UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A THEOLOGY OF ANGELS: THE REPRESENTATION OF SPIRITUAL BEINGS IN TEN DRAMATIC WORKS OF TIRSO DE MOLINA, ODEM

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

MARIAN AMOS KASPEREK
Norman, Oklahoma
2013

A THEOLOGY OF ANGELS: THE REPRESENTATION OF SPIRITUAL BEINGS IN TEN DRAMATIC WORKS OF TIRSO DE MOLINA, ODEM

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND LINGUISTICS

BY

_____
Dr. A. Robert Lauer, Chair

_____
Dr. Bruce A. Boggs

_____
Dr. Luis Cortest

_____
Dr. David J. Hildner

_____
Dr. Grady C. Wray

_____
Dr. James J. Yoch

Dedicated to Miss Barbara Lewis and Mrs. Marcy Wolsieffer, for the countless hours they have spent investing in the lives of their students, for the lifelong love of Spanish literature and pedagogy they shared with me, for the constant source of encouragement and support they have provided, and, most of all, for their continual graciousness, humility, and love for God they have consistently demonstrated.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the many people who have made this project possible. I would like to thank the professors from the department of Modern Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics from the University of Oklahoma. I have learned much in your classes and appreciate the time you have invested in my academic training.

I would like to offer a special word of thanks to each of my committee members from the University of Oklahoma: Dr. Bruce Boggs, Dr. Luis Cortest, Dr. Grady Wray, and Dr. James Yoch. I have enjoyed our many conversations throughout this process and have benefitted greatly from your suggestions, comments, and criticisms. I especially appreciate your flexibility and patience during the final weeks of this project.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation to Dr. David Hildner from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Thank you for your willingness to participate despite the distance, for the graciousness with which you offered criticism, and for the many questions which provoked me to further study and consideration.

None of this project would have been possible without the valuable expertise and direction of my chair, Dr. A. Robert Lauer from the University of Oklahoma. I appreciate the many hours he has devoted to the refinement of this project, the extreme care and attention to detail he has consistently offered, and, most of all, the

enthusiasm for Golden Age Drama he has shared with me. Thank you very much for all the advice and help you have offered over the years.

I would be remiss if I neglected to mention those in my family who have provided much needed support and encouragement during this process. I am grateful to my parents for their love and generosity. I deeply appreciate my wife, Sarah, for all the hours she spent patiently listening to me talk about Tirso's plays and for her valuable help in proofreading my dissertation. I especially thank her for all the extra work that she did at home that made it possible for me to have the time I needed to read, study, and write. Finally, I would like to thank my son, Titus. His smiles, laughs, and frequent visits to my office to help me reorganize my books provided much needed distractions from the pressures of school.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

As a Mercedarian Friar in seventeenth-century Spain, Tirso de Molina composed many dramatic works in which religious themes and images are prevalent. While critics have investigated various aspects of theology and religious imagery in his works, to date no comprehensive study has explored the roles that supernatural beings fulfill in his drama. Consequently, the purpose of this thesis is to analyze the way in which Tirso represents spiritual beings in ten of his dramatic works. The study will focus on the plays in which angels and/or demons appear in the cast of characters.

All of the works for analysis in this study portray the spiritual struggle that the human characters experience in different circumstances of their lives and the role that the angels and demons play in that struggle. The plays represent four different subgenres, including an *auto*, a theological drama, seven hagiographic works, and a biblical play. The narratives include stories of redemption and conversion, suffering and martyrdom, and persecution and service.

The textual analysis will be contextualized within the framework of St. Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae* as well as the biblical evidence that forms the basis for angelology. Special attention will be given to the functions that the spiritual beings perform in the works, the way in which the dramatist chooses to represent them, the similarities and differences between the different subgenres, and the way in which his works would help shape the popular belief of the audiences that watched his plays in the *corrales*.

Introduction

As Sancho Panza and his master were discussing the extent of Dulcinea's enchantment, they happened upon a group of odd-looking characters. In response to Don Quixote's enquiry as to their identities, the company's leader described what would be a not too unfamiliar scene for Spain during its Golden Age of literature:

> —Señor, nosotros somos recitantes de la compañía de Angulo el Malo; hemos hecho en un lugar que está detrás de aquella loma, esta mañana, que es la octava del Corpus, el auto de *Las Cortes de la Muerte*, y hémosle de hacer esta tarde en aquel lugar que desde aquí se parece, y por estar tan cerca y excusar el trabajo de desnudarnos y volvernos a vestir nos vamos vestidos con los mesmos vestidos que representamos. Aquel mancebo va de Muerte; el otro, de Ángel; aquella mujer, que es la del autor, va de Reina; el otro, de Soldado; aquél, de Emperador, y yo, de Demonio, y soy una de las principales figuras del auto, porque hago en esta compañía los primeros papeles: si otra cosa vuesa merced desea saber de nosotros, pregúntemelo, que yo le sabré responder con toda puntualidad, que como soy demonio, todo se me alcanza. (Cervantes 2: 116-17)

The encounter between Don Quixote and the group of actors highlights the growing importance of theater in Spain, not only as a form of religious instruction, but also as an ever-growing industry of popular entertainment. In this particular passage, the group's leader introduces an array of characters common to popular drama: nobility, represented by the Emperor and the Queen; professional types, embodied in the presence of the Soldier; allegorical figures, such as Death; and supernatural beings, displayed through the Angel and the Demon.

These final two characters form the focal point of this present study. The use of angels and demons in Spanish drama has been largely untouched by critics.[1] Yet, as

[1] A search on angels and demons in Spanish Golden Age Theater in *WorldCat* in July of 2012 yielded one dissertation on the topic of the Devil in Golden Age Drama. Narrowing the search to Tirso and angels and/or demons produced only one related study, a Master's thesis entitled "Dramatic and Theological Uses of the Devil in Four

indicated by the preceding quotation, the demon's role, at least, carries substantial weight in the *auto* the group was to present. He is an intriguing figure representing all that is evil in the daily struggle of the human characters' lives. The demon actor exudes arrogance and pride as he boasts of the infinite, god-like power that he possesses. Though brief, the speech in this passage provides a glimpse into the important roles that angels and demons often play in drama. They are spectacular characters that have the potential to impress audiences, and their presence enhances the drama's ability to entertain and instruct the audience, which are primary functions of the *auto* as a subgenre.

This study will focus on the ten dramatic works of Tirso de Molina, the pseudonym for Friar Gabriel Téllez, in which angels and/or demons appear as characters. These plays represent four subgenres: 1) an *auto* (*La madrina del cielo*); 2) a theological drama (*El condenado por desconfiado*); 3) hagiographic works (*El caballero de gracia*; *La joya de las montañas*; *La ninfa del cielo*; *El mayor desengaño*; *Santo y sastre*; *Quien no cae, no se levanta*; and *La Santa Juana* trilogy); and 4) a biblical play (*La mujer que manda en casa*).[2]

'Siglo de Oro' Plays" completed in 1985 by Ellen Joy Williams. Her study compares two plays by Calderón de la Barca and two by Tirso de Molina in seventy-three pages (including bibliography). Expanding the search to the works of Lope de Vega uncovered one Master's thesis on the Devil and one general book of essays on Catholic theater. For Calderón de la Barca, related results indicated one book of essays on Calderón, a book entitled *El demonio en el teatro de Calderón* by Ángel L. Cilveti, and the conference publication "The Theology of the Devil in the Drama of Calderón: A Paper Read to the Aquinas Society of London in 1957" by Alexander A. Parker.

[2] Of the dramas listed, an angel appears as a character in all the plays except *El condenado por desconfiado* in which a demon plays a major role. In *La ninfa del cielo,* an angel and a devil are listed. *La madrina del cielo* includes an angel and a demon. Finally, the *Santa Juana* trilogy additionally classifies the Angel as a Guardian Angel.

The first chapter will briefly summarize the life of the dramatist, discuss issues related to authorship, and overview the development of major critical trends in Tirsian studies. The second chapter will explore the biblical basis for angelology and the prevailing theological system of Tirso's day so as to establish a framework for the textual analysis. The third and fourth chapters will contain a catalogue of scenes in which angels and demons appear and the textual analysis of the plays. The final chapter will establish appropriate connections to the critical trends from chapter one, and provide a summary of Tirso's representation of these spiritual beings within the literary and religious contexts of his time.

Chapter 1: An Overview of Tirsian Studies

The Dramatist's Life

Considering the life of Tirso de Molina (1579?-1648), Jonathan Thacker observed: "Little is known for certain about Téllez's early life, leading imaginative biographers to create a host of myths" (62).[3] The lack of official records regarding the life of the dramatist has made it difficult for critics to compile much of a biography, despite the countless hours that researchers have spent sorting through archives. The comparatively scant documents that were uncovered by investigators such as Blanca de los Ríos and Fray Manuel Penedo Rey mostly referenced Tirso's later life; often critics placed a heavy emphasis on textual evidence from literary sources to fill in the missing gaps. As a result, many of these now debunked theories relied on a large amount of speculation based on a small number of documents. Nevertheless, the arduous work of these early investigators provided an important foundation on which scholars since the late twentieth century have continued to build.

In contrast to the debates about Tirso's early life, most critics agree that his later life is much easier to reconstruct.[4] According to Wilson, he began his career in the

[3] Appendix A of this study contains a detailed explanation of the ongoing debate about the dramatist's date of birth and early life.

[4] Luis Vázquez's research provides the most recent documentation about the dramatist's life. In her 2003 article, Blanca Oteiza mentions that Luis Vázquez continues to publish his findings about Tirso's life and that soon he will be publishing an updated, more authoritative biography of the dramatist ("Tirso" 3). In a later edition that same year, Vázquez did publish the article "Biografía de Tirso de Molina (1579-1648): Estado actual de la cuestión" summarizing the known dates of Tirso's activities. However, Wilson's book is still the most comprehensive biography and analysis of Tirso's life and works, despite the inaccuracies discovered over the last forty years. Consequently,

Mercedarian Order in 1600 and professed his vows in 1601. His religious and scholastic studies took him to Salamanca, Toledo, Guadalajara and, very likely, Alcalá de Henares (*Tirso* 20-21).[5] From 1610 to 1640 Tirso spent the majority of his time in Madrid and the surrounding towns with the exception of a two-year hiatus during which he ministered with his Order in Santo Domingo between 1616 and 1618 (*Tirso* 21-29).[6]

Tirso began writing plays around 1610 (*Tirso* 21), with his most active literary period dominating the early 1620s (*Tirso* 24-25). During the last twenty years of his life, the dramatist wrote relatively few works primarily due to the growing hostility he faced in the late 1620s. Beginning with the recommendation in 1625 from the *Junta de Reformación* that Tirso no longer be permitted to write secular works for fear that they promoted licentious behavior, the dramatist was forced to withdraw little by little from the public's view (*Tirso* 25-26). Tirso was transferred from Madrid to a more isolated location within his Order, but he continued to write and publish during his later years.[7]

---

although this study will include any necessary correctives from Vázquez's work, most of the citations come from Wilson's scholarship.

[5] Vázquez doubts the extent of Tirso's university training, citing first the fact that no one has yet uncovered any proof of his enrollment in either the University of Salamanca or the University of Alcalá de Henares, and second that he was never awarded a title commensurate with any university degree. Rather, Vázquez posits that he realized his studies within his Order and not a university setting. The fact that the titles that were awarded to him were all positions granted by the Order itself would seem to confirm this hypothesis. In no way does Vázquez imply that Tirso was not an intelligent, gifted, and educated friar. He merely points out that there is no evidence to solidify whether or not he studied at the universities as previously assumed ("Apuntes" 32-34).

[6] Vázquez does present some slight contradictions as to the timing of Tirso's whereabouts ("Apuntes" 34-46). However, he does affirm that Tirso passed the majority of his life within the province of Castilla ("Apuntes" 46).

[7] The best treatment of this topic is Ruth Lee Kennedy's book *Studies in Tirso I* in which she traces both literary and historical documents in order to contextualize what she views as more an act of personal vengeance towards Tirso than a true desire to seek moral purity in drama.

Nevertheless, the Mercedarian friar continued to work in an official capacity within his Order, holding several prestigious positions such as that of *Comendador* in Trujillo (*Tirso* 27),[8] as official chronicler (*Tirso* 27-28), and as *Definidor de Provincia* (*Tirso* 11).[9] During his time as chronicler, Tirso labored on his *Historia general de la Orden de nuestra Señora de las Mercedes*, which he completed in 1639. After being removed from his position in 1640, Tirso was forced to relocate to a remote monastery in Cuenca. Although in 1645 his superiors did reappoint him as *Comendador* in Soria, Gabriel Téllez lived only three additional years in his final position of service. He died in nearby Almazán in 1648 (*Tirso* 28-29).

Issues of Authorship

Since this study proposes to explore the representation of angels and demons in the dramatic works attributed to Tirso, the first question that must be addressed is whether or not the dramatist did indeed compose all ten of the plays for analysis. Even though Tirso claimed to have written approximately four hundred plays, only eighty-six of those are extant today (Darst, "Comic Art" 11). Wilson claims the true quantity of

[8] This definition of the term "Comendador" in *Autoridades* seems to apply primarily to leadership within the system of *Encomiendas* in the New World ("Comendador"). When understood in the religious context of a convent or monastery, it simply refers to a position of authority within the Order. According to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Tirso was a "superior" in the convent at Trujillo (Fuentes). While "superiors" had varying levels of authority within an Order, they held nonetheless positions of honor and leadership vital to the overall hierarchy of the Catholic Church (Vermeersch).

[9] According to the *Diccionario de Autoridades*, a *definidor* is a member of a governing council of an Order that determines the outcome of special important cases ("Definidor").

authentic plays numbers fifty-four (*Tirso* 40).[10] She attributes the thirty-two play difference to the general complications of the production and publication processes of the day. Works the dramatists composed were often sold to the theaters. The directors would then make changes in order to adapt the works for the stage and then distribute copies of the manuscripts to the actors. Compounding the problem was the frequent tendency of publishers who made attributions that researchers later proved to be false (Wilson, *Tirso* 40). By the time the plays reached the publication stage, they would have been subjected to revisions by various people, oftentimes complicating the task and creating confusion for scholars seeking to establish authorship (*Tirso* 34-35).[11]

The single most perplexing aspect of the authorship debates relates to Tirso's statement in the introduction to his second *Parte* that only four of the twelve plays are his: "dedico destas doce comedias cuatro, que son mías, en mi nombre y en el de los dueños de las otras ocho (que no sé por qué infortunio suyo, siendo hijas de tan ilustres padres, las echaron a mis puertas), las que restan" ("A la venerable" 6). The obvious problems presented by this ambiguous statement have dominated a large portion of Tirsian studies and spawned a great variety of theories. According to Ruth Lee Kennedy,

> Critics, in their attempt to solve this "bibliographical conundrum", have, in this [20th] century at least, tended to fall into two schools of thought: those who have asserted that Tirso was really the author of all the *comedias* . . . and those who have partially accepted the declaration that he wrote only four of the plays included in the volume but insist that he must as well have composed the other

[10] During the time period, dramatists often published their plays in volumes which typically contained twelve plays called *Partes.* Wilson arrives at the number fifty-four by including only the works from Tirso's *Partes I*, *III*, *IV*, and *V*. To these she adds the third play from the *Santa Juana* trilogy, three from *Los cigarrales de Toledo*, and the three from his second *Parte* that critics in her day claimed were undoubtedly his.
[11] See also chapter six of Wilson's book *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age* (84-87).

> eight in collaboration with other dramatists of the time period. ("Various Reasons" 129)

Kennedy believes that both schools of thought are incorrect. Regarding the first proposed solution, research has proven that other dramatists did indeed write several of the plays included in the *Parte.* The second she dismisses on the grounds that "there is not . . . a scintilla of historical evidence to support such a position" ("Various Reasons" 129). In her estimation, scholars should accept Tirso's declaration at face value. Additionally, she points out that

> all critics would agree . . . that *Amor y celos hacen discretos* and *Por el sótano y el torno* are his, completely his: these not only bear his name in their final lines, but they, insofar as I know, are in every way characteristic of the dramatist. ("Various Reasons" 130)

To these two plays she adds *Esto sí que es negociar* ("Various Reasons" 130).[12] Wilson reiterates Kennedy's assessment regarding these three plays (*Tirso* 38), and then identifies the remaining questionable plays:

> Candidates for the fourth place include *La mujer por fuerza* (*A Woman Against her Will*), suggested by Cotarelo because of its likeness to many of Tirso's comedies of intrigue . . . *Cautela contra cautela* (*Cunning Matched with Cunning*), strongly urged by Professor Kennedy on the basis of the material it has in common with other Tirsian works . . . and *El condenado por desconfiado* (*The Man of Little Faith*). (*Tirso* 39)

Despite the plethora of theories regarding which plays actually belong to Tirso, no definitive evidence is available to resolve the debate in a satisfactory manner.

Of the ten works attributed to the dramatist in which angels and/or demons appear, the following five are definitely Tirso's: *El mayor desengaño, Santo y sastre, La mujer que manda en casa, Quien no cae, no se levanta*, and the *Santa Juana* trilogy.

[12] Blanca Oteiza indicates that scholars no longer accept Tirso's authorship of *Esto sí que es negociar* ("Tirso" 3). Given that her article is primarily a brief overview of Tirsian studies up to the twenty-first century, space does not allow her to elaborate the reasoning.

With the exception of the latter, all five of these works appear in the first, fourth and fifth *Partes*. The first two plays of the *Santa Juana* trilogy were published in the fifth *Parte*, and the third remained in manuscript form "in Tirso's own hand" (Wilson, *Tirso* 40).[13]

The remaining five plays are of more doubtful authorship. Scholars tend to view *El condenado por desconfiado*, one of the five dubious plays, as a masterpiece. As a result, an extensive bibliography exists dedicated to questions of authorship and analysis of this work. In contrast, critics have largely ignored the remaining four plays.[14] Blanca de los Ríos, in preparing her *Obras dramáticas completas*, relies heavily on the works of Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch (1806-1800) and Emilio Cotarelo y Mori (1857-1936). *La ninfa del cielo, El caballero de gracia, La joya de las montañas*, and *La madrina del cielo* all appear in Cotarelo's *Comedias de Tirso de Molina* (1906-

[13] Tirso's fifth *Parte* contained only eleven works. However, as Wilson has shown, since the final two plays of the *Parte* are the two *Santa Juana* plays, it is reasonable to assume that Tirso intended to publish the third installment as the twelfth play (*Tirso* 40).

[14] Oteiza briefly traces the history of Tirsian studies in her article "Tirso en el siglo XXI: Estado actual de los estudios tirsianos." She highlights several efforts begun in the 1990s to produce and publish critical editions of Tirso's works, and ultimately, an authoritative complete works: Xavier A. Fernández's critical, textual study entitled *Las comedias de Tirso de Molina*, a ground-breaking analysis and comparison of available manuscripts; the *Turner-Biblioteca Castro* project to reproduce Tirso's *Partes* and miscellanies; and the ongoing work of the *Instituto de estudios tirsianos* (a subgroup of *GRISO—Grupo de Investigación Siglo de Oro*, associated with the University of Navarra) to publish critical editions of Tirso's complete works. The final two projects are still in progress (1-5). With regard to Ríos's *Obras dramáticas completas*, José M. Ruano de la Haza and Henry W. Sullivan explain that despite the textual problems with the edition, as of 1989 it was still the most convenient and complete collection of Tirso's works, even though it is not a critical edition of the texts (19-20) but rather consists primarily of "reprints of Hartzenbusch's and Cotarelo's earlier editions" (19). For the purposes of this current study on angels and demons, Blanca Oteiza has graciously provided her expert opinion on which editions of the ten plays should be consulted for analysis ("Re: Los textos").

1907).[15] Although Ríos includes these four plays and cites the former's explanations, she provides little supporting evidence to solidify the works' authenticity as plays written by Tirso.[16]

[15] This collection of works forms a part of the larger series, *Nueva biblioteca de autores españoles*, edited by Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (volumes 4 and 9), and published in 1906 and 1907, respectively. In addition to studying manuscripts available from the *Biblioteca Nacional,* Cotarelo consulted Hartzenbusch's earlier *Comedias escogidas de Fray Gabriel Téllez*. This particular volume was first printed in 1948 with a final, ninth edition published in 1944.

[16] For *La ninfa del cielo* Ríos simply restates that Cotarelo used the oldest, most complete manuscript available, even though that manuscript was only a revision of an original text that might have belonged to Tirso (1: 911). She then proceeds to discuss the *auto, La ninfa del cielo*, and states that Tirso must be the author of both (1: 915). Additionally, Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti in their edition of the *auto* cites Ríos to establish authorship, yet they admit that the work bears only slight similarity to Tirso's other works (*Autos II* 53). Thus, critics still lack evidence supporting the work's attribution to Tirso. In her introduction to *El caballero de gracia*, Ríos states "Cotarelo . . . pone en duda, aunque dudando de su propia incertidumbre, la atribución de esta comedia a Tirso, pero el erudito académico que prestó un servicio a las letras reproduciendo la obra, dudaba inmotivadamente de su autenticidad" (3: 263). She then provides four brief textual examples to show how the play, "aunque no sea de las más típicas de Tirso, contiene rasgos que equivalen a su firma" (3: 263). Once again, attribution is based loosely on similarities to Tirso's other works. With regard to *La joya de las montañas*, Ríos reiterates that Cotarelo utilized an incomplete manuscript that he then completed the play by consulting an earlier revised manuscript from the *Biblioteca Nacional* that listed the work as anonymous (1: 161). Ríos adds her own doubts to the debate, stating that the play's inclusion in the Tirsian canon would be an exception to the dramatist's normal output (1: 161). She then cites numerous stylistic differences present in the play and concludes that she would not attribute the work to Tirso (1: 163-64). *La madrina del cielo* appears to have been published in 1648 as a part of a "colección *Navidad* y *Corpus Christi*" (1: 549). According to Ríos, "aparecería como expósito y abandonado de su autor. Y a pesar de ese indudable abandono, suerte común de muchas obras de Téllez, y, por lo mismo, indicio de legitimidad, y a pesar de la incorrección o estragamiento de su forma, es undubitablemente de Tirso" (1: 549). However, despite the firm conclusion that Ríos maintains, she again only presents as evidence its similarity to *El condenado por desconfiado*. Given the dubious nature of the latter, it hardly offers substantial proof of authorship. It seems the strongest reason that critics continue to include the works in their collections of Tirso's drama is founded largely on the fact that all the other major collections contain the works as well. Critics have not yet been able to produce authoritative evidence to support their claims. Consequently, these plays will likely continue to be clouded by the doubts that arise

El condenado por desconfiado has received substantial critical attention, especially regarding whether or not the play is one of the four plays Tirso claims to be his from the second *Parte*. Wilson explains that many critics believe that *El condenado* was written by Tirso due to perceived doctrinal similarities to *El burlador de Sevilla*. They view it "as a companion piece to the other great theological drama" (*Tirso* 39). However, others find this approach unconvincing. Ruth Kennedy, for example, rejects Tirso's authorship based on inconsistencies between the works' stylistic attributes.[17]

Wilson's personal position has shifted over time. In her book *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age* (1969), she states that "[t]he strong probability is that Tirso wrote both *El condenado* and *El Burlador*. Both plays were published under his name and no other convincing claim to the authorship of either has yet been made" (115). Later, in her book *Tirso de Molina* (1977), Wilson presents two main arguments in favor of *El condenado*. First, she discusses Alan K. G. Paterson's theory that Tirso had initially submitted an earlier version of his first *Parte* for publication as viable proof that the play belonged to him. Furthermore, she does not comment on Kennedy's objections to his theories, which the latter bases primarily on a misinterpretation of a date on the

---

from second and third-hand attributions based on copies of revised manuscripts largely from unknown sources.

