, edited by William C. Carroll, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. *The Taming of the Shrew*, edited by Dympna Callaghan, W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2009.

Shapiro, Scott. "Massively Shared Agency." *Rational and Social Agency: The Philosophy of Michael Bratman*, edited by Manuel Vargas and Gideon Yaffe, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 257-293.

Shergold, N. D. *A History of the Spanish Stage: From Medieval times until the End of the Seventeenth Century*. Clarendon House, 1967.

———, and J. E. Varey. *Representaciones Palaciegas, 1603-1699: Estudio y documentos*. Tamesis Books Limited, 1982.

Slater, Philip E. *The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family*. Beacon Press, 1971.

Spadaccini, Nicholas, and Jenaro Taléns. Introduction. *El rufián dichoso* by Miguel de Cervantes, Cátedra, 1986, pp. 11-79.

Stages of Conflict: A Critical Anthology of Latin American Theater and Performance. Translated by Margaret Carson, edited by Diana Taylor and Sarah J. Townsend, University of Michigan Press, 2008.

Stampino, Maria Galli. "Space of the Performance of Aminta, the Court, and the Theater." *Romance Review*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1996, pp. 7–28

Stein, Louise K. *Songs of Mortals, Dialogues of the Gods: Music and Theater in Seventeenth-Century Spain*. 1st ed., Clarendon Press, 2011.

Stroud, Matthew D. "Pedro Calderón de la Barca." *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age*, edited by Mary Parker, Greenwood Press, 1998, pp. 39-50.

Taylor, Diana. "Performance and/as History." *The Drama Review,* vol. 50, no. 1, Spring 2006, pp. 67-86.

———. "Scenes Of Cognition: Performance and Conquest." *Theatre Journal*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2004, pp. 353-372.

———, and Sarah J. Townsend. *Stages of Conflict: A Critical Anthology of Latin American Theater and Performance.* The University of Michigan Press, 2008.

"Testamento de Felipe IV." *Testamentos de los Reyes de la Casa de Austria*. Comp. Antonio Domínguez Ortiz. Editora Nacional, 1982.

Thacker, Jonathan. *A Companion to Golden Age Theater*. Tamesis Books Limited, 2007.

Thompson, Michael. "The Order of the Visible and the Sayable: Theatre Censorship in Twentieth-Century Spain." *Hispanic Research Journal*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2012, pp. 93-110. Accessed 30 Apr. 2015.

Turia, Ricardo de. "Apologético." *Preceptiva dramática española: del Renacimiento y el Barroco*, edited by Francisco Sánchez Escribano y Antonio Porqueras Mayo, Gredos, 1972.

Varey, John E. "The Audience and the Play at Court Spectacles: The Role of the King." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 61, 1984, pp. 399-406.

———. “El influjo de la puesta en escena del teatro palaciego en la de los corrales de comedias.” *El teatro español a fines del Siglo XVII historia, cultura y teatro en la España de Carlos II. Representaciones y fiestas.* Diálogos hispánicos de Ámsterdam, vol. 8, no. 3, 1989, pp. 715–730.

———, and N. D. Shergold. *Teatros y comedias en Madrid, 1651-1665: Estudio y documentos*. Tamesis Books Limited, 1973.

Vega, Félix Lope de. *Arte nuevo de hacer Comedias*, 1609, edited by Enrique Santo-Tomás García, Cátedra, 2006.

Vidal, Judith Farré, ed. *Teatro y poder en la época de Carlos II: Fiestas en torno a reyes y virreyes*. Iberoamericana, 2007.

Villafranca Malagón, Pedro. *Mariana de Austria entrega la corona a Carlos Segundo*. 1672, engraving, Sala Goya, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.

Wacks, David. “Cultural Exchange in the Literatures and Languages of Medieval Iberia.” NYU Abu Dhabi Institute, New York. 29 Oct. 2013. David A. Wacks Research and Teaching on Medieval Iberian and Sephardic Culture. Accessed 15 Mar. 2014.

Williams, Raymond. “Culture Is Ordinary.” *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*, edited by Robin Gable, Verso Books, 1989, pp. 91–100.

Wilson, Edmund. “The Historical Interpretation of Literature.” 1940. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, W.W. Norton & Company, 2010, pp. 1127–1140.

Wilson, Edward M. Introduction. *Fieras afemina amor*, by Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Reichenberger, 1984.

Wright, Elizabeth R. *Pilgrimage to Patronage: Lope de Vega and the Court of Philip III, 1598-1621*. Bucknell University Press, 2001.

Yun Casalilla, Bartolomé. "The Castilian Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century: Crisis, Refeudalisation, or Political Offensive?" 1994. *The Castilian Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: New Perspectives on the Economic and Social History of Seventeenth Century Spain*, edited by I.A.A. Thompson and Bartolomé Yun Casalilla, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 277–300.

Yun Casalilla, Bartolomé. "Spain and the Seventeenth-century Crisis in Europe: Some Final Considerations." 1994. *The Castilian Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: New Perspectives on the Economic and Social History of Seventeenth Century Spain*, edited by I.A.A. Thompson and Bartolomé Yun Casalilla, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 301-321.

*Mariana de Austria is listed as the official author in all biographical entries. However, in reality, there are various authors to the documents in this file.