[17] Kennedy proposes that the work is not Tirso's based on the following reasons: 1) *El condenado* includes a large section of plagiarism from one of Lope de Vega's plays, a trait uncharacteristic of Tirso in her estimation ("Various Reasons" 132); 2) the play's structure departs from the typical Shakespearian tragedy form and instead takes the form of "a Greek cross" ("Various Reasons" 133), the two main characters essentially trading places from wretched sinner to devoted saint, and vice versa ("Various Reasons" 133-36); 3) its symbolism further enhances the structure's contrast through strong dark/light imagery which Kennedy does not see as a typical Tirsian trait ("Various Reasons" 136-37); 4) the "diction, style, and versification" are dissimilar to what Tirso normally employed ("Various Reasons" 137-39); and 5) the characterization departs from Tirso's typical representation ("Further Reasons").

manuscript Paterson examined (*Tirso* 115).[18] Second, Wilson offers some slight similarities between Paulo's actions and beliefs to those of a "minor character" from Tirso's play, *El mayor desengaño* (*Tirso* 115). However, Wilson leaves the impression that this evidence fails to convince her. Yet, despite the slight change of opinion, she distances herself from an outright claim of Tirsian authorship, siding with Kennedy and affirming that she " almost certainly knows Tirso's theater and that of his contemporaries better than any other living scholar" (*Tirso* 115).

In a more recent review of the authorship question (1993), Wilson states her opinion in slightly more confident terms:

> I am increasingly inclined to believe with Kennedy that *El condenado* is not the work of Tirso de Molina. At one time I saw it as a companion piece to *El burlador de Sevilla*, the one stressing faith, the other right behaviour, as necessary for salvation, but this now seems to me too facile. The lessons of the two plays, as well as their respective styles, are too far apart for it to be likely that they were written by the same man. They are not complementary but opposed. ("Tirso's Texts" 101)

Nevertheless, the reasoning behind Wilson's change in position reveals the subjective nature of the debate. In the absence of adequate documentation, critics are left to compare the play's characteristics with supposed Tirsian traits, a standard that quickly becomes challenging to define and defend.[19]

---

[18] See Paterson's article "Tirso de Molina: Two Bibliographical Studies" and Kennedy's "Did Tirso Send to Press a Primera Parte of Madrid (1626) Which Contained *El condenado por desconfiado*?" for further details.

[19] *Ediciones Cátedra* has published two editions of *El condenado por desconfiado*, one in 1984 edited by Ciriaco Morón and Rolena Adorno and another in 2008 edited by Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez. Morón and Adorno accept Tirso's authorship without question. Rodríguez López-Vázquez doubts Tirso's authorship, yet admits that the evidence supporting the theory that Andrés de Claramonte composed the piece while likely, is not wholly convincing (13-17). The primary reason these two editions are not cited in this study is due to their condensed treatment of the topic which required further corroboration with the works cited.

Due to the subjective nature of the authorship debates, some critics have sought to establish a more scientific approach to the dramatist's style. Marie Stratil and Robert J. Oakley conducted a study on Tirso's texts in which they mathematically analyzed *El vergonzoso en palacio,* an unquestionably Tirsian play, as well as *El burlador de Sevilla* and *El condenado por desconfiado*, two plays of uncertain provenance. In their study they quantitatively established the range of Tirso's sentence lengths, word lengths, textual units, word frequencies, uses of words, and cluster analyses as a way to set up a more objective, comparative tool for determining authorship (153). They concluded that *El condenado*'s similarity to the known play provides substantial proof that it could belong to Tirso (157).[20]

Jane W. Albrecht also performed a statistical analysis of *El condenado*. In her study she found mixed results regarding *El condenado.*[21] In her explanation of the study's format, she does carefully note the limitations of her approach:

> Since Tirso's plays vary in style considerably, the parameters are wide and, consequently, the statistical proof is weak in favor of his authorship. However, the proof is very strong against his authorship if a play falls outside those parameters. ("Statistical Analysis" 250)

With regard to the play in question, Albrecht discovered that *El condenado*'s "14% *redondilla* usage falls outside of the parameters for Tirso's authorship while its 42% *romance* usage falls within. The [verse] length, 2997, is fine" ("Statistical

[20] One problem with this study is its scope: comparing two doubtful plays to one authentic work in an attempt to establish a norm in the previously listed categories is hardly convincing given the fact that approximately fifty-four Tirsian works exist.
[21] This study attempts to rectify the problem of scope. Albrecht explains that she utilized the fifty-eight plays from Sylvanus Griswold Morley's study on Tirso's verse forms ("Statistical Analysis" 247-49). She then states, "I should point out that even if Tirso did write as many as 400 plays, as he claimed, fifty eight plays randomly spread throughout his career is a number more than sufficient to furnish reliable information about his use of strophes" ("Statistical Analysis" 250).

Analysis" 251).[22] Given these mixed results, Albrecht concludes that while one cannot be absolutely sure, she "would not reject the possibility that Tirso wrote *El condenado*. Two of three categories fit his style" ("Statistical Analysis" 252).[23]

In sum, the questions about authorship will in all likelihood continue to plague Tirsian studies. Given not only the nature of the production and publication processes of *Comedias* in seventeenth-century Spain but also the critics' tendency to rely on internal, literary evidence for support, certain works will remain doubtful attributions. Consequently, this study on angels and demons will include all ten plays for analysis. However, it will divide them into separate chapters: one to explore the five works of universally accepted authorship, and another for the doubtful plays.

General Trends in Tirsian Criticism

The purpose of this section is not to provide an exhaustive treatment of Tirsian criticism due to limitations of space and time. However, certain trends within the scholarship are pertinent to the topic of angels and demons in his drama. The intent is to give an overview of each topic and its development and then make applicable connections to the focus of this study.

---

[22] Albrecht analyzes three areas: *redondilla* usage, *romance* usage, and line length.
[23] Xavier A. Fernández accepts that Tirso is the author of *El condenado* based on the evidence provided by such versification studies (1: 417). Margaret Wilson disagrees with his conclusion: "[Fernández] brings forward two new pieces of evidence to support this view. Firstly, a couple of *quintillas* with the rhyme scheme *abaab*, a pattern never used by Tirso, are shown to have had lines transposed . . . [T]hey cannot therefore be used as an argument against Tirsian authorship. Secondly, a recent important typographical study by Don W. Cruickshank establishes that the *suelta* of *El condenado* now in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, which ascribes the play to Tirso, was in all probability printed in 1626; this therefore gives a much earlier attribution than that of the 1635 *parte*" ("Tirso's Texts" 100-01).

Early Tirsian Studies

Prior to the early 1900s very few scholars had published any significant critical work about Tirso de Molina. However, this trend quickly changed at the beginning of the twentieth century. Wilson identifies an 1885 contest held by the Spanish Academy as the impetus that set in motion a fury of Tirsian studies (*Tirso* 14). In addition to the previously mentioned archival searches and the attempt to establish a workable biography of the dramatist, the early 1900s also saw the development of the first theories about Tirso's position within the overall context of Golden Age Drama. A great amount of credit during this first stage of Tirsian studies belongs to Blanca de los Ríos. While the majority of critics today no longer accept the validity of her theories regarding Tirso's life, her contributions to the field remain an important starting point for scholars in the twenty-first century, not only for her aforementioned archival searches but also for the three volume *Obras dramáticas completas* (1946, 1952, and 1958) which remains the most comprehensive collection of Tirso's plays.

Ríos frames Tirso's unique characteristics against a backdrop of Spanish Nationalism.[24] Her opening statements reveal a romanticized mission by which she intends to save the dramatist and his works from abandon:

> Diríase que Fray Gabriel Téllez fué un predestinado a la injusticia y al olvido; tocóle nacer entre dos colosos del Arte que gozaron en vida la inmortalidad:

[24] Ríos's framework is hardly surprising given the time period in which she lived (1862-1956). Golden Age Drama regained popularity through the work of the German Romantics after almost a century of neglect under French, Neoclassic tastes (Wilson, *Spanish Drama* 88). Additionally, the nationalistic emphasis through which Ríos presents Tirso's work fits perfectly within the values enforced by Franco's regime. For more information on nationalism, literature, and the Franco regime, see "Modern Spanish Culture: An Introduction" by David T. Gies, "Spain as Castile: Nationalism and National Identity" by E. Inman Fox, "The Literature of Franco Spain, 1939-1975" by Michael Ugarte, and "Prose in Franco Spain" by Janet Pérez.

> Lope, el «poeta de los cielos y la tierra», casi divinizado por la admiración popular, y Calderón, que, advenido el último en una generación de titanes, vivió casi entero el gran siglo de nuestra Dramática, llegó a la cima cuando Lope moría en plena gloria; y Tirso, abandonado lentamente el Teatro, salió en silencio de la vida, tan en silencio, que hasta hace poco no sabíamos dónde ni cuándo murió. (1: 12)

In order to accomplish this mission, Ríos begins on the critical foundation laid by Menéndez Pelayo in his studies on Lope de Vega. While she affirms Lope's importance as the catalyst of the national theater, she quickly notes that Tirso had not yet appeared on the scene as a major dramatist of the period (1: 40). Since Lope was instrumental in the origin of the national drama, Tirso naturally fulfilled the role of developing the *comedia* and preparing it for maturity by Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681):

> Esto era Lope: un creador de la dramática, un poblador de la escena. Su teatro era síntesis del arte arcaico y génesis del arte nuevo; no podía ser análisis, ni perfeccionamiento, ni equilibrio; él llevó toda la Humanidad a su obra; tras él vendría otro que individualizase toda aquella masa viviente. Y ésta fué la misión de Tirso. (1: 41)

Two keys to Lope's success, according to Ríos, were his prolific genius, which overflowed from his pen into a creative "chaos," and his control of "intrigue" (1: 41).[25] Due to both Lope's encyclopedic knowledge and diverse life experiences, his impressive dramatic output touches a vast array of themes and topics. His work reflects breadth of knowledge and experience rather than depth (1: 40-41). Tirso masterfully perfected the art of the latter. Although his scope is less extensive, Ríos underscores his

[25] In this section Ríos continues to build on Menéndez Pelayo's work: "Había que situar a Tirso solo, aislado, en su cumbre de creador de hombres con vida y alma propias. Que hasta ella no ascendió el fundador de nuestro teatro, ya nos lo muestra Menéndez Pelayo al afirmar que en Lope 'el carácter va siempre subordinado a la intriga y al raudal de la dicción poética', y al declarar que, 'después de Shakespeare, en el teatro moderno no hay creador de caracteres tan poderoso y enérgico como Tirso . . .'" (Ríos 1: 43).

ability to develop character: "inventó menos *personajes*, pero creó verdaderas *personas*, supremacía que ejerció sin rivales" (1: 42).

Humanized characterization also distinguishes Tirso from Calderón de la Barca. Although Ríos admits that Calderón displays exceptional character development in *El alcalde de Zalamea*, his focus is more cerebral and academic than psychologically profound (1: 43). On the contrary, Tirso's characters are well-developed human beings with individual personalities:

> Compárese la escasez psicológica de ambos teatros con la opulencia del de Tirso, donde los caracteres son legión, donde no hay personaje que no tenga, por lo menos, individualidad propia y donde hasta las colectividades tienen personalidad definida. (1: 43)

Ríos provides further support by emphasizing that Tirso was particularly apt at portraying women as real beings with a wide scope of types and a variety of vices and virtues (1: 45). His representation of women excels as a proof of the "predominio realista y psicológico de Téllez sobre sus contemporáneos . . . y operó sobre ella [la dramática] una fecunda transfusión de vida y de alma" (1: 47). For Ríos, he is a master realist that effectively developed true-to-life, human-like characters within Spanish drama at a level of excellence that far surpassed his literary peers.

The dominant realism of which Blanca de los Ríos speaks also forms the subject of another early critic's studies: those of Ivy L. McClelland. An important disclaimer that McClelland establishes in his study is that realism typically relates to eighteenth-century literary values (v). Nevertheless, McClelland believes that the Golden Age played an important part in the development of the aesthetics of the following century (2-3). In order to demonstrate Tirso's realism, McClelland makes an important distinction:

> For what is the secret of dramatic profundity, such profundity at least as would be acceptable to the national tastes of Spain? If it lies in some form of realism—as would seem likely—it must lie, not in a realism of externals, but in the abstract reaches of an interior realism—the realism that releases thought, feeling, and expression from the conventions of artistic formulae and reconciles them with the vast but intangible workings of the human mind. (7-8)

What sets Tirso's works apart from those of other dramatists of his time is precisely his ability to probe the workings of the human mind in a realistic way, reflecting the struggles and emotions that come into play when characters find themselves in challenging situations:

> His best themes are complicated with problems of mind. However startling or unusual his situations, they can appear to conform to an interior logic that rises from the atmosphere of thought. Many of his characters are made up of human contradictions; and when they speak they seem to reason in their own minds. But Tirso also has powers peculiar to the dramatist, in such a degree that on the few occasions when he puts out his best effort he can easily surpass . . . any other of the major playwrights. (13)

As support, McClelland cites examples such as Don Juan from *El burlador de Sevilla* (27) and Paulo from *El condenado por desconfiado* (32) in order to show that Tirso specialized in such characters as a way to demonstrate the inability of human reasoning to cope with the extreme circumstances encountered (34-35). This emphasis on the character's reasoning is another example of Tirso's ability to delve into the psychology of his personages and show their humanity, as Ríos indicated.

The late 1960s through the mid-1980s brought a sort of climax in Tirsian scholarship. This was the time period in which critics published a plethora of books about the dramatist: recapitulating the research of the previous decades, debunking theories that lacked adequate support, and drawing conclusions about the author's work

and style.[26] As expected critics have never come to unanimity about Tirso's unique characteristics, but certain general trends are present within the criticism.

Tirso and the Lopean Drama

A first area of critical attention relates to Tirso's place as one of the three greatest dramatists of the Golden Age. He appears on the scene between Lope de Vega (1562-1635), the initiator of the *comedia nueva*, and Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681), the supposed perfector of the art's thematic and dramatic possibilities. Additionally, some view Tirso as a transitional figure in the overall development of Spanish drama (Lyon 1): Richard E. Chandler and Kessel Schwartz write that the dramatist "was a disciple of Lope and agreed with him on the principles of dramatic composition" (88); Wilson labels both Tirso as "Lope's follower and disciple" (*Spanish Drama* 34) and Lope as Tirso's "master" (*Tirso* 33); and Melveena McKendrick bestows on him the honor of being "the greatest of Lope's disciples" (115).[27]

However, Tirso was not merely an imitator of Lope's style; he also defended the notion of popular drama during a time when sharp opposition characterized the venue. The controversy essentially revolved around a definition of art and its purpose. The Aristotelians balked against the *comedia nueva* on the grounds that it was an anemic imitation that deviated from the established rules and formulas presented by the classical authors, and the Moralists objected to the works as promoting profligate living.

---

[26] The surge in research and publication was prompted in part by the approaching 400th anniversary of Tirso's supposed birth in 1584.

[27] A key reason for this assumption relates directly to Tirso's output. After Lope, he is the second most prolific dramatist from the time period, claiming to have written between three and four hundred plays during his lifetime (Wilson, *Tirso* 13).

While Lope responded to the resistance by publishing his *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias* (1609), Tirso reinforced support for the innovations through the mouths of his characters in his miscellany *Los cigarrales de Toledo*, published in 1624 (Wilson, *Tirso* 32). Wilson highlights the major arguments as follows:

> [Tirso] begins by defending his own disregard of the Unity of Time, on the grounds that twenty-four hours is not long enough for the action of a play to be presented with any verisimilitude; particularly when it concerns a love-affair. Imitation of life is always to be the yard-stick. (Here at least the moderns coincide with Aristotle; but they derive different deductions from the same premise.) Then apparently answering the arguments of Francisco Cascales that what was once true must always be true, Tirso agrees that the ancients deserve respect for their pioneer work, but distinguishes between the "substance" of their achievement, which cannot change, and the "accidents", which can be improved upon in the light of experience.[28] Nature, it is true, always follows the same pattern, so that the pear-tree can only produce pears, and the oak acorns; but art is not tied to this uniformity. (*Spanish Drama* 34)

Tirso's defense reveals that the *comedia nueva* had not abandoned its philosophic base, but rather built upon it to further expand the possibilities of the genre in a new age:

> . . . if the ancient world had its Aeschylus and Euripides, its Seneca and Terence, modern Spain has its Lope de Vega, who has already done enough to constitute a school in himself, and to win the firm support of all those proud to call themselves his disciples. (Wilson, *Tirso* 33).

Thus, Tirso's importance as a great dramatist of the time period not only rests on an abundance of his works, but also on his eloquent defense of the legitimacy of a hotly-debated school of thought.[29]

---

[28] Wilson emphasizes that this terminology reflects Tirso's familiarity and use of scholastic reasoning to prove his point on intellectual grounds that the *comedia nueva* is a legitimate art form with an equally authoritative classical base. Later she highlights Tirso's use of "the Horatian principle of pleasure with profit" as further support for his style of writing (*Tirso* 33). For a more detailed account of the debate's historical development, see chapter two of Wilson's *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age* (24-37).

[29] Some critics view Tirso's defense as more precise than Lope's, demonstrating the way in which Tirso excelled over his master. John Lyon states, "Tirso's defence of his departure from classical precept is set out with greater coherence and intellectual rigour than Lope's somewhat offhand and loosely-argued treatise. His succinct exposé makes

Excellence of Characterization

A second area of critical attention focuses on characterization. David H. Darst sums up the general opinion that "the Mercedarian is widely acclaimed as the greatest, if not the sole, creator of character in seventeenth century Spanish drama" ("Comic Art" 11). While it is true that most critics do at some point make reference to Tirso's ability to create character, a wide array of perspectives exists regarding what this excellence of characterization actually encompasses.

At first glance, scholars are quick to point to both Tirso's Don Juan and his women characters as evidence of his skill. However, while it is true that the Don Juan type did become popular as a result of *El burlador de Sevilla*, one cannot say with absolute certainty that Tirso is indeed the author of the play. With regard to his representation of women, critical support has remained more constant, yet a closer look at what critics have written about this topic reveals a large spectrum of opinions and definitions.

One common Tirsian trait that critics tout is his unconventionality. Chandler and Schwartz draw attention to the bizarre nature of the Tirsian protagonists as evidence of the dramatist's ability:

> Tirso excelled in the creation of character and here surpassed even the Phoenix [referring to Lope]. He showed a predilection for the strange, extreme, or unusual types . . . He was particularly skilled in creating feminine characters, and he specialized in portraying them as spirited, bold females, particularly

---

clear something that had been only vaguely implied in the *Arte nuevo*: that Aristotle's central principle of unity of conception is, generally speaking, respected by the *comedia,* in spite of its multiple scene changes and elasticity of its time-scale" (5). Additionally, Jonathan Thacker, in reference to Tirso's defense, states, "Indeed, free from the niceties of literary academicians, he produced through the character Don Alejo, in the *Cigarrales*, one of the most intellectually satisfying defences of the *comedia nueva* written in Spain" (62).

> adept at compromising themselves and intrepid in the pursuit of their lovers. His men, on the contrary, are weak, timid, and irresolute, lukewarm in love, pursued, and finally cornered by frank, daring women. His plots frequently are battles of wits between the women, and the main female character conquers in the end by being cleverer, more daring, or more ardent than her rivals. (88)

To this, Nicholas G. Round adds elasticity as an important attribute:

> It is, above all, an insight into the unpredictability of these characters: the product, as it seems, of an almost Shakespearian brooding on the possibilities present in this or that fragment of conventional dramatic or human material. Both Lope and Calderón, for slightly different reasons in each case, tend to see their personages in terms of a fixed range of conventionalized types. They may be given certain individuating touches; they may even undergo processes of sudden change or conversion. But they remain in character as Rash Young Man, Jealous Husband, Girl Made Ingenious by Love, Innocent Victim, and the like. Even repentance registers as a transformation of conduct, rather than a development of personality. Tirso's characters are different: what they are about to do, and what they are about to become, remains subject to a real uncertainty. (xxix)

Tirso's characters do not fall into the neatly-established types that many have identified in the *comedia nueva* as a whole. Instead, they are more flexible and create an element of uncertainty for the audience observing the play.

Wilson takes a slightly different approach to Tirso's ability to create characters. She begins by describing a historical shift in the critical opinion of her day:

> The views of critics on characterization in Tirso's theatre have fluctuated during the last hundred years. The nineteenth century limited its attention mainly to the heroines of the comedies, and saw them as too bad to be true. A later generation, with Doña Blanca as its chief representative, admired their quicksilver vivacity, and praised Tirso as a great creator of lifelike figures. Today [in 1969], few people would see much verisimilitude—or even look for it. His comedies are for the most part unashamedly escapist, and his figures, when they are not mere pawns in the plot, are drawn considerably larger than life. An illusion of life is given, as in the *comedia* as a whole, by much of the background material and the dialogue. The language, particularly that of the aristocratic characters, is often conventionally *culto*, unredeemed by very much telling imagery or poetic intensity. But in the livelier scenes it is excellent: colloquial, racy and pointed. (*Spanish Drama* 103)

Even though Wilson demonstrates the continuing interest especially in his female characters, she also observes that critical opinion has shifted as interpretative frameworks have continually evolved. Whereas at one point verisimilitude served as the standard for evaluation, she now downplays its role as an indicator of the overall quality of characterization. Nevertheless, when Wilson discusses Tirso's biblical plays, she refers to his characterization as a positive aspect of his skill:

> Among Tirso's serious dramas are a handful based on Bible stories . . . The mannerisms of the comedies are still present; yet in these plays, with the biblical text to control and guide him, Tirso achieves some of his finest characterization. (*Spanish Drama* 110)

While her main focus elucidates the character development of different women in their individual circumstances, Wilson also provides the example of Amnon from *La venganza de Tamar* as a supreme example of the dramatist's ability:

> . . . [I]t is in Amnon that the most masterly characterization is seen. Behind the incestuous desire Tirso divines a tortured, neurotic temperament . . . Amnon is the supreme example of the misfit, the outsider . . . and here, with scriptural authority behind him, Tirso is bold enough to develop the character through to its full tragic fruition. (*Spanish Drama* 111)

For Wilson, the psychological development of the characters is of utmost importance for that is what gives them humanity and personality. "The biblical plays as a whole prove what in the case of the comedies was only adumbrated: Tirso's power to write great drama when he chooses to portray humanity, rather than to contrive situations" (*Spanish Drama* 111).[30]

[30] Eight years later in her book *Tirso de Molina*, Wilson largely abandons the use of the term "characterization." Instead, she chooses to organize her treatment of the dramatist through a series of motif comparisons in order to show the contrasts of how the dramatist's characters act and interact. She continues to highlight their psychological development, especially in the biblical plays. However, she makes no real attempt to show how Tirso is better *per se* at characterization than his contemporaries. She does indicate that Tirso penetrates somewhat more deeply into character development than

While much of the criticism on Tirso's characterization has dealt with generalities based on relatively few, isolated examples, some critics have investigated very specific aspects of his character development. One example is Ion Tudor Agheana's study in which he identifies "intelligence" as a uniquely Tirsian trait. His usage of the term "intelligence" does not necessarily reflect its contemporary meaning, but rather its relation to how the characters react in a given situation.[31] He clarifies this idea as follows:

> It is **industria** rather than **inteligencia**. The operational verb in the definition of **industria** is **hazer,** indicating something done with a minimum of effort and a maximum of profit .Tirso's [sic] characters possess a practical intelligence, resourcefulness. They cope with life by relying on their wits like Lázaro and his picaresque progeny. In the dramas of Tirso, as in the Picaresque novel, **industria** is not only a term of convention, a linguistic amenity, but a vital part of man's existence. The fact that Don Juan and many other Tirsian characters use it, though for different reasons than Lázaro's sheer biological survival, is of great significance. Tirso's heroes, despite their exalted social position, operate, like the rogues, from familiar, human motives.[32] (12)

Lope. Yet, she implies that Tirso's reputation for creating character is far greater than the actual number of interesting personages in his plays. In her estimation, "the intrigue is uppermost and the characters are little more than marionettes. Yet even within the limitations of this kind of comedy he will sometimes produce a Marta or a Melchor who has some degree of individual endowment; or a Mari-Hernández who, while less individualized, nevertheless shares with other Tirsian heroines an overpowering vitality that raises her above the ordinary" (66).

[31] While Agheana does not use the term "intelligence" in its contemporary sense, Margaret Wilson does employ the term to refer to intellect. For Wilson, Tirso exalts intellectual activity and the preoccupation with acquiring knowledge more than other dramatists of the time period. She views it as a departure from the normal motivations and social roles (*Spanish Drama* 101-03).

[32] Comparing Tirso's characters with those of the picaresque genre also characterized the writings of critics such as Ángel Valbuena Prat, who viewed the works in light of the Spanish Baroque. However, these critics usually distinguished Tirso from the other dramatists of the time period by drawing attention to his similarities to the contemporary English dramatists. "Las creaciones de Tirso, por tanto se parecerán más a las figuras del teatro inglés—ya Menéndez Pelayo las comparó con las de Shakespeare, o a las de Cervantes, o de la picaresca, como 'Lazarillo,' 'Guzmán' o 'Marcos'--, que a las de Quevedo que son 'esperpentos' de su época" (Valbuena Prat 187).

Here the combination of extreme circumstances, quick thinking, and the resulting action of the characters is what distinguishes them.

Continuing in the same framework as Agheana, Melveena McKendrick also adopts the term "intelligence" to describe Tirso's characterization. However, her focus primarily centers on Tirso's women characters and their ability to use their wit in a given situation. For McKendrick this tool not only drives the action of the play but also probes into the psychological depth and development of the characters. Additionally, she uses this intelligence as a way to underscore Tirso's unique portrayal of women characters:

> Tirso brought to the Golden-Age stage an intellectual turn of mind and a psychological range and penetration absent in Lope. He was interested in the extraordinary and possessed a greater tolerance and understanding of human oddity and variety than the other dramatists. Owing perhaps to his observer status, he had a broadness of outlook with regard to women's role in the scheme of things which Lope, for all his passionate interest in women and his sympathy with their problems, lacked . . . Lope's women have courage, passion, daring and determination but Tirso's have intelligence. If Lope's women rise to the occasion, Tirso's create it. (116)

A final critic who has followed a similar line of thought is Henry W. Sullivan. He describes the typical Tirsian model as a confluence of extreme circumstances in which the characters find themselves and the resourceful ways in which they respond:

> Thus far in our portrait of the typical Tirsian protagonist, we have found that he or she is usually a person cornered by circumstance, confronted with an overwhelming set of odds and willing to step adroitly in and out of a multitude of social and sexual identities in order to prevail against them. To this end, they draw on an extraordinary dynamism (often sexual in inspiration), remarkable will power and tenacity, and the gift of great practical intelligence; these forces of personality are directed towards the attainment of some goal. What makes them especially distinguished is the balance achieved between their irrational energies of love, desire, ambition or other drive, and the purely rational mastery and exploitation of such energies through self-imposed will, postponement of immediate self-gratification and a capacity for imposition of their will on others

> via manipulation. In terms of dramaturgy, this 'one versus many' situation provides the basic structure of a typical Tirsian comedy.[33] (111)

Consequently, while opinions have changed over time, it seems that the merit in Tirso's characterization begins with his apparent departure from the use of fixed types, and focuses on development particularly of the thought processes that influence the decisions his characters make in their given circumstances.

Morality and Religion

A third area that critics have explored is the extent to which Tirso's works can be read as moral or religious literature. When considering the Spanish Golden Age, an understanding of the trends and changes taking place during the early sixteenth-century provides important insight into circumstances that most probably influenced the writers. Henry Kamen, in his discussion of Spain's reaction to the Renaissance, points out the following:

> Spaniards of that generation were excited at the new horizons opened up by Renaissance scholarship. Scholars who went to Italy, such as Antonio de Nebrija, who returned from there to take up a chair at Salamanca in 1505, were in the vanguard of the drive to promote learning . . . One of the key tasks that Cisneros set the professors of the university [of Alcalá] was the production of a critical edition of the Bible which would remain a classic of contemporary scholarship. The great Polyglot Bible that resulted from this enterprise consisted of six volumes, with the Hebrew, Chaldean and Greek originals of the Bible printed in columns parallel to the Latin Vulgate. (83)

Despite the initial enthusiasm and resulting scholarly endeavors, Spain did not whole-heartedly embrace Renaissance humanism as did many of the other European countries of the time period:

---

[33] Even though Sullivan indicates that the characters' actions are "often sexual in inspiration," he recognizes some instances where the protagonists are placed in a position where the will is subject to another force (111-12).

> The triumphs of Spanish humanism were, inevitably, exaggerated by contemporaries. No more than a fraction of the elite . . . were active patrons of the arts, and only a small number of clergy were devoted to classical studies . . . The learned aspects of humanism always took a second place to scholastic theology. (Kamen 85)

Consequently, as the rise and spread of Lutheranism with its connections to the study of the original languages of Scripture began in Spain, the Catholic Church, inseparably linked to the Crown, fought back against the perceived Protestant heresies by means of suppression, primarily through the Inquisition, which became very active under Carlos V and continued to be strengthened by his successor, Felipe II (Kamen 91-102).

In addition to the active role of the Holy Office, the Counter Reformation also responded intellectually to the perceived threats of Lutheranism. The Council of Trent (1545-1563) undertook the task of officially recording and affirming official Catholic doctrine, largely basing its decrees on the prevailing systematic theology of St. Thomas Aquinas. These doctrinal debates set an important foundation on which the Spanish Golden Age dramatists worked. The writers of the day frequently employed religious themes in their literary works. Furthermore, all three of the major dramatists of the time period at some point in their career took up Holy Orders. Thus, it is not surprising that didacticism alongside popular entertainment would become important traits of Spanish drama.

Critical opinion about the moral and religious nature of Tirso's works varies. At the outset, most critics would not ignore the influence of religion on his drama.[34] Like his contemporaries, Tirso wrote several plays that were basically re-workings of

[34] See *Catholic Theatre and Drama*, edited by Kevin J. Wetmore Jr. for further details on the history of drama in the Catholic Church and an analysis of major themes and works. In essence, the essays show that while Church Fathers initially condemned the theatre as an expression of paganity, they later adopted the practice of writing and producing plays and "christianized it" for the purpose of evangelization and edification.

familiar biblical stories. Additionally, he wrote works based on the lives of the saints, or hagiographic dramas, and several *autos sacramentales*. These plays are undeniably religious in essence. In conjunction with his sources for the plots of his plays, religious imagery also permeates Tirso's drama, as Ann Nickerson Hughes has aptly demonstrated. Her study elucidates three types of images, "verbal, allegorical, and scenic" (x), that the dramatist employs in order "to establish the religious intent" (145).

Furthermore, Sullivan contextualizes Tirso against the backdrop of the Counter Reformation and the intellectual currents of the day "to illustrate how the classical Spanish theater played a central role in the nation's cultural and intellectual life" and to show "that the catastrophe of religious division in the Renaissance created a spiritual need throughout Europe that was supplied by the drama" (7). Sullivan's study begins with a summary of the major issues of the day, particularly those addressed during the Council of Trent. He then contrasts these issues with the general trend in European society away from a theocentric world-view to an anthropocentric one, and the conflicting beliefs spawned thereby. Consequently, Sullivan notes the following:

> A resultant state of paradoxical doubt, of paralyzed confusion is a recurrent motif of Spanish literature in the Counter Reformation, and it gave great stimulus to a theater which frequently probed deeply in its formulation of problematic situations, but usually reached timid, "safe" and reconciliatory conclusions. Such a spirit stands in direct contrast to the contemporary Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, where the implications of a tragic situation were freely pushed to their logical, catastrophic limits. The Spanish *comedia* could consequently serve a double function in its society: a) homeopathically to purge a doubt-filled collective conscience of its feelings of confusion, and b) to leave the spectator restored in himself at play's end by concluding on a note of reaffirmation. Thus the *comedia* operated as a very effective safety-valve for all sectors of society and its success was correspondingly great. (14)

It is important to note that Sullivan does not claim that the primary purposes of the dramatists of the day, and in particular, Tirso, was to uphold orthodoxy and instruct

the audience. He clearly cautions against viewing the dramatists "as the 'conformists' in an 'Age of Faith' that they are so often represented to be" (17). Rather, Sullivan emphasizes that the writers ably "captured the essence of human questioning and tragic conflict with extraordinary skill. Their curiosity often led them to the creation of ingenious hypothetical situations, where the irreconcilable forces predicated in the very notion of Counter Reformation were set on a collision course" (17-18).

Even though Sullivan contextualizes the dramatist in the issues of the time period, he shifts the emphasis to the probing or questioning nature of the works as an outlet for a crisis of faith. Other critics proceed even farther in their doubts of the playwright's moral emphases. For example, Wilson underscores the element of conflict as does Sullivan, but she employs more forceful language against the moral intent. In her discussion of the biblical plays, she states, "they are not works of piety, but records of human conflict occurring at critical moments in the development of a race" (*Spanish Drama* 110). Here Wilson assumes that Tirso's primary purpose was not to provide an example from which his audience could learn something, i.e. a moral lesson, but rather that he chose the material as an opportunity for probing the effect of historical events on individuals. Furthermore, when discussing the early hagiographic dramas, Wilson begins by contextualizing them against the backdrop of "the tradition of simple medieval piety" (*Tirso* 99), but then proceeds to downplay the moral aspect of the plays by emphasizing the recurring role of the supernatural. With regard to the *Santa Juana* trilogy, she declares, "it is undoubtedly this element [supernatural intervention], rather than any deeper spirituality or moral teaching, that provides the *raison d'être* of Tirso's early saint plays" (*Tirso* 99).

Conversely, Bruno M. Damiani does not seek to elevate moral or non-moral emphases in the dramatist's works, but rather compartmentalizes them based on type: those dealing with moral issues and those he labels "amoral" (211). Contrary to Wilson, Damiani does not question the religious intent of the *Santa Juana* trilogy. Rather, he accepts the nature of the genre as didactic based on the socio-historic context of Spain during the Golden Age:

> Unlike Renaissance England and France, Spain retained throughout the Golden Age a distinctly moral and didactic orientation in its literature. This can be seen in significant areas of Spanish drama at the time, which contained abundant religious material and representations of saint lives. (211)

He then goes on to list works such as *Quien no cae, no se levanta* and *La mujer que manda en casa*, in addition to the previously mentioned trilogy, as works that follow the mold of the medieval tradition (211-12).

An alternate position, which Jonathan Thacker adopts, claims reader preference in determining whether or not a work is moral in nature. In his treatment of *La venganza de Tamar*, he states,

> for those who wanted to see it, Tirso depicted, in his re-working of a well-known Biblical story, the chaos of a world not governed by virtuous principles or edified by morally exemplary behaviour. Violence and vice breed further violence and vice. [35] (70)

While Thacker's assessment underscores the importance of subjectivity, an especially common aspect of contemporary literary criticism, much of the problem in this debate originates from an attempt to discern the motivation of the author. It is true that documentation may produce contradicting statements made by an author, causing critics to doubt the author's assumed moral purpose. However, the debate often degenerates

[35] John Lyon is one of the critics who holds this view. See the introduction to his edition of the play for further details.

into speculation based on each critic's personal bias on the matter, rather than following an objective process. With regard to Tirso, it is possible that he wrote based on the accepted rhetoric of his time and that in reality he had no religious or moral purpose in mind. However, the opposite is equally possible, and perhaps probable given the historic context of his works.

Didacticism and the Comedia

A final critical trend in Tirsian studies explores the didactic nature of his works based on the dramatic form he developed. Darst provides further perspective on this aspect of Tirso's works by exploring the philosophic base of his *comedia* as comic art. Darst observes that imitation of nature is a key aspect of artistic creation because the act of human creation mirrors the creative power of God. It is a process directed by divine inspiration ("Comic Art" 14). Hence, the verisimilitude of the works becomes of utmost importance ("Comic Art" 15).[36] As a natural consequence of this creative process, the represented work then takes on an additional didactic element. Darst summarizes it as follows:

> In the case of drama, then, the spectators will be presented a believable work of art which they transform, through projection, visual anticipation, ideated sensations, or attitudinal references, into nature. Outside the theater, they will invariably tend to apply what they have experienced to their daily lives, interpreting nature—the objective world—in terms of art—the theater . . . Consequently, the art form 'drama' makes the real world more variant; it opens

[36] Verisimilitude here does not mean realistic in the sense that it is a faithful copy of life, but rather that it bears similarity to the processes of the natural world and, thus, portray events as they could happen given the right circumstances. "The artistic events that transpire on stage are not solely re-presentations, but, through verisimilitude, become events as 'real' as those that occur in nature. The dramatists articulated their dramatic art forms in such a way that they virtually eliminated the time and space barriers separating the audience from the actors on stage" (Darst, *Comic Art* 19).

> the eyes of the spectator to the outside world by offering to him wider possibilities of characters, actions, and events in nature that have never before been seen so objectively. And this illumination of nature by art is not limited solely to the sphere of customs and uses. It refers to the whole gamut of objective realities, from the very 'nature' of man to 'nature' as the living universe around us. ("Comic Art" 29)

Thus the *comedia* as a genre is didactic in essence. Through it authors seek to impress the audience by recreating of nature as a way to entertain, provoke thought, and shape collective beliefs about nature. In the case of Tirso, it is reasonable to assume that moral emphasis is indeed an important motivation for the dramatist, based not only on the frequent religious images and sources he employs but also on his sense of dramatic art.

In conclusion, although facts concerning much of Tirso de Molina's life remain uncertain, critics over the last forty years have made great progress in uncovering the necessary data to create a basic biography of the author's life. Given that critics consider Tirso one of the three greatest dramatists of the Spanish Golden Age, much scholarly attention has been dedicated to the task of uncovering the ambiguities of the playwright's life, describing his unique characteristics as a writer, exploring the extent of the moral nature of his works, and elucidating the didactic nature of the dramatic form he cultivated. Consequently, the remainder of this study on angels and demons will focus on three primary areas of analysis: 1) a descriptive component in which the study will compare the representation of angels and demons to the teachings of theologians such as St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine, along with the supporting biblical passages; 2) an analytical component in which the study will explore the effect that the presence and actions of angels and demons have on the development of the characters in the plays; and 3) a receptive component in which the study will explore

the didactic nature of the works and how the presence of these supernatural beings might have affected the audience in the *corrales*.[37]

[37] While the areas of Tirsian criticism explored in this chapter certainly no longer dominate current research priorities, they nonetheless provide a useful framework for this study on angels and demons for several reasons. First, searches in the *WorldCat* and *MLA International Bibliography* databases reveal that, with the exception of the *Instituto de estudios tirsianos*, the dramatist has received very little critical attention since the 1980s. Consequently, many scholars who are new to Tirsian studies may be unaware of the major trends and issues in the field. Second, given the fact that no significant publications exist on the topic of angels and demons in Tirso's works, this study could provide additional insight to more traditional theories about the dramatist's works. Finally, since the subgenres of all ten plays are religious in nature (an *auto*, a theological drama, hagiographic plays, and a biblical play), this more traditional approach can be helpful in elucidating theological ideas and concepts that contemporary theories may disregard.

Chapter 2: Angels and Demons in 17th Century Spain

The Prominence of Angels in the Golden Age

In the introduction to his book *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (1998), David Keck states,

> It is by no means clear how angels came to be linked to nearly every aspect of medieval life. Despite the recent resurgence of popular interest in angels, scholars of the Middle Ages have devoted little attention to the spirits of heaven. Angels are not central to Christianity, as is Christ or the church, and historians and theologians of the twentieth century have been preoccupied with other issues. [38] (3-4)

The preceding quotation reveals an important starting point for this current study of angels: a significant disparity exists between the prevalence of angels in Christian societies and the scholarly attention theologians have devoted to these supernatural beings.

Christians, whether in Tirso de Molina's day or in the twenty-first century, would hardly deny the prominence of angelic existence and action. For the seventeenth century, one need only consider the artistic expression of the day, whether in print or through the visual arts, to encounter numerous examples of angels. Evidence of this tradition abounds throughout the Middle Ages and into the Golden Age. For example, Gonzalo de Berceo's *Milagros de nuestra Señora* (ca. 1250) contains references not only to the archangel Gabriel and his role in announcing the birth of the Christ to the

[38] For purposes of consistency and clarity, all references to God as the Supreme Being will be capitalized in order to reflect the Christian understanding of the term as relates to deity. Quotations will be appropriately modified to reflect this usage and perspective.

Virgin[39] but also to the importance of angels and demons in the ongoing struggle for human souls.[40] The "Enxienplo del ladrón que fizo carta al diablo de su ánima" (371-80), from the *Libro de buen amor* (ca. 1330), is essentially a reworking of the Faustian tale of a man selling his soul to the Devil for temporary earthly gain.[41] In *La Celestina*, references to angels range from the procuress's invocations to the powers of darkness to multiple characters' general pleas for angelic protection and assistance.[42]

In addition to literary references, angels also form an important part of the visual arts of the day. It is hardly possible to visit any cathedral, church, monastery, convent, or palace and escape the plethora of artwork depicting angelic presence and action in

---

[39] In "La casulla de San Ildefonso," Berceo writes, "Quando Gabrïel vino con la messagería, / quando sabrosamientre disso 'Ave María', / e díssoli por nuevas que parrié Messía / estando tan entrega como era al día" (79).

[40] In "El sacristán fornicario" he states, "El enemigo malo, de Belzebud vicario, / que siempre fue e éslo de los buenos contrario, / tanto pudió bullir el sotil aversario / que corrompió al monge, fizolo fornicario" (84). Later in the same work Berceo proclaims, "Mientre que los dïablos la trayén com a pella, / vidiéronla los ángeles, descendieron a ella, / ficieron los dïablos luego muy grand querella, / que suya era quita, que se partiessen d'ella" (85).

[41] Even though the definitions of specific terminology will appear in a later section of this chapter, it is necessary at this point to clarify the use of terminology relating to the fallen angels. Theologians and scholars alike often use terms such as "devil," "devils," and "demons" inconsistently. In an attempt to clarify the use of the terms, this study will use the term "Devil" to refer to Satan, the highest angel that fell. Capitalization in this case does not imply that he is equal to God, but rather that the term always refers to a specific being. The term "demons" will be used to denote those angels that followed the Devil's rebellion in the beginning. When the terms appear within quotations, they will be left in their original wording. However, capitalization will be altered to indicate whether the word "devil" refers to the Devil or a demon.

[42] The following are several examples from the work: when Sempronio goes to Celestina's house, she states, "Conjúrote, triste Plutón, señor de la profundidad infernal, emperador de la corte dañada, capitán sobervio de los condenados ángeles, señor de los súlfuros fuegos que los hervientes étnicos montes manan, gobernador y veedor de los tormentos y atormentadores de las pecadoras ánimas" (Rojas 147); later, speaking of Areúsa, she exclaims: "¡Bendígate Dios y el Sant Miguel Ángel, y qué gorda y fresca que estás; qué pechos y qué gentileza!" (202); and when Soria takes her leave from Areúsa and Elicia, she exclaims, "Y queden los ángeles contigo" (312).

scenes from key biblical stories, the lives of the saints, and, of course, the Final Judgment.[43] Perhaps the best evidence of this phenomenon exists in historic sites such as *El Escorial* and the city of Toledo.[44] Within the former, one can find representations of these spiritual beings in the basilica's high altar (Tomlinson 20-21), in El Greco's and Romulo Cincinato's depictions of *The Martyrdom of St. Maurice and the Theban Legion* (Tomlinson 36-37), and in Pellegrino Tibaldi's *St. Michael* (Tomlinson 39).[45] Examples from the latter include El Greco's *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* (Tomlinson 50-51) and his *St. Joseph and the Christ Child* (Tomlinson 51-53).[46]

This small sampling of examples illustrates not only the numerous images of angels but also a broad spectrum of the functions ascribed to these beings, from simple

---

[43] This phenomenon was not unique to Spain, but true for the Christian West in general. For more information on angels in art, see Rosa Giorgi's *Angels and Demons in Art*. Her book provides examples of painters from multiple countries and time periods. She divides the works thematically, including such divisions as 1) "Creation and the Geography of the Next World" (11), 2) "The Path of Evil" (67), 3) "The Path of Salvation" (121), 4) "The Last Days: Judgment and Reality" (167), 5) "The Infernal Cohorts" (231), and 6) "The Angelic Cohorts" (279).

[44] For a concise overview of artwork during the time period, see Janis Tomlinson's book *From El Greco to Goya: Painting in Spain 1561-1828.* In her study, Tomlinson includes one chapter devoted to the reign of Felipe II and one chapter to the works of *El Greco* in Toledo. Critics and historians often consider *El Escorial*, the royal compound constructed during the reign of Felipe II, to be an architectural symbol of the Counter Reformation in Spain. Additionally, Toledo, the administrative center of the peninsula during much of the Reconquest, provides ample evidence of the three dominant religious cultures in the peninsula's history (Islamic, Jewish, and Christian) in its churches, convents, synagogues, and mosques.

[45] In the high altar of *El Escorial*'s basilica, the angels surround both the representations of the crucified Christ and the exalted Virgin. In El Greco's and Cincinato's respective versions, the angels form part of the heavenly host observing the martyrdom of St. Maurice and awaiting his reception into heaven. In Tibaldi's painting, the scene portrays the powerful victory of an archangel over evil spiritual beings.

[46] The *Burial of the Count of Orgaz* is located in the Church of Santo Tomé in Toledo. This work portrays a dual scene of the earthly interment of the count and the celestial host of saints and angels waiting to receive him. *St. Joseph and the Christ Child* can be found in the chapel of San José in Toledo.

reproductions of biblical accounts to spectacular stories of supernatural involvement in human lives. The frequent representation of angels in the different artistic expressions of the day is unsurprising, given the essential role of the Church in the country's early development during the Reconquest and, later, during the Counter Reformation. The Spanish people were constantly surrounded by Christianity—its images, its liturgy, and its vocabulary. While, as Keck has stated, the reasons for this widespread belief in angels remains a mystery, a review of angelology's development in Christian theology is vital in order to understand not only the prevailing doctrines but also the framework through which Tirso viewed these beings.

Christian Angelology in the Medieval Period

Rangar Cline's book *Ancient Angels: Conceptualizing Angeloi in the Roman Empire*[47] provides a foundational study not only of angels in the latter part of the Roman Empire but also of the development of Christian thought on the topic. Cline begins by establishing that just as angels comprise an important field of study within Jewish and Christian theologies (xv-xvi), they also form an important topic of discussion among the pagan philosophers of the latter Roman period:

> Literary evidence indicates that there was considerable discussion among Roman-era philosophers concerning the nature of *angeli* (Greek: *angeloi*) and

[47] Cline states that the purpose of his book is two-fold: "The present book examines the conceptualization and veneration of *angeloi* in various non-Christian and non-Jewish contexts from ca. 150 to ca. 450 CE and the reaction of Christian authorities to various conceptions of *angeloi* and different forms of *angelos* veneration and invocation" (xvii). He accomplishes these goals by presenting "the literary and archaeological evidence . . . [for] *angeli* (*angeloi*) . . . in the Roman Empire" (2).

> their relationship to a supreme god in the second century CE and afterwards.[48] (2)

He continues by discussing the way in which the terminology's implications have evolved. According to Cline, the Greek word used for angel originally carried a much broader definition than what is typically assumed:

> Quite simply, *angelos* means messenger. In origin, the term does not necessarily denote a celestial being. For instance, Homer (ca. 700 BCE) uses *angelos* to describe the (human) messengers sent to Achilles, as well as the Greek heroes Patroclus and Tydeus when they act as messengers. Likewise, in the New Testament and Septuagint, the term *angelos* can refer to human messengers. For instance, the Gospel of Luke uses *angelos* to refer to the messengers of John the Baptist and the men that Jesus sent ahead of [H]im to a Samaritan village. Similarly, the Septuagint Genesis uses *angelos* to refer to the messengers that Jacob sent to his brother Esau. (3)

However, Cline shows the gradual evolution of the term over time: "By the second century CE, non-Christian Greek authors began using the word *angelos* in a more specifically celestial sense, and in later Roman texts and inscriptions, the word could denote a special class of celestial beings" (3-4). The result of this semantic shift necessitated further refining of the Christian vocabulary with regard to angels in order to "distinguish between the pagan and Christian meanings of the word" (4). Cline then identifies two key early Church Fathers who contributed significantly to the development of the now orthodox doctrines of angels: Origen and St. Augustine (4).

---

[48] At the outset of the study, Cline clarifies his use of terminology as follows: "Throughout the following study, I use the transliterated forms of the Greek word *angelos* (plural: *angeloi*) and its Latin equivalent, *angelus* (plural: *angeli*) when discussing ancient texts and inscriptions. I have chosen to use the Greek and Latin forms, rather than the standard English translation, 'angel,' in order to better illustrate the fluidity of meaning in the ancient terms. By maintaining the period-specific indigenous terminology I thus hope to avoid the imposition of an anachronistic terminological category. This approach is intended to more accurately reflect the religious views of the later Roman period rather than force such views to conform to religious and scholarly terminological categories of a later age, which would, by necessity, come laden with their own connotations and prejudices" (xv).

Origen's (185-ca. 254) contribution to the doctrine's development centers on a debate with Celsus (ca. 240) regarding the legitimacy of the Christian religion. According to Cline, one of Celsus's main objections concerned "the meaning of the terms *angelos* and *daimon*" within the whole of Christian doctrine (4). For Celsus, ancient philosophy's concept of being opposes key Christian tenets, a fact that reveals the religion's flawed base:

> One of the problems that Celsus found with Christianity was the belief that a god, or even a son of a god, could come to earth, as this violated certain philosophical beliefs about the separation of the divine and material worlds. Thus, Celsus suggested that when Christians describe a god coming to earth, they refer to an *angelos*; he suggested further that the particular type of *angelos* they refer to was probably a *daimon*. (5)

Celsus's objections demonstrate the ambiguity created by the broad semantic range of the terminology. Consequently, Origen's response, according to Cline, included two main points of clarification and specification. With regard to Celsus's charge of illegitimacy on philosophic grounds, Origen countered by

> [r]estrict[ing] the meaning of terms such as *angelos* and *daimon*. According to Platonists, *daimones* could be evil or good, just like men. However, Origen argued, based on biblical references, that *daimones* are exclusively evil, while *angeloi* are good, stating that Christians have learned that the gods of the Gentiles are *daimones* in search of sacrifices and blood, while the "divine and holy *angeloi* of God are of a nature and character other than that of the daemons on earth." (Origen's *Contra Celsum* qtd. in Cline 6)

Furthermore, Origen's discussion about the possibility of God coming to earth includes both an explanation of some additional biblical terminology and an appropriate application to human thought and action:

> Origen infers that Celsus equated God and *angeloi*, and he took the opportunity to further clarify his Christian understanding of both. He argued that although *angeloi* are sometimes called gods (*theoi*), this is because of their divine nature and not because Christians ought to pay them reverence or worship them. Origen adds that Christians should not worship *angeloi* but follow the example of such creatures' devotion to God. He also states that Christians should not pray

> to *angeloi*, but send all of their prayers through the "high priest of the *angeloi*," the divine Logos. (Origin's *Contra Celsum* qtd. in Cline 7)

Thus, Origen pioneered the development of Christian angelology by beginning the process of defining with greater precision what would later become accepted, standard theological terminology.

The second theologian to further the doctrine's development is St. Augustine (354-430). According to Cline, while both Church Fathers focus on uniquely Christian definitions of words, St. Augustine's contribution largely relates to his use of sacred Scripture as supporting authority for his arguments (8).[49] For example, when discussing the overlap in the ancient philosophers' uses of the Latin words *angelus* and *daemon*, Cline shows that Augustine maintains a tight distinction between the terms based on the way in which Scripture presents them. For him, then, demons always carry a negative connotation. He adds further proof for his point by indicating that "in popular usage the meaning of the word had changed, such that people would be confused if he were to speak positively of *daemones*" (9).

One interesting aspect of St. Augustine's work that Cline explores is the fact that the theologian "does not wholly discredit the Platonic system of *angeli* and *daemones* but claims that the philosophers have either mislabeled or misunderstood the functions of these beings" (10). In part, this confusion is due to the ambiguity of the philosophers' uses of the terminology, an important problem the Christian Fathers sought to rectify.

---

[49] Cline uses St. Augustine's *City of God* to demonstrate the theologian's beliefs (8). This work contains twenty-two books in which the saint uses the analogy of a city to describe Christianity and the attacks it receives at the hands of the pagans and their gods. A large portion of the work describes angels and demons, their nature in relation to God and human beings, their abilities, their actions, and their end. For the purposes of this study, Cline's analysis sufficiently summarizes St. Augustine's contribution to the overall development of angelology.

Consequently, St. Augustine adds further support to Origen's conclusions that angels are not worthy of human worship, because, for the former, the biblical evidence places angels and demons within the hierarchy of created beings that God has established (Cline 11).[50]

In sum, Cline's analysis underscores several foundational points for this current study of angels: 1) widespread interest in supernatural beings extends far beyond the Christian era; 2) beliefs about angels have evolved over time; 3) Christianity has availed itself of existing terminology in order to communicate and distinguish its creed regarding angels, their being, and their functions; and 4) Scripture provides the authoritative basis for the early Church Fathers' conclusions regarding angels and their functions.

Approaching a Scholastic Theology of Angels

While Cline limits his discussion to the important groundwork laid by Origen and St. Augustine, David Keck's book focuses on the broader development of angelology in the Middle Ages, culminating with the writings of the scholastic theologians.[51] According to Keck, the thirteenth century is a benchmark for the doctrines because by that time

[50] According to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) further affirmed the doctrine that angels are created beings (Pope "Angels").

[51] The purpose of this section is to give an overview of the doctrine's development rather than give an exhaustive treatment of angelology and all of its debates. Sources for this section primarily reference Cline and Keck's books, since together they provide a good panorama of the history of angelology. Keck traces the history of the doctrines through the Middle Ages through a primarily Christian framework. While he does include some discussion of angels in other religions (such as Judaism and Islam), his treatment considers only "the extent that they influenced Christian angelology" (3).

> angelology had become a required, formal part of the theological curriculum at the University of Paris, and [St.] Bonaventure, [St. Thomas] Aquinas, and their fellow scholastics were required to develop complex angelological systems.[52] (3)

This sophisticated systemization of doctrines created by the scholastics established a methodological framework which continued to dominate theology until Tirso's time.

Keck begins his study by establishing the basis for any Christian doctrine: "For medieval Christians, Scripture was the primary source for understanding their own world" (11). Consequently, he approaches his analysis of the scriptural evidence through the overall "narrative of human sin and divine salvific activity, and the roles of the angels in these" (13) with special attention to St. Bonaventure (1221-1274), the theologian whose contribution Keck deems the "best single source for organizing the reconstruction and synthesis of how Christians throughout the medieval period would have understood the length of angelology" (14).[53] He then divides his study chronologically through Scripture as follows:

Thus his primary concern is to trace the overall development of Christian doctrines of angels. Cline, on the other hand, opts for an "interdisciplinary approach to *angeloi* veneration as a religious practice common to several religious traditions in late antiquity" (xvi); his primary focus explores the singular aspect of angel worship and the way in which the Catholic Church responded to the pagan practices in developing its own doctrines.

[52] Keck attributes the progress in the doctrine's development to the incorporation of Aristotelian logic: "Most importantly, at this time Aristotle first became widely known to Western Christendom, and his teachings on 'intelligences' and 'separated substances' transformed the Christian understanding of angels by providing a coherent set of metaphysical concepts congenial to angelic speculation. As [St. Thomas] Aquinas and [St.] Bonaventure asked whether angels were composed of pure form or of form and matter, they were probing the very fabric of reality" (6). This new application of philosophical language to theology leads Keck to state emphatically that "[n]o century before the thirteenth produced an angelology as rich and thorough as those of the scholastics" (7).

[53] Keck cites two reasons for his focus on St. Bonaventure: "First, his era witnessed a blossoming of devotional habits and opportunities for the laity, and as a member of an order of preachers, he was particularly responsible for preaching on angels on a regular

> [T]he creation, confirmation, and fall of the angels; the time before the presentation of the Law to Moses; the era of the Law from Moses to Christ; the Incarnation; the era of the church (from the Resurrection of the Christ till the end of time); and the Last Judgment and the end of all things. (15)

Keck's discussion of the biblical evidence for the creation and fall of the angels seems to focus on the problems caused by what the Scriptures do not say.[54] The lack of revelation regarding creation of angels provoked many debates not only within the Church but also with non-Christian groups.[55] Even though theologians such as St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas offered several possible explanations, they had to rely more on logical assumptions based on explicit statements from the Bible about God and His unique attributes in order to come to their conclusions about the angels. Thus, from these extrapolations theologians were able to establish the following points: 1) the angels are created beings (Keck 18-20);[56] 2) both angels and demons are capable of

---

basis to a wide range of audiences. Second . . . as exegetes the Franciscans were particularly trained in the study of the literal, historical reading of the entire Bible. Whereas the exegetes of previous centuries and indeed other religious habits would have been relatively more interested in exploring the allegorical dimensions of the angels of Scripture, [St.] Bonaventure and his colleagues were keenly focused on the literal presence of the angels in biblical narratives" (14).

[54] Keck states, "As [St.] Augustine was well aware, Genesis does not provide certain details concerning the creation that would have facilitated Christian angelology. In particular, Genesis seems to remain silent on the question of the divine creation of the angels" (17).

[55] Keck identifies three primary groups: "philosophers, Gnostic and Cathar dualists, and even pagan magicians" (17).

[56] Keck offers several examples of these theologians' explanations of what the book of Genesis includes and excludes. St. Bonaventure seems to believe that since the overall narrative of the Bible is the story of redemption, it is not necessary to speak of angels' creation "since fallen angels cannot be redeemed." Rather, "Scripture points to their creation 'symbolically'" (19). For St. Thomas Aquinas, Keck cites two primary points: 1) "[St. Thomas] Aquinas also follows the bishop of Hippo in offering Psalm 148:2-5 as proof of God's creation of the heavenly spirits" (19-20), and 2) the fact that Moses was an early corporeal being made it impossible for him to understand higher beings: "For [St. Thomas] Aquinas, the angels revealed their mysteries as the human race became more capable of understanding them" (20).

creating, but only within the limits of their nature (20-22);[57] 3) angels have not always existed (23);[58] 4) God did not originally create any angel in a state of sin (24);[59] 5) both the fall of the demons, brought about by the sin of pride, and the confirmation of the good angels in grace took place shortly after their creation (25-26);[60] and 6) that the fall

[57] Keck identifies Genesis 1:26-27 as a key passage of dissent in this debate: "[St.] Augustine had read the *us* [in these verses] . . . in terms of the Persons of the Trinity" (20). Other philosophers "had seen the *us* in terms of God's assistants, the angels" (20). Additionally, "[St.] Bonaventure . . . rejected the 'modern philosophers' who used Genesis 1:26-27 to defend the erroneous proposition that angels were involved in the creation" (21). With regard to the ability of angels to create, Keck cites Lombard, St. Augustine, and St. Bonaventure (21). He furthermore emphasizes the distinction between God and the angels as follows: "The Fourth Lateran Council addressed the problem of the Cathars and responded by strengthening Nicea's declaration of God as the sole creator" (22).

[58] "As created beings, the angels are not eternal. However, as spirits who are not subject to the vicissitudes of time and temporality as corporeal creatures are, they are not really temporal . . . The term adopted by thirteenth-century theologians to describe the duration of angels was aeviternity. While they disagreed on what exactly this concept meant, theologians agreed that it was a way of describing the angelic mode of existence to make it distinct from God and His eternity and the material creation and its temporality" (Keck 23).

[59] "Genesis 1:4 states, 'God separated the light from the darkness.' 2 Peter 2:4 reveals that 'God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of nether gloom to be kept until the Judgment.' The early Fathers were uncertain as to exactly when the angelic sin took place and what its precise nature was. Two things were clear, however: that God did create the demons and that He did not create them evil. God created all things visible and invisible, and He created all things good. As [St.] Bonaventure notes, to assert that God created the fallen angels evil would be heretical" (Keck 24).

[60] "As [St.] Bonaventure presents the sequence of the angels' fall, a very, very small space of time (a *morula*) after their creation, some of the angels fell away from God . . . The Seraphic Doctor in Augustinian fashion affirms that pride (*superbia*) was the original sin of Satan and his followers. They desired to be equal to God. They fell into the middle air between heaven and earth, and from there, they descended to Hell to torture the souls of the damned. Those angels who did not fall, instead turned toward God and were forever confirmed in their glory by the grace of God . . . Both types of angel had sufficient knowledge of their alternatives at the moment of their decision (thus, their freedom, knowledge, and responsibility are inseparable and sufficient), but through their own will and pride, the demons fell" (Keck 24).

of the demons opened the opportunity for human beings to become saints and thus fill the place in Heaven originally occupied by those angels (26-27).[61]

While Scripture, in a sense, has complicated the job of defining aspects of angelic nature related to their creation and fall, Keck shows that it provides a higher degree of clarity on the functions of angels in the remaining five periods of the biblical narrative.[62] Keck shows that, prior to the giving of the law, the angels' initial task related directly to their title: they "began serving as messengers of God to humanity (both the Hebrew *mal'akh* and the Greek *aggelos* mean literally 'messenger')" (28). This task implies a two-fold function: the angels are both "God's ministers" (29) and intermediary agents delivering God's words to people. While it is true that they perform an important function in the developing narrative of Scripture, the angels remain subordinate to the overall theme of God and His working in the lives of human beings. This important qualification underscores for Keck that the stories of angelic interaction with the patriarchs show that "God continues to love His creatures even after the Fall and even after the recurring sins of the chosen people" (29).[63]

---

[61] Keck cites two passages that the theologians used in support of this belief: Matthew 22:30 (26) and Luke 15:10 (27).

[62] First, this statement does not imply that no disagreements exist between theologians. By nature, theology has always included a level of debate based on interpretations of biblical texts. The main distinction between Keck's treatment of the angels' creation and fall and his other categories of analysis is that, for the former, the Church Fathers had to rely on statements from Scripture about God in order to arrive at conclusions about angels, and for the latter, theologians were able to avail themselves of verses relating specifically to angels. Second, the focus in this section of Keck's study switches to function as relates to angelic interaction with human beings as opposed to a defining the nature of the angels in scholastic terminology.

[63] Keck discusses several related secondary topics in this section as well. The first relates to medieval art. He elucidates the fact that many of the artistic representations from the time period reflect common Bible stories in which angels deliver messages. Naturally, these representations raise the question of how the angels appeared. Keck

By the time the Mosaic law enters the biblical narrative, the ministry of angels expands to include three more functions. First, God chose to use the angels to communicate the law to Israel (36-37);[64] second, the angels and human beings are co-worshippers of God (37);[65] and third, the angels serve as guardians over individuals and specific nations (37-39).[66]

The New Testament provides further specification for angelology in the gospels' accounts of the Messiah's coming to earth to redeem His people. The Incarnation changes the relationship between angels and human beings. Keck states,

> The Christian understanding of angels has always been subordinate to the understanding of the person, work and deeds of Jesus Christ . . . Several books of Scripture stress the superiority of Christ to the angels. Hebrews 1:4-2:18, in particular, is a lengthy discussion defining the subordination of the angels to the

---

cites several passages of Scripture to show that while angels are incorporeal, spirit beings, they oftentimes appear in human bodies (29-33). The second topic deals with the "Angel of the Lord" (35). This particular topic has produced significant debate within the Church. Keck indicates that the general consensus of the Church Fathers is that the term refers to pre-incarnate appearances of Christ (35-36). For a brief overview of the history of the term's use in Scripture, see Pope's article on angels from *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. For a more thorough study on the topic, see Charles A. Gieschen's book *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*.

[64] "Acts 7:30 and 38 identify the flame of the burning bush of Mt. Sinai as an angel. And in verse 53, medieval clerics would have read that angels presented the Law to Moses and Israel. Further, they discovered that in addition to a similar message in Hebrews 2:2, Galatians 3:19 states the Law was 'ordained by angels.'" (Keck 36).

[65] Keck cites Psalm 137:1 and Isaiah 6:1-3 as support for this function. Additionally, he emphasizes how this doctrine has influenced liturgy: "[t]exts from both testaments further elaborated the roles of angels for Christian worship. As Isaiah 6 provided the basis for the *Sanctus*, so did Luke 2:14 give to Christendom the *Gloria in Excelsis*" (37).

[66] "As Psalm 91:11 indicated, in addition to their ongoing work as messengers and concelebrators, the celestial spirits were given the responsibility of serving as Guardian Angels to individual men and women" (Keck 37-38). Keck also cites the book of Daniel as proof that the archangel Michael was responsible for protecting Israel (38). As support for the claim that angels also guarded other nations, Keck says, "Pseudo-Dionysius . . . quotes the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy 32:8 (the Hebrew makes no mention of angelic beings) and explains, 'Michael is called the ruler of the Jewish people, and other angels are described as rulers of other nations'" (38).

> Son . . . Hence the prophets, the angels, Moses himself, the Levitical priesthood, and the sacrifices of the Jews are altered by the radical event in the history of salvation. The image of Christ's rulership over the angels in I Peter 3:22 and the Pauline statements about disarming principalities and powers (c.f. Col. 2:15 made in response to some form of angel worship at Colossae) became the normative Christian understanding of the relationship between Christ and the angels.[67] (39-40)

Thus, Keck explains that in the New Testament the intermediary role of the angels is superseded by the superiority of two new mediators: the Christ and the Virgin Mary.[68] Nevertheless, angels continue to fulfill functions as messengers and ministers: they are present "in the Annunciation and Nativity" (40); they "become subordinate to Christ's mother" (40);[69] and "they appear at the Temptation of Christ (ministering to Him in Matt. 4:11), the Mount of Olives (according to certain manuscripts of Luke 22:43, though early manuscripts lack the verse), at the Sepulchre (Luke 24:4-8, for example) and at His Ascension (Acts 1:10-11)" (41).

If the angels take on lesser roles during Christ's earthly ministry, they once again become more active in Scripture after the Ascension. Keck shows two primary aspects of angelic function in this section. First, the book of Acts describes how angels assisted in the establishment and spread of the Church:

> In Acts 5:17-21, angels liberate the apostles from prison. (They perform the same service for Peter in 1 2:6-11 [sic].) In 8:26, an angel of the Lord directs

[67] Much of the story of the Old Testament revolves around the system God set in place through Moses whereby His people could have access to and communication with Him. Whereas the priests became the human mediators, the angels, as previously shown, served as the heavenly mediators. Later, the prophets also assumed the role of messengers to the people as God directed. When Christ died on the cross, the veil in the temple was torn in two, symbolizing that God, through the Redemption, had once again made possible the way for human beings to have direct access to Him (St. Matthew 27:51). See also Hebrews 9.

[68] Keck shows in the above quotation that Christ is, according to the book of Hebrews, the first and primary Mediator. However, he also brings to light the importance of the Virgin Mary in Catholic doctrine and her role in the redemptive narrative (40-41).

[69] Keck cites Luke 1:28, the source of the *Magnificat*, as support.

> Philip to take the road from Jerusalem to Gaza (so that he might ultimately baptize an important Ethiopian eunuch).[70] And in Acts 12:23, an angel, still administering divine justice, smites Herod "because he did not give God the glory; and he [Herod] was eaten by worms and died." (43)

Second, Keck highlights how theologians have used Scripture passages about angels to establish ecclesiastical authority over the civil government, citing the dispute between Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany (43-44).[71]

The book of the Apocalypse contains the majority of the biblical evidence for the role of the angels in the end of time. Here Keck reiterates the way in which the biblical text has influenced the visual arts as painters have created images of the Final Judgment, the angels executing justice, and the final defeat of Satan (44-45). Additionally, Keck elucidates the connection between the angels and the eternal destinies of human beings. He cites Luke 16:19-31 to support the belief that "angels clearly transport the souls of the elect to heaven" (44) and Matthew 13:41-42 to show that the angels "are responsible for the punishment of the reprobate" (45). Thus, the scriptural evidence demonstrates that angels not only are present throughout the biblical narrative but also they perform important functions that vary for each section of the Bible according to the divine plan of God for the redemption of His people and the punishment of the lost.

Keck's final area of Scripture analysis deals with the ranking of angels and the way in which theologians through the Middle Ages categorized the terminology to refer to supernatural, celestial beings. He explains that the major hierarchies of angels

---

[70] Keck's use of the phrase "an angel of the Lord" reflects the literal translation from Latin to English of the Douay-Rheims.

[71] Keck writes that Pope Gregory VII used I Corinthians 6:4 as support for his claim to papal authority while King Henry IV quoted Galatians 1:8 as a basis for limiting the papal authority to matters of heresy (43-44).

originate from "Pseudo-Dionysius's *Celestial Hierarchy* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*" (57). He then quotes several other Church Fathers, such as St. Gregory the Great, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and describes their efforts to expand and clarify the divisions. Generally, these theologians divided angels into three categories: the First, Second, and Third hierarchies (57). The organization of these divisions reflects the position that different types of angels hold with relation to the hierarchy of being that leads up to God—the One who created everything and is over all things. Each level is then subdivided into three types of angels based on the titles assigned to them in Scripture. The first group contains the seraphim, cherubim, and thrones. The second consists of the dominions, virtues, and powers. The final includes the principalities, archangels, and angels (57).

The beings of the First hierarchy are the closest to God and execute the most important functions. The seraphim are the highest of all the angelic beings. Keck states, "Medieval exegetes found the six-winged seraphim in Isaiah 6:2-7 (their only appearance in Scripture)" (58). Due to the fact that the Hebrew word used for seraphim means "burning," these beings are connected "with the fiery love of God" (59): "[a]s they cry the *Sanctus* of the Mass, 'Holy, holy, holy,' they burn with the love of God and never leave His presence. The seraphim represent the summit of the creaturely ability to contemplate and love the divine" (59). According to Keck, the cherubim "appear more frequently in Scripture than the seraphim, and although they were important for devotional and theological reflection, they were not nearly as frequently discussed" (60). The emphasis on reflection underscores their intellectual power. Furthermore, these beings are commonly associated in Scripture with "the Ark of the Covenant" (60).

The Ark was a key Old Testament representation of God's presence. It initially remained in the Holy of Holies within the tabernacle and later was transferred to the temple.[72] The cherubim, who sat on both sides of the Ark, maintained close proximity to God and, consequently, they were often considered to have the best opportunity for intellectual contemplation of His nature.[73] Consequently, Keck shows that they "suggest the perfection of creaturely knowledge" (60). The thrones carry the imagery of the seat of divine power. Keck states, "As the final rank of the first hierarchy, the thrones represent the essence of creaturely clinging to the divine goodness. They suggest the permanence of the divine presence, the authority and power of the throne of a king" (61).

Keck summarizes the second angelic division as follows:

> The [S]econd hierarchy suggests 'ordained power'; thus the dominions preside, the virtues operate (by performing miracles, among other things), and the powers repel harmful forces (usually demons). (61)

However, he readily admits the insufficiency of such a simple explanation: the "medieval language itself on this point is vague and slippery" (61), and, consequently, theologians were unable to arrive at a precise description of this hierarchy. Thus, Keck concludes that this poverty of terminology led the majority of medieval theologians to accept a more general description of this hierarchy as a matter of necessity.[74]

According to Keck, the Third hierarchy "is the most active in human affairs, and here the medieval theologians became more explicit about the actual functions of the

---

[72] See Charles Souvay's article in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* for further details.
[73] "The word *cherub* (*cherubim* is the Hebrew masculine plural) is a word borrowed from the Assyrian *kirubu*, from *karâbu*, 'to be near', hence it means near ones, familiars, personal servants, bodyguards, courtiers" (Arendzen "Cherubim").
[74] Keck briefly names St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Gregory and Pseudo-Dionysius as theologians that have struggled to define this hierarchy (61-62).

angels" (62). The principalities relate to the rise and fall of nations. Consequently, Keck connects this subgroup of angels to the larger questions of God's sovereignty and the free will of human beings, especially as relates to ancient philosophy's opinion of these creatures:

> To ancient minds, one of the central roles of Fortune had been to explain the seemingly unpredictable shifts of power and empire from one nation to the next. In discussions on free will, Fortune, fate, and Providence, [St. Thomas] Aquinas ascribes to the principalities this exact role. Similarly, [St.] Bernard ascribes to the principalities this task of raising and diminishing kingdoms. (62)

Since the rise and fall of nations relate directly to God as He works out His plan of redemption, the principalities, then, seem to be charged with influencing the decisions of leaders within the nations, decisions that bring about the removal and establishment of earthly kings.[75] The archangels, as previously mentioned, are responsible for "presid[ing] over multitudes of people" (63). They are "in many respects the most important rank of angels for humanity" (63).[76] The final, and lowest, subgroup of angels is the most common. Keck shows that this group "appears frequently in the Vulgate where *aggelos* served as a translation of the Hebrew *mal'akh*, also meaning 'messenger.'" (64). This division of angels seems to be the largest group and entrusted with the task of delivering messages and ministering most directly to human beings (64). Keck concludes that these angels

---

[75] Apart from some debates regarding the meaning of Daniel 10:13, Keck does not present any Scripture passages illustrating this function. However, several possible examples are easily identifiable. In the account of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt (described in chapters 1-15), Moses indicates that while God promised to harden Pharaoh's heart (Exodus 7:3-5), Pharaoh himself also hardened his heart (Exodus 8:15). Also, King Saul was plagued by an evil spirit (I Samuel 16:23). Both of these examples illustrate how God influenced the decisions of kings in order to propel human events according to divine providence.

[76] Keck identifies three traditional archangels: "Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael" (63).

> are crucial for the church even though they are not particularly distinct. In some sense, they serve as "default angels," the angels that would be presumed to have the various responsibilities mentioned in the Bible, such as the control of winds in Psalms 104:4 [sic], Hebrews 1:7, and Apocalypse 7:1. (64)

In sum, Keck's study provides a valuable analysis of the scriptural basis for angelology. He explores the angels' changing roles throughout the different divisions of the biblical narrative and overviews their essential functions according to the various hierarchies. For this current study, the foundation laid by Keck will be an important resource for analyzing Tirso's representation of angels and their functions within his drama.

A Thomistic Theology of Angels

During the time when Tirso de Molina lived, the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas continued to provide the prevailing doctrinal framework and methodology employed by theologians. While, as Keck has shown, the basis for angelology begins with evidence provided by the biblical accounts, the Scholastics sought to systematize the doctrine and explain the angels' relationship to the order of nature and being:

> The *quaestio* transformed the theological analysis of angels in two important respects. First, the *quaestio* opened up many avenues of theological speculation; it encouraged questioning, probing, analyzing. The basic form led theologians to explore questions about the nature of the angels with greater and greater depth. Second, by virtue of encouraging rational argumentation, the *quaestio* established a new place in the field of angelology for philosophy, logic, and reason. (75)

Whereas the biblical evidence describes primarily what the angels do (their functions), the "Treatise on the Angels," comprising questions fifty through sixty-four of the *Summa*, focuses on what angels are (their being). St. Thomas divides the Treatise

into four sections: 1) their substance, 2) their intellect, 3) their will, and 4) their creation.[77]

In order to understand St. Thomas's "Treatise on the Angels," it is necessary to contextualize it within the overall framework of the *Summa*. Since his approach primarily explores being, the saint naturally begins by laying the foundation of the Supreme Being, God, and then comparing all others to Him. Within the theologian's discussion of angels, many times St. Thomas references previous questions about God in the *Summa* as a way to elucidate truths about the angels. In this way he illustrates the fact that what human beings can know about angels and, for that matter, any part of the creation, is only possible as they relate to their source: the One God. Consequently, some of the key attributes of God that St. Thomas consistently references are His non-corporeal, spirit being (1a.3.1); His perfection, or completeness (1a.4.1); His eternality (1a.10.2); His will as a part of His being and the cause of all things except evil (1a.19.1-12); His love (1a.20.1); and His role as sole Creator of all beings (1a.44.1-4).

The first area St. Thomas explores is the substance of the angels. According to the theologian, in the overall hierarchy of being, angels are non-corporeal, intellectual creatures that rank between God and human beings: "Ad primum ergo dicendum quod substantiæ incorporeæ medium sunt inter Deum et creaturas corporeas. (The incorporeal

[77] All citations from the *Summa* are from the edition published by Blackfriars under the direction of the general editor, Thomas Gilby, O.P. This sixty-one volume set includes the Latin text and an English translation, introductions to each volume, academic articles on theological issues, glossaries of important terms, and notes prepared by various scholars. Due to the layout of the text in Blackfriar's edition, parenthetical citations in the text of this study will indicate the part, question, and article referenced, rather than the page numbers from the books. The "Treatise on the Angels" appears in volume 9 of the set, edited by Kenelm Foster.

substances are midway between God and corporeal things)" (1a.50.1).[78] God, the supreme intellectual Being, brought into existence various types of creatures so that the order and scope of Creation would be complete and better reflect who He is. Therefore, St. Thomas concludes that, logically, angelic beings are necessary in order to produce the desired end God seeks:

> Dicendum quod necesse est ponere aliquas creaturas incorporeas. Id enim quod præcipue in rebus creatis Deus intendit est bonum, quod consistit in assimilatione ad Deum . . . Deus autem creaturam producit per intellectum et voluntatem, ut supra dictum est. Unde ad perfectionem universi requiritur quod sint aliquæ creaturæ intellectuales. (There must be some incorporeal creatures, because what God chiefly intends in creation is to produce a goodness consisting in a likeness to [H]imself . . . But God causes by [H]is intellect and will, as we have seen; whence it follows that the universe would be incomplete without intellectual creatures).[79] (1a.50.1)

In the remaining questions in this section, St. Thomas adds more specifics as to the substance of the angels. He states that they exist in large quantities (1a.50.3),[80] that they are divisible into different species (1a.50.4), and that they are incorruptible (1a.50.5).[81] Their incorruptibility directly relates back to the fact that the angelic substance is incorporeal:

---

[78] Roy J. Deferrari defines substance as follows: "(1) *substance in the general sense of the word*, i.e., that which stands under, basis, foundation, principle, *support*, of the manifold appearances (accidents) . . . (2) *first substance, individual substance, an entity existing of itself and not in another as subject*, (3) *the substance principle*, i.e., the inner or constituting principle of a substance" (1063).

[79] In the previous section of the *Summa*, St. Thomas establishes that goodness springs from being (1a.5.1), that God is the greatest good (1a.5.3), and that goodness is an important part of the final cause and greatest end (1a.5.4). Furthermore, it is an innate attribute of God (1a.6.1-4) and, consequently, in all other creatures is possible only as it relates to divine goodness (1a.6.4).

[80] St. Thomas cites Daniel 7:10 as support for this point (1a.50.3).

[81] The English translation in Foster's edition of the *Summa* uses the term "immortal" instead of incorruptible. However, the Latin text uses the word "incorruptibiles" (1a.50.5). While both terms indicate that angels do not die, the word "incorruptible" emphasizes the fact that the angels are incorporeal beings since only bodies can decay. Deferrari's entry on the Latin word "corruptibilis" crossreferences the term "substantia

> Dicendum quod necesse est dicere angelos secundum suam naturam esse incorruptibiles. Cujus ratio est quia nihil corrumpitur nisi per hoc quod forma ejus a materia separator. Unde cum angelus sit ipsa forma subsistens, ut ex dictis patet, impossibile est quod ejus substantia sit corruptibilis. (We have to affirm the natural immortality of the angels. The reason is that nothing perishes except by a separation of its form from matter, and we have already shown that an angel is simply a pure form subsisting in itself. It is therefore by nature imperishable). (1a.50.5)

Nevertheless, even though angels do not naturally have bodies (1a.51.1), they are able to assume bodies as they minister to human beings (1a.51.2).[82]

Another important characteristic of angels is that they occupy space (1a.52.1). However, St. Thomas clarifies his statement as follows:

> Dicendum quod angelo convenit esse in loco; æquivoce tamen dicitur angelus esse in loco, et corpus. Corpus enim est in loco per hoc quod applicatur loco secundum contactum dimensivæ quantitatis; quæ quidem in angelis non est, sed est in eis quantitas virtualis. Per applicationem igitur virtutis angelicæ ad aliquem locum qualitercumque dicitur angelus esse in loco corporeo. (An angel can be said to exist in place, but not in the same sense as we say this of a body. A body is localized as being related to a particular place by a contiguity that can be measured quantitatively. Now an angel has no measurable quantity; he has however a 'power-quantity', by which I mean that when an angel's power is applied in any way to a given place, he can be said to be locally there—where the body is to which it is applied). (1a.52.1)

---

corruptibilis" (252) which he defines as follows: "substantia corruptibilis seu generabilis and substantia incorruptibilis, *the substance which can come to be* and *pass away by generation* and *corruption because composed* and *the changeless* and *incorruptible substance because not a composite*" (1065). (Deferrari includes 1a.50.5 as one of his examples.) Thus, since angels do not have bodies by nature of their substance, they neither die nor suffer bodily corruption.

[82] St. Thomas writes: "Dicendum quod quidam dixerunt angelos nunquam corpora assumere, sed omnia quæ in Scripturis divinis leguntur de apparitionibus angelorum, contigisse in visione prophetiæ, hoc est, secundum imaginationem. Sed hoc repugnat intentioni Scripturæ. (Some have maintained that angels never assume bodies, and that all the angelic appearances of which we read in the Scriptures were prophetic visions; that is, they took place in the imagination. But this goes against the sense of the Scriptures)" (1a.51.2).

The angel's relation to space also differs from the Supreme Being's relation to space. God is omnipresent by virtue of His nature and power, but the angels, as subordinate creatures, are limited in this respect:

> Dicendum quod angelus est virtutis et essentiæ finitæ. Divina autem virtus et essentia infinita est et est universalis causa omnium; et ideo sua virtute omnia contingit, et non solum in pluribus locis est, sed ubique. Virtus autem angeli, quia finita est, non se extendit ad omnia, sed ad aliquid unum determinatum . . . Unde cum angelus sit in loco per applicationem virtutis suæ ad locum, sequitur quod non sit ubique nec in pluribus locis, sed in uno loco tantum. (We must distinguish between the finite nature and power of an angel and the infinite nature and power of God. God is the universal cause; hence all things happen through [H]is power; hence [H]e is present, not in many places merely, but everywhere. The angel's power, on the other hand, being finite, does not extend to all things but only to a definite limited thing . . . Since then an angel is in place inasmuch as his power is applied to a place, he is never simply everywhere at once, nor in several places, but in one place only at a given moment). (1a.52.2)

The second area St. Thomas explores is that of the angelic intellect. In order to understand the source and medium of angelic knowledge, one must again compare these creatures to other beings. On the one hand, God as the Supreme Being also is the highest intellect. He not only knows all things, but His omniscience flows naturally from Himself. Angels, on the other hand, are not able to understand a thing simply based on their substance, because knowing is an act. Hence, "[d]icendum quod impossibile est quod actio angeli, vel cujuscumque alterius creaturæ, sit ejus substantia. ([n]either in an angel nor in any other created being can substance and activity be identical)" (1a.54.1). Likewise, existence and understanding cannot be synonymous for the angels:

> SED CONTRA, intelligere angeli est motus ejus, ut patet per Dionysium. Sed esse non est motus. Ergo esse angeli non est intelligere ejus. (ON THE OTHER HAND Dionysius says in the *Divine Names* that an angel's understanding is his movement; and existence is not a movement). (1a.54.2)

Such unity between substance, being, act, and understanding is a unique characteristic of deity:

> Esse autem solius Dei est simpliciter infinitum, in se omnia comprehendens, ut dicit Dionysius. Unde solum esse divinum est divinum intelligere, et divinum velle. (Only God's existence is absolutely infinite, as including all things in itself, as Dionysius says in the *Divine Names*. Hence in God alone is existence identical with understanding and willing). (1a.54.2)

With regard to whether or not an angel's understanding and essence are one, St. Thomas states,

> SED CONTRA est quod Dionysius dicit quod angeli *dividuntur in substantiam, virtutem et operationem*. Ergo aliud est in eis substantia, aliud virtus et aliud operatio. (ON THE OTHER HAND, Dionysius distinguishes in the angels *substance, power and activity*). (1a.54.3)

He further distinguishes between angels and human beings with regard to the intellect in his reply to the first objection as follows:

> Ad primum ergo dicendum quod angelus dicitur *intellectus et mens*, quia tota ejus cognitio est intellectualis. Cognitio autem animæ partim est intellectualis, et partim sensitiva. (I. The reason for calling angels 'intellects' or 'minds' is that their knowledge is wholly intellectual: whereas that of the human soul is partly intellectual and partly in the senses).[83] (1a.54.3)

Consequently, the angels' knowledge is less extensive and powerful than God's knowledge but superior to human knowledge by nature of their being.

In addition to the source and medium of the angelic intellect, this section of the Treatise also explores what it is that the angels know. According to St. Thomas, the angels know themselves by virtue of the fact that they have been enlightened by truth

[83] The question St. Thomas explores is the following: "[U]trum potentia intellectiva angeli sit ejus essentia. ([I]s an angel's power to understand one thing with his essence?)" (1a.54.3). The first objection is, "Videtur quod virtus vel potentia intellectiva in angelo non sit aliud quam ejus essentia. Mens enim et intellectus nominant potentiam intellectivam. Sed Dionysius in pluribus locis suorum librorum nominat ipsos angelos *intellectus* et *mentes.* Ergo angelus est sua potentia intellectiva. (It would seem that it is; for mind and intellect denote this power, and these terms are often used by Dionysius to signify angels)" (1a.54.3).

(1a.56.1).[84] They also know other angels due to their likeness to each other. The ability to know other angels is based on the similarity of their creation as like beings (1a.56.2). Additionally, the angels have some knowledge of God (1a.56.3). In the "SED CONTRA" St. Thomas states,

> [A]ngeli sunt potentiores in cognoscendo quam homines. Sed homines per sua naturalia Deum cognoscere possunt, secundum illud Rom., *Quod notum est Dei, manifestum est in illis*. Ergo multo magis angelis. ([T]he angels have greater cognitive powers than we have: yet we can know God naturally, according to *Romans* I, *what is known of God is apparent in them*: then *a fortiori* the angels). (1a.56.3)

In his explanation, St. Thomas distinguishes between three types of knowledge. The first is a knowledge possessed only by God "qua per essentiam suam videtur (as seen in [H]is essence)" (1a.56.3). The second is a knowledge of the divine One accessible to human beings: "*Rom.* I, *Invisibilia Dei per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur*, unde et dicimur Deum videre in speculo. (*The invisible things of God are clearly perceived through the things [H]e has made*; and so we speak of seeing God 'in a mirror')" (1a.56.3). The final type of knowledge is an intermediary knowledge, which God created as part of the angelic nature:

> Quia enim imago Dei est in ipsa natura angeli impressa, per suam essentiam angelus Deum cognoscit, inquantum est similitudo Dei. Non tamen ipsam essentiam Dei videt, quia nulla similitudo creata est sufficiens ad repræsentandam divinam essentiam. Unde magis ista cognitio tenet se cum speculari, quia et ipsa natura angelica est quoddam speculum, divinam similitudinem repræsentans. (For, since God's image is imprinted on the very

[84] St. Thomas writes, "[D]icit Augustinus quod angelus *in ipsa sua conformatione, hoc est, illustratione veritatis, cognoscit seipsum*. (Augustine says that *as soon as an angel is 'conformed' to truth* (*i.e. illuminated by it) he knows himself*)" (1a.56.1). In his explanation he shows, "Angelus autem, cum sit immaterialis, est quædam forma subsistens, et per hoc intelligibilis in actu. Unde sequitur quod per suam formam, quæ est sua substantia, seipsum intelligat. (Now an angel, we have seen, is a non-material form existing on its own, and so in a state of actual intelligibility. Therefore in virtue of his form, which is none other than his substance, an angel understands himself)" (1a.56.1).

> nature of an angel, an angel knows God through his own essence to the extent this resembles God. Yet he does not see the divine essence itself, for no created likeness is adequate to represent it. His knowledge, in fact, has more in common with that given by a reflection in a mirror—the mirror being the angelic nature itself as representing a likeness of God). (1a.56.3)

In addition to knowledge of celestial beings, the angels also possess some knowledge of non-celestial beings. St. Thomas shows that since human beings can know material things, and the angels are higher than humans, the angels too can know material things (1a.57.1). Additionally, St. Thomas declares that angels must have knowledge of individuals because they serve as guardians of human beings[85] (1a.57.2).[86]

Although angels can know individuals, their knowledge is limited in several areas. One area relates to the future. While St. Thomas declares that the angels do not have knowledge of the future, he does clarify this statement by demonstrating two aspects of future knowledge: an indirect knowledge based on causes, and a direct knowledge based on nature. St. Thomas explains their knowledge as follows:

> Dicendum quod futurum dupliciter potest cognosci: uno modo in causa sua; et sic futura quæ ex necessitate ex causis suis proveniunt per certam scientiam cognoscuntur, ut solem oriri cras. Quæ vero ex suis causis proveniunt ut in pluribus, cognoscuntur non per certitudinem, sed per conjecturam; sicut medicus præcognoscit sanitatem infirmi. Et iste modus cognoscendi futura adest angelis, et tanto magis quam nobis, quanto rerum causas et universalius et perfectius cognoscunt . . . Alio modo cognoscuntur futura in seipsis; et sic solius Dei est futura cognoscere, non solum quæ ex necessitate proveniunt, vel ut in pluribus, sed etiam casualia et fortuita. (The future can be known in two ways. First, in its causes; and so future things which come necessarily from their causes can be known with certainty, as that the sun will rise tomorrow. Other things, that come from their causes in most cases, are not foreknowable with certainty but with a measure of probability, as when a doctor forms an opinion on the future health

[85] They can know individual beings as opposed to having a knowledge of non-celestial beings as a collective group.
[86] St. Thomas uses the term "singularia" translated as "particular things" (1a.57.2). Singulars or particulars in the context of this article seem to refer to singular or particular human beings.

> of a patient. And this kind of foreknowledge is found in the angels, and at a higher degree than in man because they know the causes of things more extensively and more thoroughly than we do . . . The other way in which future things may be known is directly in themselves; and such knowledge of the future is proper to God alone). (1a.57.3)

Angelic knowledge is also limited with regard to whether or not they know the thoughts of human beings. St. Thomas indicates that they do not know their thoughts because that type of knowledge is reserved for God alone (1a.57.4). Nevertheless, the theologian qualifies his answer by distinguishing between two ways in which thoughts can be understood: "in suo effectu (in their outward effects)" (1a.57.4), and "cogitationes, prout sunt in intellectu, et affectiones, prout sunt in voluntate (as they exist in the mind [thoughts] and will [desires or emotions])" (1a.57.4). The latter, once again, is an ability unique to God. However, the former is possible for the angels. The angels cannot know the thoughts themselves, but they are able to discern thoughts based on how they outwardly affect the person.

Another area of angelic knowledge relates to the mysteries of grace. According to St. Thomas, angels do not know these mysteries:

> SED CONTRA est quod nullus discit illud quod cognoscit. Sed angeli etiam supremi quærunt de divinis mysteriis gratiæ. (ON THE OTHER HAND no one learns what he already knows; but even the highest angels have to inquire and learn about the mysteries of grace).[87] (1a.57.5)

On the one hand, the theologian responds that God has given innate knowledge to the angels based on their nature. Since He alone by nature can understand all things in Himself, the angels cannot understand grace in this manner (1a.57.5). On the other hand, the angels do have various levels of knowledge based on God's revelation by His Spirit about the "Verbo (Word)" (1a.57.5). Consequently, St. Thomas believes that

[87] St. Thomas then quotes Dionysius and the prophet Isaiah as patristic and biblical evidence.

angels, as higher beings, do possess this type of knowledge of grace, and at a higher level than that of human knowledge (1a.57.5).

A final aspect of angelic knowledge relates to whether or not an angel can err. On this topic, St. Thomas cites Dionysius on the demons: "Sed in dæmonibus est *phantasia proterva* (*the imagination of the devils is perverse*)" (1a.58.5). However, he counters that

> Philosophus dicit, 3 *De Anima*, quod *intellectus semper verus est.* Augustinus etiam dicit in libro 83 *Quaest.* quod *nihil intelligitur nisi verum*. Sed angeli non cognoscunt aliquid nisi intelligendo. Ergo in angeli cognitione non potest esse deceptio et falsitas. ([W]e have Aristotle saying, *intuitive understanding is always true*, and Augustine saying that *only what is true can be understood.* Now all angelic knowledge is by intuitive understanding: it can admit, then of no error or deception). (1a.58.5)

An important key to this topic lies in the nature of the angelic beings. St. Thomas shows that, unlike humans, the angels are purely intuitive intellectual beings.[88] Their knowledge is more direct, protecting them from being deceived. Hence, the objection about the devils must be resolved by distinguishing between good and bad angels:

> Angeli igitur boni habentes rectam voluntatem per cognitionem quidditatis rei, non judicant de his quæ naturaliter ad rem pertinet, nisi salva ordinatione divina. Unde in eis non potest esse falsitas aut error. Dæmones vero per voluntatem perversam subducentes intellectum a divina sapientia. (A good angel, that is one with a rightly directed will, never forms a judgment about the nature of anything he knows except subject to the divine plan; hence he can never be in error about it. But the devils, owing to the perversion in their will, are intellectually withdrawn from submission to the divine wisdom). (1a.58.5)

Thus, good angels cannot err because their nature is fixed. The apparent error of the devils accounts for their fallen state. They no longer are able to comprehend the divine will and, consequently, their intellect is darkened.[89]

---

[88] St. Thomas cites his previous article in which he explained that angels do not learn by combining (deductive reasoning) but by intuition of essences (1a.58.4)
[89] The theologian revisits this topic in 1a.64.1.

The third area of the "Treatise on the Angels" deals with the angelic will. St. Thomas begins by establishing the fact that the angels do indeed have a will. He does so by discussing St. Augustine's teaching about the mind and the Trinity:

> [I]mago Trinitatis invenitur in mente secundum memoriam, intelligentiam et voluntatem. Imago autem Dei invenitur non solum in mente humana, sed etiam in mente angelica, cum etiam mens angelica sit capax Dei. Ergo in angelis est voluntas. ([The] mind is an image of the Trinity as comprising memory, intelligence and will. But if the human mind images God, so does the angelic mind; it too is a capacity to receive God. The angel, then, is endowed with will). (1a.59.1)

Not only do the angels have a will, but they have free will. Here the saint compares the angels to human beings:

> [L]ibertas arbitrii ad dignitatem hominis pertinet. Sed angeli digniores sunt hominibus. Ergo libertas arbitrii, cum sit in hominibus, multi magis est in angelis. ([F]ree will is a constituent of human dignity: angels have a more than human dignity; *a fortiori* then they have free will)" (1a.59.3).

St. Thomas Aquinas goes on to explain that even though they have free will, their will is subject to their nature, as is the human will. However, there is a key distinction: the theologian underscores the fact that human beings often exercise their will after deliberation, but the angels do not learn by inquiry. Their knowledge is intuitive and immediate (1a.59.3). Consequently, their will, just as their intellect, is higher than the human will.

The next question St. Thomas Aquinas considers is "utrum in angelis sit irascibilis et concupiscibilis. ([whether] are the irascible and concupiscible tendencies found in angels)" (1a.59.4).[90] In the first objection, St. Thomas Aquinas indicates that the angels do have such tendencies, because

[90] Deferrari defines "irascibilis" as "a kind of passion, including fear, despair, hope, boldness, and anger" (599). He defines "concupiscibilis" as "(1) desirable, covetous, (2) concupiscent, desiring, desirous" (197).

> [d]icit enim Dionysius quod *in dæmonibus est furor irrationabilis, et concupiscentia amens.* Sed dæmones ejusdem naturæ sunt cum angelis, quia peccatum non mutavit in eis naturam. (Dionysius says, the devils are *full of irrational fury, mad concupiscence*; and they are still of the same nature as angels, notwithstanding their sin). (1a.59.4)

However, in the SED CONTRA, the theologian references Aristotle to prove that the angels cannot exhibit these two vices because they are both associated with the "parte sensitiva, quæ non est in angelis. (sensitive part of the soul, which is not found in the angels)" (1a.59.4). In response to the first objection, the saint explains,

> quod furor et concupiscentia metaphorice dicuntur esse in dæmonibus, sicut et ira quandoque Deo attribuitur propter similitudinem effectus. ([f]ury and concupiscence are attributed to devils metaphorically; as anger is sometimes attributed to God, because of some likeness between [H]is effects and those of anger. (1a.59.4)

Thus, the angels, as beings without sensory faculties, experience neither passions nor the vices that spring from them.

In the final area of the Treatise, St. Thomas Aquinas discusses four aspects related to the creation of the angels.[91] First, the theologian explains that God did create the angels even though there is no account of angelic creation in the Scriptures (1a.61.1). They could not be eternal for only God has always existed (1a.61.2). With regard to the chronology of their creation, St. Thomas Aquinas reiterates the belief that they were probably created at the same time as the corporeal beings (1a.61.3).

Second, the saint discusses the state in which the good angels were initially created. According to him, the angels were not created in a state of beatitude, as evidenced by the fact that some angels fell after creation (1a.62.1).[92] The theologian

[91] Many of the questions that St. Thomas explores in this section overlap with the biblical evidence presented earlier.

[92] The Latin expression is "creatione beati" (1a.62.1). Deferrari states that "beatitudo" means, "*blissfulness, salvation, beatitude, felicity*, a synonym of *felicitas*. This

then explains that those angels that did not fall both turned to God by His grace (1a.62.2)[93] and merited the beatified state (1a.62.4),[94] albeit through only one act of merit (1a.62.5).[95] As a result of their state, beatified angels are incapable of sinning (1a.62.8).

Third, St. Thomas Aquinas explores the topic of sin in the angels. In this final section of the Treatise, he explores not only the creation of the angels but related matters as well. Since theologians generally accept that the confirmation and fall of the angels took place very soon after their creation, he includes a discussion of sin in the angels and the resulting punishment for their sin. In the first article St. Thomas Aquinas cites the book of Job to establish that moral evil can exist in the angels: "*Job.* 4, *In Angelis suis reperit pravitatem.* ([W]e read in *Job, He found wickedness in [H]is*

---

happiness can be considered under various aspects, (1) as a *state* of being happy, (2) as an *object*, the attainment of which will make one happy, (3) as the *action of operation* by which the objective happiness is attained, and (4) antonomastically, as an *extremely good and virtuous operation* proceeding from the impulse of the Holy Ghost in the Gifts" (106).

[93] St. Thomas writes, "per conversionem ad Deum angelus pervenit ad beatitudinem. Si igitur non indiguisset gratia ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum, sequeretur quod non indigeret gratia ad habendam vitam æternam; quod est contra illud Apostoli *Rom.* 6, *Gratia Dei vita æterna*. (it was through turning to God that the angels entered into bliss; so that if that turning did not depend on grace, then neither does eternal life, which is against St[.] Paul's teaching, *The grace of God is eternal life*)" (1a.62.2).

[94] "*Apoc.* 21 dicitur quod *mensura angeli*, in illa cœlesti Hierusalem, *est mensura hominis*. Sed homo ad beatitudinem pertingere non potest nisi per meritum. Ergo neque angelus. ([W]e read that in the heavenly Jerusalem, *An angel's measure is the same as a man's*)" (1a.62.4). The Blackfriar edition did not include a translation of the second half of the Latin quotation. A rough paraphrase is as follows: Since human beings achieve beatitude through merit, angels do as well (paraphrase mine).

[95] "Meritum autem beatitudinis non solum in angelo, sed etiam in homine esse potest per unicum actum: quia quolibet actu charitate informato homo beatitudinem meretur. Unde relinquitur quod statim post unum actum charitate informatum angelus beatus fuit. (The meriting of bliss can certainly be completed in one act, not only where angels are concerned but even in our own case: a man can merit bliss by any act done in charity. Each angel, then, obtained bliss immediately after a single act done in charity)" (1a.62.5).

angels.)" (1a.63.1). The saint then demonstrates that the angels can only sin by pride and envy. Because of their incorporeal nature, angels cannot commit the sins of the flesh. Nevertheless, they can be guilty of those types of sin:

> Dicendum quod peccatum aliquod in aliquo esse potest dupliciter, uno modo secundum reatum, alio modo secundum affectum. Secundum reatum quidem omnia peccata in dæmonibus esse contingit, quia, dum homines ad omnia peccata inducunt, omnium peccatorum reatum incurrunt. (Sin can exist in a subject in two ways, as something he is guilty of and as something to which he is inclined. In the first way any sin can be in the devils, since by leading men in to every kind of sin they incur the guilt of every kind. But by inclination they can only sin in ways to which a spiritual nature can be attracted. Now such a nature cannot be attracted by satisfactions that are found in the body as such, but only by such as are spiritual; for nothing can be attracted by whatever does not, in some way, correspond to its nature). (1a.63.2)

The theologian then explains that the only way that the angels could sin was in their rebellion against God through pride (1a.63.2). Since pride is the only sin of the angels, St. Thomas Aquinas then proceeds to discuss the sin of the Devil:

> [E]st quod dicitur Isa. 14, ex persona diaboli, Ascendam in cælum . . . et ero similis Altissimo. Et Augustinus dicit in libro De quaest. Vet. Test. quod elatione inflatus voluit dici Deus. (Scripture shows us the [D]evil saying, I will ascend into heaven . . . I will be like the Most High. And Augustine says, Inflated with pride, he wished to be called God).[96] (1a.63.3)

[96] St. Thomas further explains the Devil's sin as follows: "Et hoc modo diabolus appetiit esse ut Deus, non ut ei assimilaretur quantum ad hoc quod est nulli subesse simpliciter; quia sic etiam suum non esse appeteret, cum nulla creatura esse possit nisi per hoc quod sub Deo esse participat. Sed in hoc appetiit indebite esse similis Deo, quia appetiit ut finem ultimum beatitudinis id ad quod virtute suæ naturæ poterat pervenire, avertens suum appetitum a beatitudine supernaturali, quæ est ex gratia Dei. Vel si appetiit ut ultimum finem illam Dei similitudinem quæ datur ex gratia, voluit hoc habere per virtutem suæ naturæ, non ex divino auxilio secundum Dei dispositionem. Et hoc consonat dictis Anselmi, qui dicit quod appetiit illud ad quod pervenisset, si stetisset. (And it was thus that the [D]evil aspired to be as God. Not that he desired godlikeness in the sense of an absolute pre-eminence in being; for that would have amounted to desiring non-existence, since no creature can exist except as holding existence under God. But he desired godlikeness in this sense, that he placed his ultimate bliss in an objective to be obtained by the force of his own nature alone, rejecting the supernatural bliss which depends on the grace of God. Or if, perhaps, he did desire as his last end that likeness to God which is a gift of grace, he willed to possess this by his own natural

Thus, the pride of the highest angel caused not only his fall (1a.63.7) but also the fall of the other angels who sinned with him (1a.63.8):

> Dicundum quod peccatum primi angeli fuit aliis causa peccandi, non quidem congens, sed quadam quasi exhortatione inducens. (The sin of the first angel who sinned was the cause of others sinning; not by compulsion but by a kind of inducement).[97] (1a.63.8)

Finally, St. Thomas Aquinas concludes with a discussion of the demons' punishment. In the first article the theologian states that although God punished the demons by darkening their intellect, they did not lose all knowledge of truth (1a.64.1). Rather, they retained the knowledge they possessed through their nature as intellectual beings, but they were darkened in the knowledge that comes through grace:

> [Q]uia de hujusmodi secretis divinis tantum revelatur eis, quantum oportet, vel mediantibus angelis, vel *per aliqua temporalia divinæ virtutis effecta,* ut dicit Augustinus, 9 *De civ. Dei.* Non autem sicut ipsis sanctis angelis, quibus plura et clarius revelantur in ipso Verbo. ([T]hey are shown as much of the divine mysteries as they need to know, and this either by way of the good angels or, as Augustine says, *through certain temporal effects of God's power*; but less

---

power and not with the divine assistance in conformity to God's will. This would agree with Anselm's view that the [D]evil desired that to which he would eventually have come had he curbed his desire)" (1a.63.3).

[97] Just as the good angels were not created in a beatified state, the fallen angels were not created evil. St. Thomas says, "Dicendum quod omne quod est inquantum est et naturam habet aliquam, in bonum aliquod naturaliter tendit, utpote ex principio bono existens, quia semper effectus convertitur in suum principium. Contingit autem alicui bono particulari aliquod malum esse adjunctum, sicut igni conjungitur hoc malum quod est esse consumptivum aliorum. Sed bono universali nullum malum potest esse adjunctum. (Everything that is, by the mere fact that it is and has a nature of some kind, has a natural inclination to goodness of some kind; for it draws existence from a good source and effects always tend to rejoin their origin)" (1a.63.4). However, the saint then proceeds to clarify that nature can indeed incline an angel toward evil "non in quantum malum, sed per accidens, inquantum est conjunctum cuidam bono. (not to evil as evil, but to evil incidentally, as being involved in the realization of some good)" (1a.63.4). With regard to the Devil, St. Thomas indicates that he, too, was not created evil because "est quod dicitur *Gen.* I, *Vidit Deus cuncta quæ fecerat, et erant valde bona*. Inter ea autem errant etiam dæmones. Ergo et dæmones aliquando fuerunt boni. (we read, *God saw all things that [H]e had made, and they were very good*. And they included the devils; who at some time, then were good)" (1a.63.5).

> abundantly and clearly than is the case with the holy angels who are shown those mysteries in the Word [H]imself).[98] (1a.64.1)

In the second article, St. Thomas Aquinas cites Psalm 73 to show that the will of the demons has been fixed in evil:

> *Superbia eorum qui te oderunt, ascendit semper*, quod de dæmonibus exponitur. Ergo semper obstinati in malitia perseverant. (*The pride of those who hate you ascends continually*; which is understood to refer to the devils and to express their obduracy in evil). (1a.64.2)

In the third article, the theologian declares that the demons also experience pain as part of their punishment:

> [E]st quod peccatum dæmonis est gravius quam peccatum hominis. Sed homo punitur dolore pro delectatione peccati, secundum illud *Apoc.* 18, *Quantum glorificavit se, et in deliciis fuit, tantum date ei tormentum et luctum*. Ergo multo magis diabolus, qui maxime se glorificavit, punitur doloris luctu. ([T]he devils' sin is greater than any man's sin. But men are punished with pain for the pleasure they have taken in sin, as we read in the *Apocalypse, As much as she glorified herself and lived in delight, so much torment and sorrow give her*. Much more then must the [D]evil, who went furthest in self-glorification, be punished with pain and grief). (1a.64.3)

In the final article St. Thomas Aquinas describes the place of the demons' punishment:

> Sic ergo dæmonibus duplex locus pœnalis debetur; unus quidem ratione suæ culpæ, et hic est infernus; alius autem ratione exercitationis humanæ, et sic debetur eis caliginosus aër. (Consequently, there are two places where the devils are punished: one due to them precisely as sinners, which is hell; and one due to them in their function as proving human virtue, and this is the dark atmosphere). (1a.64.4)

Since the overall narrative of Scripture revolves around God's plan to redeem human beings, St. Thomas Aquinas appropriately ends his discussion of the demons' punishment by returning to this theme:

---

[98] St. Thomas's *De malo* includes a more detailed discussion of evil and the demons. However, much of the information contained therein overlaps with the content of the *Summa.* Since the purpose of this chapter is to provide a theological foundation rather than an exhaustive study, only the *Summa* has been cited here.

> Unde et usque tunc et boni angeli ad nos huc mittuntur, et dæmones in hoc aëre caliginoso sunt ad nostrum exercitium; licet eorum aliqui etiam nunc in inferno sint ad torquendum eos quos ad malum induxerunt; sicut et aliqui boni angeli sunt cum animabus sanctis in cœlo. Sed post diem judicii omnes mali tam homines quam angeli in inferno erunt, boni vero in cœlo. (Hence until that [Final Judgment] Day the good angels will be sent down to us here on earth, and the devils will be abroad in this dark atmosphere in order to try us; though some of them are already in hell, to torment those whom they have successfully led into evil; just as some of the good angels are with the blessed in heaven. But after Judgment Day all the wicked, both men and angels, will be in hell, and all the good in heaven). (1a.64.4)

Hence, while part of the demons' punishment awaits them in the future, they also experience some of it presently as they inhabit the earth for the purpose of testing human beings. In this way they continue to fulfill God's overall plan of salvation and damnation according to the divine will.

In conclusion, both the biblical evidence and the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas provide an important framework for this study of angels in the drama of Tirso de Molina by defining who these beings are and what functions they perform. The term "angels" refers to the large group of intellectual, spiritual beings that serve God by performing the various functions assigned to them according to the divine plan. The good angels minister as intermediaries between God and human beings, serving as messengers and guardians that seek to move human beings toward faith in God and eventual beatification in Heaven. The demons are those fallen angels that followed the Devil in his proud rebellion against the divine will. As a result of their sin, God darkened their intellect and condemned them both to the earth to tempt human beings and to Hell to torment the souls of those who ultimately reject God. Based on this theological foundation, the following chapters will seek to analyze the functions that angels and demons perform in Tirso's works, how those functions align with orthodox

doctrine, and the possible effects that his representation of angels and demons might have had on his audience.

Chapter 3: Angels and Demons in the Plays of Doubtful Authorship

This chapter will explore the representation of angels and demons in the plays of doubtful authorship. Critics generally categorize these works into three subgenres: an *auto* (*La madrina del cielo*), a theological drama (*El condenado por desconfiado*), and the hagiographic dramas (*El caballero de gracia*, *La joya de las montañas*, and *La ninfa del cielo*). The format of this chapter will utilize the following organizational scheme: 1) a basic summary of the plot; 2) a discussion of issues unique to the specific work, such as genre classification or necessary background information to the play (when applicable); and 3) textual analysis, consisting primarily of the scenes in which the supernatural characters appear.[99] Finally, each play's analysis will conclude with a summary of the functions and representations of the spiritual beings from the plays and how each work compares to the others.

The *auto*: *La madrina del cielo*

Nuestra Señora del Rosario, la madrina del cielo relates the story of the fall, penance, and salvation of a villain. As the play begins, Dionisio, following the advice of his supposed friend Doroteo, rapes Marcela, a virgin who has dedicated herself to a life of chastity and service to God. Marcela brings her complaint to God and asks Him to execute vengeance on the one who has violated her. Christ then appears to Marcela and encourages her not to lose faith but rather to trust Him to do justice.

[99] Each play also contains references to angels and demons in the ordinary speech of the other characters. These references also reveal the extent to which the religious vocabulary and its connotation affected the common language of the period. Consequently, the study will also include a brief summary and analysis of these statements, even though they are not the primary focus of the study.

Subsequently, Dionisio and Doroteo meet two religious men on the road, Santo Domingo and Chinarro, whom they rob. During the robbery, Dionisio takes only the rosary that the saint carries, indicating his respect for the Virgin and foreshadowing his ultimate conversion. While the two men sleep, the Demon appears and tempts them to continue in their sinful lifestyle. Meanwhile, a group of Musicians exhorts them to repent.

The action then transitions to a judgment scene. The Demon speaks first, recounting the wicked deeds of the two men from the previous ten years. However, Santo Domingo and the Virgin intercede on behalf of Dionisio, appealing first and foremost to Christ and His mercy but also to the fact that Dionisio has, at the very least, maintained a respect for and devotion to the Virgin. On the contrary, the Virgin does not intercede for Doroteo because his life gave no evidence of any virtue whatsoever. In response to their intercession, Christ extends mercy to Dionisio but condemns Doroteo.

The next scene of the *auto* details Dionisio's penance. He enters the stage dressed in rags as a symbol of the contrite nature of his heart and proceeds to give a lengthy prayer of confession through which he affirms his faith in God and his devotion to the Virgin. During his penance, the Musicians, the Demon, and two additional allegorical characters, Vice and Virtue, appear and battle over his soul. Finally, the Angel appears and proclaims the Demon's defeat and Dionisio's salvation.

The final scene returns to Marcela. She has, during all these years, retained her desire for vengeance. However, near the play's end, Christ appears to her once again and tests her by asking her to forgive Dionisio. After much contemplation, Marcela chooses to follow Christ's example of forgiveness and pardon Dionisio. Thus, she earns

favor with God. The reconciled couple is then married, God having brought them together Himself. The play ends when the Virgin gives a final speech in which she summarizes the main lessons of the *auto*.

One problem this *auto* presents is the question of genre classification. Typically, the term *auto* in relation to Spanish Golden Age drama refers to an *auto sacramental,* defined in *Autoridades* as

> [c]ierto género de obras cómicas en verſo, con figúras alegóricas, que ſe hacen en los theatros por la feſtividád del Corpus en obséquio y alabanza del Auguſto Sacramento de la Euchariſtía, por cuya razón ſe llaman Sacramentáles. No tienen la diviſión de aƈtos ò jornadas como las Comédias, ſino repreſentación contuinuada ſin intermedio, y lo miſmo ſon los del Nacimiento. ("Auto sacramental")

When compared to this basic definition, *La madrina del cielo* complies with the standard of length as a one-act play. However, the primary intention of the work does not appear to center on praising the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Critics tend to emphasize the visual representation of the Eucharist, an element absent in the play, as an essential characteristic of the genre. Consequently, they would not classify this work as an *auto sacramental*. According to Blanca de los Ríos, "*La madrina del cielo* es un drama comprimido dentro del molde de un auto moral—no sacramental, pues no se refiere a la Eucaristía" (1: 551). Arellano, Oteiza and Zugasti, in their introduction to the play, state,

> [d]e todas las obras de Tirso denominadas «autos», *La madrina del cielo* es la menos sacramental. Se trata de una pieza dramática en un acto . . . sin aparición del asunto eucarístico ni estructura alegórica. No tiene que ver, pues, de manera directa con el tema de la Redención ni de la exaltación del Sacramento. (37)

In addition to the lack of Eucharistic representation, the work also fails to satisfy the criteria of an allegorical storyline:

> En el desarrollo de *La madrina del cielo* no hay lectura a dos luces (como diría Calderón) del argumento, y únicamente algunos personajes que encarnan entidades astractas—como las Virtudes y Vicios, con un pequeño papel en la obra—, evocan parcialmente las técnicas alegóricas que caracterizan al auto sacramental. (37)

Consequently, these two significant points of divergence severely complicate the work's classification as an *auto sacramental*.

Despite these problems, some similarities do exist between the work and an *auto sacramental*. In his book *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón,* Alexander A. Parker describes several characteristics of the *auto sacramental* as they appear in the works of the genre's supposed perfecter: Calderón de la Barca. One of the problems that Parker presents is the fact that defining this particular genre can be challenging due to the "widely divergent and even contradictory" definitions critics have employed (*Allegorical Drama* 58). In his description of the term's evolution from Lope de Vega to Calderón de la Barca, Parker elucidates a key distinction that must be true in order to qualify an *auto* as being *sacramental*:

> The *asunto* of every *auto* is therefore the Eucharist, but the *argumento* can vary from one to another: it can be any 'historia divina'—historical, legendary, or fictitious—provided that it throws some light on some aspect of the *asunto*. (*Allegorical Drama* 59)

Furthermore, Parker indicates that since the doctrine of the Eucharist affects nearly all other teachings of the Catholic Church, a great flexibility of themes becomes possible within the genre: "For his *argumentos* the dramatist can therefore draw on virtually the whole wide field of Catholic dogmatic and moral theology" (*Allegorical Drama* 60).

Given Parker's explanation of the genre, one could conclude that an *auto sacramental* would not necessarily have to include an actual visible representation of the Eucharist as part of the action of the play, but rather that the dramatist could

establish an indirect reference to the key doctrine in the *argumento*. With regard to *La madrina del cielo,* the dramatist does accomplish this task in two primary ways. First, a direct connection to the doctrine of the Redemption appears in at least three instances: 1) as Marcela begins her prayer to God, she addresses Him as "Divino Redentor" (177); 2) as she closes her prayer, the stage directions read, "*Corren una cortina y aparezca* Cristo, *de resurrección*" (178);[100] and 3) when Chinarro discusses the merit of doing penance, he states, "porque alcance la clemencia / del redentor celestial" (196). Furthermore, the plot revolves around themes of salvation and damnation not only for the two thieves, Dionisio and Doroteo, but also for Chinarro and Marcela. Second, the actual publication of the play indicates that it was performed as a part of the liturgical celebrations of either Christmas or Corpus Christi. According to Ríos, *La madrina* appeared in 1664 as a part of a larger collection of plays entitled

> *Navidad y Corpus Christi festejado [sic] por los mejores ingenios de España, en diez y seis Autos a lo divino, Diez y seis Loas, y diez y seis Entremeses. Representados en esta Corte, y nunca hasta aora impresos. Recogidos por Isidro de Robles*. (1: 549)

While the publication's title indicates that sixteen of the works are simply *"autos a lo divino,"* the table of contents in the publication to which she refers lists *La madrina del cielo* as an "*auto sacramental*" (Robles n. p.).[101] Furthermore, the actual title page for the work lists the play as an "*auto famoso*" (Robles 353). Despite the differing designations given, it is clear that the types of works included in the collection are all brief, devotional works and clearly linked to the two major religious celebrations of the

[100] St. Paul identifies the Resurrection as a key component to the doctrine of the Redemption in his epistle to the Romans. See Romans 3:21-26; 4:16-25; and 6:1-11.
[101] The front matter of this particular edition is not paginated. Page numbering begins with the first work.

day.[102] Thus, while one cannot affirm that *La madrina* is indeed an *auto sacramental*, neither can one ignore the similarities of the play to this genre.

A second aspect of the genre that Parker explores is the sermon-like nature that these works display:

> That the autos are liturgical, or devotional, drama is the first point that emerges from Calderón's definition. The second is that they are sermons: a form of instruction. As such they offer not only ethical instruction, but also instruction in 'cuestiones de la Sacra Teología'—dogmatic instruction. But they are not ordinary sermons, for they are 'puestos en verso', and as such address themselves to their listeners in the special way proper to their medium. Further, they are dramatic poetry ('en idea representable'), and therefore exercise not only an auditory but a visual appeal. (*Allegorical Drama* 65)

This fusion of sermon-within-a-play is a key facet of the genre's success because "[a] sermon acted possesses greater didactic value than a sermon preached. It is better to demonstrate to an audience the meaning of the Redemption than to tell it to them" (*Allegorical Drama* 66). *La madrina*, as this study will demonstrate, aptly illustrates its sermon-like qualities, aligning it well within the didactic purpose of the genre.

Apart from the *auto sacramental*, Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti have also compared the play to two additional genres: "la hagiografía y los milagros marianos" (37). With regard to the hagiographic tradition, the plot of *La madrina* illustrates striking similarities to many of the storylines of the saint plays.[103] With respect to the

---

[102] According to A*utoridades*, a *loa* "[s]e llama tambien el prólogo ò prelúdio que antecede en las fieſtas cómicas, que ſe respreſentan ò cantan. Llámaſe aſsí porque ſu aſſunto es ſiempre en alabanza de aquel à quien ſe dedican" ("Loa"). An *entremés*, is a "[r]epreſentacion breve, jocóſa y burleſca, la qual ſe entremete de ordinario entre una jornada y otra de la comedia, para mayór variedad, ò para divertir y alegrar al auditório" ("Entremés").

[103] A discussion of the characteristics of the hagiographic dramas will follow later in chapter three. In order to maintain the distinction between the doubtful plays and those Tirso undoubtedly wrote, it is necessary to order the *auto* prior to the hagiographic works despite the problems of delaying the discussion of these traits. The same will

Marian literature, the play's events resemble those of many of the stories from Gonzalo de Berceo's *Los milagros de Nuestra Señora*, especially that of "'El ladrón devoto'" (37). However, despite the similarities to these dramas, one cannot classify the play as a hagiographic drama primarily due to the fact that the story does not describe the circumstances of the life of a saint, but rather the details of the life of a fictitious sinner's salvation.[104] Likewise, the Mariological tradition cultivated by Berceo was a poetic genre primarily translated from existing Latin texts. While the appearance of the Virgin as a major character in the play closely resembles one of the typical formulas Berceo employed, the fact that the work is a drama prohibits a simple classification within this tradition alone.

Given the fact that *La madrina* draws from multiple literary traditions, the play is best described as a hybrid work. It resists ready classification into the existing categories. Nevertheless, there is at least one characteristic common to all of these genres. The *auto sacramental*, the hagiographic works, and the *Milagros* all maintain a distinctly devotional purpose. The *auto* reflects an act of worship; the hagiographic dramas uphold the lives of exemplary Christians who serve as models for all to revere and emulate; and the *Milagros* endeavor to build faith and encourage devotion to the Virgin despite human weakness.

In *La madrina del cielo*, references to angels and demons or appearances of these spiritual beings occur in six different passages. The first begins only four lines into the play and in reality does not relate to a specific angel in the play but rather

---

prove true for the second play, *El condenado*, which also includes a hagiographic-like trait in the final scenes.

[104] Although one of the minor characters, Domingo, does happen to be a bona fide saint, *La madrina* does not detail his life and journey toward sainthood.

serves as a comparative linguistic tool for Dionisio as he talks about Marcela. At the play's opening, Dionisio states: "Hizo Dios un ángel bello / debajo de humana masa; / formó una excelsa escultura / de tan divina hermosura, / mostrando su gran poder, / que se viene a conocer / el Criador por la criatura" (173). In this passage, Dionisio describes Marcela's beauty using the metaphor of Creation. God created the angels as celestial beings that hold a higher position than human beings in the overall hierarchy of Creation.[105] By comparing the physical appearance of Marcela to that of a superior being, he elevates her beyond her God-given status, although verbally crediting God for such a magnificent display of His power.[106] Additionally, through terms such as "ángel" and "humana masa" (173), Dionisio further intensifies his description by using terms akin to those that describe the doctrine of the Incarnation. Marcela's "incarnation" is

[105] Colossians 1:16-17 refers to God as Creator of all: "For in him [His Son] were all things created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and in him. And he is before all, and by him all things consist." Psalm 8:4-9 establishes human beings as lower than the angels and yet above animals having no soul: "For I will behold thy heavens, the works of thy fingers: the moon and the stars which thou hast founded. What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, thou hast crowned him with glory and honour: and hast set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast subjected all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen: moreover the beasts also of the fields. The birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea, that pass through the paths of the sea."

[106] Romans 1:19-20 identifies the Creation as one of the ways through which human beings can learn of God's power: "Because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable." Psalm 18:1 contains a similar teaching: "The heavens shew forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his hands." A numbering discrepency exists in different translations of the book of the Psalms. According to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, the Latin Vulgate follows the Septuagint's inclusion of one hundred fifty-one psalms as opposed to the Hebrew Scripture's one hundred fifty. However, the Latin Vulgate combines psalms nine and ten, resulting in one hundred fifty total psalms (Drum "Psalms"). Hence, in many Protestant translations of the Scriptures, Psalm 18 is numbered as Psalm 19.

distinct, of course, from the unique power God displayed when Christ took on human flesh. In this instance, Dionisio credits God with the power for the creative act, but nonetheless establishes a new type of hybrid creature (angelic and human) in order to praise her beauty. Thus, while this first mention of an angel functions as a symbol of heavenly beauty, it also foreshadows a dangerous type of idolatry that Dionisio commits, as he exalts a human being as having non-human characteristics.

In a similar manner the second passage, referencing the Devil, does not actually relate to the specific character in the play. Rather, it describes the plan that Dionisio has determined to execute. In response to his friend's statement, "entro en el nombre de Dios" (175), Doroteo counters,

> Entra en el nombre del diablo.
> Va a forzar una doncella
> y nombra de Dios el nombre
> que forma contra él querella;
> sin duda que entiende este hombre
> que ha de ayudalle a movella.
> Aquesto, si bien lo notas,
> de demonio es el oficio,
> que con sus obras remotas
> entre el deleite y el vicio
> deja las conciencias rotas.
> Hacemos mil insolencias
> sin tener a Dios temor
> ni escrúpulo en las conciencias,
> y pídele a Dios favor:
> ¡qué hermosas impertenencias! (175-76)

Despite the fact that God condemns him at the play's end for never displaying any sort of virtue, Doroteo does not deceive himself as does Dionisio about the nature of his deeds. The latter has convinced himself that he can bring glory to God through his evil deed, but the former corrects him. He speaks the truth that this nefarious plan is demonic in nature and not heavenly. By using words such as "insolencias" and

"impertenencias," Doroteo aligns the mens' actions with the fallen characteristics of the demons, as opposed to the virtuous, godly attributes they should seek to possess.[107]

Not only does Doroteo's rebuttal indicate the nature of their works, it also identifies a key reason for their actions: they do not fear God. Consequently, their evil deeds abound, and their consciences have become dull. Their lives underscore the same summary statement the apostle St. Paul utters as he completes his discussion about the extent of human sinfulness: "There is no fear of God before their eyes" (Romans 3:18).[108]

The third passage presents the statements made by the Demon and the Musicians while Dionisio and Doroteo are asleep. The Demon speaks first: "Dormid, que yo he de velar / hasta llegaros al punto / en que tenéis de acabar" (188). In his opening speech, the Demon declares that his purpose is to deceive and ultimately to lead the men into eternal perdition. He describes his basic method by presenting an ironic contrast between the actions of sleeping and keeping vigil. *Autoridades* indicates that the verb "velar" not only carries the idea of vigilant watching but also of staying awake at

---

[107] According to *Autoridades*, the word "insolencia" means "[a]ccion mala y fuera de lo comun, y deſacoſtumbrada, o ſumamente extraña" ("Insolencia"). This definition creates a clear comparison of actions to an established norm. In the Christian sense, "insolencia" communicates the extent to which the demons and those who commit demon-like deeds fail to meet the divine standard of righteousness. St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians provides a stark contrast between these two types of deeds: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, emulations, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, sects, envies, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such there is no law" (Galatians 5:19-23).

[108] Since the functions of the angels and demons in the plays will inevitably overlap from one play to the next, this chapter will include any biblical references or theological explanations only the first time a function appears in a play.

natural times of sleep in order to keep vigil ("Velar")[109]. His call for the men to continue in sleep while he stands vigil contradicts the command St. Peter gives: "Be sober and watch: because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour" (1 St. Peter 5:8).

In addition to stating his ultimate goal, the Demon's speech reveals an ironic, quasi-submissive attitude: "[A]unque del cielo barrunto / que me lo quiere estorbar. / Mas venga lo que viniere, / yo he de hacer mi diligencia / por si acaso sucediere; / si no, haga su providencia / lo que mejor le estuviere" (188-89). The verb "barruntar" means "[i]maginar alguna coſa, tomando indicios de ella por alguna ſeñál" ("Barruntar"). "Estorbar" is defined as "[e]mbarazar, impedir el curſo y execucion de alguna operacion" ("Estorbar"). Here, the operation is the damnation of Dionisio and Doroteo's soul. Even though the Demon perceives clues that God will not allow him the victory he desires, he determines to work diligently at his task just in case he might succeed. Ultimately, however, he knows that divine Providence will win, a fact he readily admits.

The remaining portion of the Demon's speech details his attitude and reaction to God and His human creation:

> Tengo un odio desigual
> al hombre y cruel desdén,
> sin causa para hacer tal,
> y por quererle Dios bien,
> por eso le quiero mal;
> y aunque su poder me asombre,
> siempre aborrezco su nombre
> y quiero mal a los dos,
> y pues no me vengo en Dios,

[109] According to *Autoridades*, *velar* means "Eſtar ſin dormir el tiempo deſtinado para el ſueño."

he de vengarme en su nombre. (189)

The Demon explains that the reason he has such vitriolic hatred for human beings relates directly to the fact that God desires their good. This passage also reveals that the Demon has some knowledge of God. He even goes so far as to admit his awe of God's power. However, this knowledge is not sufficient cause to deter him from his goal, illustrating one of the teachings St. James develops in his epistle: "Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well: the devils also believe and tremble" (St. James 2:19).

As the Demon closes his speech, a group of Musicians appear. These allegorical characters exhort the sleeping men by employing a series of images to help the men perceive the Demon's deceit. They begin by exclaiming, "Vela, vela, pecador" (189). They then proceed to convince the men of the Demon's true identity: "mira que el mundo te engaña; / que anda el lobo en la campaña" (189).[110] Their exhortation not only mirrors St. Peter's command referenced earlier, but also employs similar terminology: the Demon is a fierce animal, a wolf that has a ravenous hunger for the destruction of souls. Furthermore, the use of the term "campaña" adds the imagery of a field. One of the definitions that *Autoridades* provides for "campaña" is "[e]l campo igual, que no tiene montes, ni peña∫cos, y generalmente, todo el sitio, que no tiene casas" ("Campaña").[111] The image of the wolf seeking its prey in the field adds urgency to the Musicians' message: if the men do not take vigil, the wild animal will devour them.

[110] The Scriptures describe the Devil as a deceiver. In the beginning of the biblical narrative, he disguises himself as a serpent and deceives Eve into taking of forbidden fruit (Genesis 3:1-5). In the gospels he is called a liar (St. John 8:44). In the epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul warns the Christians to take advantage of spiritual armor so as not to be deceived by the trickery of Satan (Ephesians 6:11-13). Finally, Apocalypse 12:9, the Devil is described as a seducer.

[111] Two of the four definitions for "campaña" in *Autoridades* refer to a military camp. The third definition metaphorically references the heavens and the sea ("Campaña").

Next, the Musicians utilize an image of light as a way for the men to see the danger before them:

> Mira que llega a la puerta
> y con deleites convida;
> la lámpara esté encendida,
> no la halle el esposo muerta.
> Entra con muestras de amor
> y siembra entre ella cizaña;
> que anda el lobo en la campaña,
> huye y teme su rigor. (189-90)

In this passage, the Musicians refer to the Demon as one who appears at the door, lovingly offering something sweet but in the end sowing darnels, or large plants with large flowering leaves that produce poisonous seeds ("Cizaña"). What he offers appears to be good, but his end is always destruction. The Musicians include the imagery of the lamp in order to encourage the men to take advantage of the light so as to recognize and protect themselves from the danger. The reference to the "esposo" finding their light burning as opposed to dead most likely refers to the parable of the ten virgins. In this gospel account, the ten virgins are instructed to keep their lamps ready at all times for the sudden return of the bridegroom: "[w]atch ye therefore, because you know not the day nor the hour" (St. Matthew 25:13).

When the Demon responds to the Musicians, he first scoffs at their attempts and methods of persuasion: "Ya vuelven a dar aviso. / ¿Con música los regalas?" (190). One of the definitions in *Autoridades* for the verb "regalar" implies showing affection and benevolence ("Regalar"). The Musicians have attempted to convince Dionisio and Doroteo through love, symbolized by their music. However, the Demon questions their approach by contrasting it with his own: "Lucifer, no estés remiso; / el veneno de tus balas / los arroja en un proviso" (190). He does not act through sweet and gentle

persuasion. Rather, he seeks to deceive them so as to destroy them. The use of the word "remiso" underscores the Demon's resolve not to be lax in his task.[112] His reference to "veneno" reaffirms his desire for their ultimate spiritual destruction:[113] he seeks to cast them down forcefully and with fury through the seemingly attractive poison that he offers them.[114]

After ridiculing the Musicians, the Demon, returning to the motif of sleep, utilizes one more image of deceit: "Dádoles he grave sueño / con un sabroso manjar / de un mortífero beleño; / quiero ver sin recordar / si al infierno los despeño" (190-91). The dramatist now describes this dangerous sleep in which Dionisio and Doroteo find themselves as a sleep induced by the heavy, sweet savor that the Demon has presented to them. As previously stated, the Demon's role is to deceive and lead human beings into perdition and the judgment of "eterno lloro" (191).

The fourth passage takes place during the judgment scene in which the Demon, Santo Domingo, and the Virgin all testify before Christ. In this scene, the Demon fulfills his role as accuser. Scripture states the following:

---

[112] According to *Autoridades*, "remiso" means "[f]loxo, dexado, ó detenido en la resolucion, ó determinacion de alguna cosa" ("Remiso").

[113] The word "veneno" carries multiple levels of meaning. Four of the definitions that *Autoridades* provides seem especially appropriate to the context of the Demon's speech: 1) literally, it refers to a liquid poison or powder designed to kill another person; 2) generally, it can designate any substance or thing that is dangerous to one's health; 3) metaphorically, it can relate to anything damaging to the health of the soul; and 4) figuratively, it can also extend to the effects caused by wrath or anger. Other definitions of the word include connections to medicine and makeup ("Veneno").

[114] *Autoridades* includes several definitions for the word "arrojar:" 1) "[d]eſpedir, echar de sí alguna coſa, tirándola con ímpetu y fuerza: como arrojar una lanza, la piedra, la ſaéta;" 2) "[v]ale aſsimiſmo deſpedir, echar de sí: como arrojar rayos, llamas, incéndios, el Sol ardiente, la hoguera, el Ethna, el eſpejo herido del Sol y aſsí otras coſas;" and 3) "[s]ignifica tambien echar de sí à alguno, deſpedirle con fúria y enójo, tratándole mal de obra ù de palabra" ("Arrojar"). It defines "proviso" as "Voz que ſolo tiene uſo en el modo adverbial [.] Al proviſo, que significa Al inſtante" ("Proviso").

> And I heard a loud voice in heaven, saying: Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: because the accuser of our brethren is cast forth, who accused them before our God day and night. (Apocalypse 12:10)

The Demon presents his case first by detailing the extreme wickedness in which the men had lived during the previous ten years. He accuses them of deceit; rape of widows, married women, and young virgins; theft; and murder (193). He sums up their vices by employing the same terminology Scripture uses to describe the Devil: "como unos leones fieros" (193).[115] The Demon ends his case by describing their lack of virtue and demands that justice be meted out to them:

> Nunca hicieron obra buena
> que les fuese meritoria,
> y así la ley les condena
> a ser privados de gloria,
> padeciendo eterna pena.
> Jamás vieron celebrar
> el misterio de la misa
> que les pudiera salvar;
> todo era contento y risa,
> sin acordarse de orar. (193-94)

Despite the damning testimony of the Demon, the intercession of Santo Domingo and the Virgin reveals that, despite his horrendous crimes against God, Dionisio did demonstrate virtue in his life, particularly that of his devotion to the Virgin (194). Consequently, in his defense, Santo Domingo begins by reminding the Demon of his eternal fate and of the fact that the Demon is a liar by nature: "Espíritu condenado, / como siempre, la maldad / es adorno de tu estrado; / traes cubierta la verdad / con hábito disfrazado" (194). Consequently, when Christ passes judgment, he condemns Doroteo for his sin and his lack of virtue, but He orders Dionisio to do penance (194-95). In this

[115] Scripture refers to the Devil as a lion that seeks to destroy its prey: "Be sober and watch: because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour" (1 St. Peter 5:18).

way the dramatist shows that, despite the Demon's attempts, he is not always successful. God allows Dionisio to be saved as an act of His grace based on the cooperative efforts of the man's virtuous deeds and the intercession of Santo Domingo and the Virgin.

The fifth passage describes the events surrounding the end of Dionisio's penance. In this section, the Angel appears and debates with the Demon for the soul of the man. At the outset of their deliberation, the Angel expresses surprise that God still allows the Demon opportunity to tempt Dionisio: "¿Ya no quedaste excluido?" (205).[116] This statement references a doctrine illustrated in the first two chapters of the book of Job in which Satan must seek an audience before God in order to make his accusation against Job and obtain divine permission to tempt him. God, being omnipotent and omniscient, does not grant the Demon unlimited access to human beings. Even when God does allow tempting, He promises that it will never be so powerful that the human being will not be able to resist it (I Corinthians 10:13).

The debate also includes instruction on the authority that the spiritual beings hold. When the Demon replies to the Angel's initial question, he speaks of the authority he possesses over human beings: "Mientras en carne viviere / de mí no se ha despedido; / mientras un cuerpo no muere / sujeto está a mi partido. / Desde que hice a Adán pecar / ninguno de mi tormenta / no se ha podido escapar" (205). St. Paul describes Satan's authority over fallen human beings in his epistle to the Ephesians:

> And you, when you were dead in your offences, and sins, Wherein in time past you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of this air, of the spirit that now worketh on the children of unbelief: In

[116] The scene closes in a similar manner to its beginning; the Angel commands the Demon to depart (206).

> which also we all conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest. (Ephesians 2:1-3)

In addition to Satan's title as "the prince of the power of this air," the term "flesh" from this passage, along with the words "carne" and "cuerpo" from the play, qualify the Demon's realm as limited to those who still inhabit their mortal bodies. Thus the Demon's claim of authority does possess some biblical basis.

However, as the debate develops, the Angel recognizes the deceitful way in which the Demon presents his authority over all flesh and counters it first by calling him a liar and then by presenting examples from Scripture of those, such as the prophet Jeremiah, St. John the Baptist, and the Virgin Mary, who inhabited flesh but were free from Satan's dominion.[117] In each case the Demon attempts to object on scriptural grounds; nevertheless, the Angel discerns the ways in which he twists Scripture and continually corrects him (205-206).

The scene finally culminates when the Demon questions the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The Angel replies forcefully by stating, "*Vade retro*, Satanás. / Exímete del derecho / que aquí pretendiendo estás; / parte para el reino estrecho / y no vuelvas aquí más" (206). The Angel uses the same words Christ uttered when Peter denied that Jesus would be crucified (St. Mark 8:33). By directly quoting Christ's words, the Angel is able to call upon divine authority to defeat Satan's attempt to thwart God's plan of Redemption.[118] When the Demon replies, he states, "¿Ya tú te

[117] According to Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti, the Angel's references to the prophet Jeremiah, St. John the Baptist, and the Virgin Mary reflect the teaching that certain individuals have received special favor from God and, consequently, have been sanctified from original sin before birth in order to fulfill a specific purpose (205-206).
[118] Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti's note identifies St. Mark 8:33 as the direct quotation from the Latin Vulgate from which this expression is taken (*Autos II* 206). A parallel

haces mandón? / ¿Eres de masa más alta / que yo? Mas ya mi opinión / después que hice la falta / perdió la reputación" (206-207). He reacts to the Angel's authority over him by returning to the doctrines of Creation. His reference to "masa más alta" questions whether or not the Angel is indeed superior to him, given the fact that they are made of the same substance: both are incorporeal, intellectual, spiritual beings. However, the Demon answers his own question by explaining that his fall from grace removed him from his position as the highest ranking angel in Heaven, thus forfeiting his authority and receiving ultimate condemnation.

In addition to the commentary on angelic authority, the preceding scene also elucidates certain aspects of the knowledge of spiritual beings. Throughout the debate both the Angel and the Demon reason with each other using Scripture. As St. Thomas Aquinas explained, both beings have a direct, intuitive knowledge of spiritual matters (1a.54.3). Nevertheless, the Angel's knowledge is superior to the Demon's because the former's knowledge always aligns with God's plan, but the latter's is distorted due to his darkened nature (1a.58.5). Consequently, even though both use Scripture, the Angel uses it in a superior manner and, therefore, is able to defeat the intellectual arguments of the Demon.

The final passage in the play serves as a summary of the work's message. The Virgin Mary, exhorting the audience to remember the lesson of the *auto*, states,

> Estimad con gran pureza
> el favor de su grandeza

---

passage can be found in St. Matthew's gospel account. Here, the wording is "vade post me Satana" (St. Matthew 16:23). Additionally, Christ uses a similar expression during His temptation in the wilderness: "tunc dicit ei Iesus vade Satanas" (St. Matthew 4:10). While in the play the quote refers specifically to Dionisio's salvation, these three Scripture passages are in the larger context of God's plan to save humankind.

y el que mi Hijo os ha hecho
la voluntad de mi pecho,
y vivid con gran limpieza.
De Domingo la oración,
del Ángel la intercesión,
de los cielos la asistencia,
de Dios la suma clemencia,
y en premio de la oración,
cubiertos de casto velo,
recibiréis gran consuelo
cuando os venga a la memoria. (212)

This final speech reinforces the pattern for spiritual victory represented through the story of Dionisio: the saints pray for sinners that seek to live in penance and ultimately experience salvation, angels assist in the process through intercession, and God grants favor and clemency. This work is not accomplished by one single person, but rather the Virgin describes the cooperative work which provides a spiritual communion for human beings in their struggle to attain salvation. The Virgin's final words provide comfort and instruction to the audience. She encourages them that they are not alone because God has provided spiritual help for Christians seeking to do penance. Thus, the doctrine illustrated in the story serves a didactic purpose. Through the act of watching the play, the audience could learn spiritual truth that would aid them in their own personal lives.

In sum, the representation of angels and demons in *La madrina del cielo* serves as an illustrated sermon intended to produce worthy Christian behavior. The supernatural characters primarily expound doctrine as they fulfill their roles within the context of the story of Dionisio and Doroteo. Even though the spiritual beings in the play perform essential roles, they remain distant from the human characters. They do not directly interact or carry on conversations with the people in the play. Rather, they speak generally in order to enlighten the audience about the spiritual battle around them

so as to encourage them to keep faith in God, live justly, and take heart that they are not struggling alone because the angels and saints assist them in their earthly journeys.

The Theological Drama: *El condenado por desconfiado*

Critics often compare the plot of *El condenado por desconfiado* to that of *La madrina del cielo* due to the abundance of evil deeds carried out by the protagonists. The first act opens as Paulo emerges from the cave in which he and Pedrisco, the *gracioso*, have been living in penance as hermits for the previous ten years. Paulo, after dreaming that he has died and gone to Hell, demands that God reveal to him whether or not he will eventually be saved or condemned to Hell. The Demon then appears, disguised as an angel, and tells him to go to Naples if he wants to learn the answer to his request. The Demon tells Paulo not to speak but rather to observe the life of Enrico, for the two will share the same eternal destiny.

Paulo, taking heart at the news and assuming Enrico to be a devout and pious man like himself, sets out for Naples with his companion. Upon arrival, he learns that Enrico is no saint. In reality, not only does he have a reputation as being the worst man in the entire city, but also Enrico openly boasts about his wicked lifestyle and his contempt for spiritual things.

Paulo's heart becomes sick upon learning this news, and he concludes that Enrico will spend eternity in Hell. Believing that he too will share the same fate, Paulo determines to return to the cave and live as a bandit, enjoying the same type of sinful lifestyle as Enrico and despairing of all hope of salvation.

In the second act Enrico visits his sickly father, Anareto. In this scene the cold-hearted villain demonstrates rare qualities of love and respect otherwise absent in his life. Then he takes leave of his father so that he can carry out a murder for which he has been hired. However, when he sees that his victim, Albano, is an elderly man who resembles his own father, Enrico decides not to carry out the deed. When Octavio, the one who paid him to commit the murder, discovers that Albano is still alive, he demands that Enrico return the money. When Enrico refuses, the two begin to fight and Enrico kills Octavio. Suddenly, the Governor appears on the scene and Enrico murders him as well. In the confusion that follows, Enrico escapes.

The following scene returns to the forest where Paulo and Pedrisco have joined a group of bandits. While the others are away, a shepherd enters the scene seeking a lost sheep. He comes upon Paulo and explains that the sheep has wandered away and that he, as a loving shepherd, will continue his search until he finds it. When Paulo discovers that one of the men from the group has captured Enrico, he decides to put the villain to a test to discern whether or not he has any hope of salvation. Paulo pleads with Enrico to confess before being killed, but Enrico refuses. Paulo responds with despair. He releases Enrico but not before explaining all that has transpired. Before departing, Enrico pauses to deliver a sermon-like admonition to Paulo, encouraging him to retain faith in God's mercy and goodness.

In the final act, Enrico and Pedrisco have been arrested and are awaiting their sentence. The Demon appears, although disguised so as to be unrecognizable, and opens a gate, tempting Enrico to escape. However, another voice encourages Enrico to remain in the cell if he wishes to be free. Enrico decides to stay. Immediately following, he

learns that for his crimes he is to be executed by hanging. When given the opportunity to repent, he becomes furious, believing that the mysterious voice has deceived him, and refuses. When Enrico's father arrives at the jail to plead with his son to repent, the villain, out of love for his father, submits and offers an elegant prayer of confession to God. He is then executed, and two angels carry his soul to Heaven.

The action of the play then returns to Paulo and his group of bandits who are being pursued by a group of laborers. Paulo is injured, and as he lies on the ground awaiting death, Pedrisco, who apparently has been released, appears and informs him that Enrico has repented. Paulo realizes that he has been deceived. However, he cannot find the faith even in death to confess, and he dies in a state of unbelief. In the last few moments of the play, Paulo speaks from Hell, admitting his error and taking responsibility for his own condemnation.

Critics have employed a variety of terms to describe the genre of this play. Ciriaco Morón and Rolena Adorno refer to it as a moral play (13), Margaret Wilson lists it as one of the dramatist's two "eschatological dramas" (*Tirso* 109), Hughes classifies it as one of the two "philosophic-religious masterpieces" (129), and Arellano categorizes it as "de tesis teológica" (*Historia* 335). A quick overview of the main themes of the work easily reveals the appropriateness of all of these terms: the play revolves around the moral actions and decisions of the two main characters and ends with a clear didactic message to have faith in God; the spectacular ending, in which Enrico is carried into Heaven and Paulo appears in the flames of Hell, underscores the eschatological nature of the work; and the numerous references by the characters to the hotly-debated

doctrines of free will and predestination provide a unifying philosophic and theological thread throughout the play.

In addition to the plot similarities to *La madrina*, *El condenado* also resembles certain aspects of the *auto*. First, while more prevalent in the latter, both plays contain sermon-like passages. For example, when the *Pastorcillo* appears, he preaches to Paulo of God's grace that abounds even for the most vile sinner (232); he reminds him that God has given human beings free will so that they can ask for mercy (232-33); and he includes examples such as St. Peter, Mary Magdalene, and others who sinned greatly and yet were graciously forgiven (234). Later, when Paulo explains to Enrico the reason he has lost hope, the latter responds with a surprising sermon on the importance of keeping faith in God despite one's wickedness, citing personal examples of his own state as "el hombre más malo / que naturaleza humana / en el mundo ha producido[,]" and yet,

> mas siempre tengo esperanzas
> en que tengo de salvarme,
> puesto que no va fundada
> mi esperanza en obras mías
> sino en saber que se humana
> Dios con el más pecador,
> y con su piedad se salva. (256)

Paulo himself delivers the final sermon after he has been condemned to Hell. In it he declares himself culpable for his fate and for allowing himself to have been deceived by the Demon (310).

A second similarity to *La madrina* relates to the spectacular ending of *El condenado*. After living a life of extreme depravity, Enrico finally confesses and is saved just before his execution. After his death, the stage notes relate the following: "*Con la música suben dos ángeles al alma de* Enrico *por una apariencia, y prosigue*

Paulo" (299). In a very dramatic way, Paulo actually witnesses the supernatural event of Enrico's flight into Heaven. This ending mirrors what often occurs in the hagiographic dramas: when the saint finally reaches Heaven, the ascent is physically represented in the play as a reminder to the audience of the reward that awaits the faithful. In this case, the ending provides even more hope for those who remain because Enrico embodies what many would deem an extreme example of sinfulness. Yet, he achieves Heaven by remaining true to his faith and hope in God, unlike Paulo who despairs.

Like *La madrina*, *El condenado* includes many references to angels and demons as a part of the ordinary speech of the characters. When Enrico makes his first entrance during the play, he does so yelling and swearing at Lisandro and Octavio. The two men then ask if Enrico is somehow related to Celia, to which Enrico proclaims, "Soy / el diablo" (168). Shortly thereafter, when Enrico describes how he chased away Octavio and Lisandro with his sword, Lidora replies in exasperation, "Malhaya quien bien os quiere, / rufianes de Belcebú" (175). Here she employs the name of Beelzebub, a New Testament title that refers to Satan's position as the chief demon, as a way of comparing Enrico and Galván's actions to those of Satan (Fenlon "Beelzebub").[119] In the scene where Octavio demands that Enrico repay him the blood money, Galván states, "Ya los dos / riñen; el diablo no duerme" (220). His statement connects the fact that evil deeds never cease on earth due to the Devil's constant attempts to cause strife among human beings. Enrico then becomes furious and kills Octavio. During his escape he encounters a group of men who are accompanying the Governor. As Enrico passes through the group, he jabs his sword at all those he can reach. The Governor, just before Enrico

[119] Fenlon's article cites St. Matthew 12:24-29 and St. Luke 11:15-22 as support ("Beelzebub").

murders him, exclaims, "¿Eres demonio?" (223). His question is logical given both the wild actions of the bandit and the rebellious assault Enrico carries out against his position of authority.

In Act Two when Paulo's group of bandits capture Enrico, Pedrisco, the *gracioso*, asks him where he is going. Enrico responds, "Al infierno" (240). Pedrisco retorts, "Pues, ¿quién le mete en cansarse / cuando hay diablos tan ligeros / que le llevarán de balde?" (240). Even though the statement is intended to be humorous, it demonstrates through a word play that not only do demons seek to lead human beings into condemnation, but they also carry them to Hell. Shortly thereafter when Pedrisco inquires as to his name, Enrico defiantly states, "Llámome el diablo" (240).

A final reference to a demon occurs at the end of the second act when Paulo reiterates his determination to live a wicked life due to his belief that God has predestined him to Hell: "Mi adverso fin no resisto, / pues mi desventura he visto, / y da claro testimonio / el vestirme de demonio / y el desnudarme de Cristo" (252). His poetic imagery of exchanging his Christ-like garments for demon-like ones is the antithesis of the imagery St. Paul employs in Colossians 3:1-15 and Ephesians 4:21-32 in which he instructs Christians to remove the old garments of the flesh and put on the new garments of holiness. Paulo's use of this biblical imagery reveals his despair. In his opinion there is no reason to continue trying to live a life of penance since he will not be permitted into Heaven. Consequently, he replaces not only the attire of a hermit with that of a bandit but also the deeds of penance with the deeds of a villain.

The many references to angels and demons in the play fulfill several important functions. First, they serve as comparative statements to demonstrate the extent of the

evil deeds that the characters perform. Second, they add humor to the dialogue by ascribing demonic functions to human beings through clever word plays. Finally, they provide connections to biblical imagery in order to enhance the overall thematic unity of the work.

In addition to examples from characters' speech, four additional areas of analysis exist which account for the remaining references to angels and demons and their appearances in the play. The first area relates to the initial appearance of the Demon. During Paulo's opening monologue, he describes his longing to reach Heaven. However, rather than give praise to God and affirm his faith in divine mercy, he emphasizes the great distance that separates the two:

> Mas ya que es imposible
> y sé cierto Señor que me estáis viendo
> desde ese inaccesible
> trono de luz hermoso a quien sirviendo
> están ángeles bellos
> más que la luz del sol, hermosos ellos. (142-43)

The image of God on His throne surrounded by the angels that serve Him is a biblical one (Apocalypse 7:11). However, Paulo views God as inaccessible. He views the angels that surround Him as only His servants. He does not seem to realize in this moment that God has assigned angels to human beings to encourage and help them in their journey to heaven. Paulo appears to hold a distorted view of God's intent for His creation. His initial speech reveals that he has forgotten St. Peter's declaration about God's forbearance and mercy: "[t]he Lord delayeth not his promise, as some imagine, but dealeth patiently for your sake, not willing that any should perish, but that all should return to penance" (2 St. Peter 3:9). The fact that Paulo is living in penance and aware

of his need for salvation should encourage him. However, since he does not appear to view God as personal and loving, he allows doubt to plague him.

Paulo's subsequent statement further reveals his fear. As he exits the cave upon awaking from the dream, he exclaims, "[S]in duda, que a mi Dios tengo enojado, / si no es que, acaso el enemigo fuerte / haya aquesta ilusión representado" (148). Once again Paulo fears that he has offended God in some unknown way, even though he briefly admits the possibility that the source of the dream could be demonic. However, Paulo seems to prefer the idea that God desires that he suffer emotionally instead of believing that the Devil is simply trying to discourage him from his life of penance.

Paulo's account of the dream itself further illustrates the uselessness of his good deeds to earn Heaven for him:

> Leyó mis culpas, y mi Guarda santa
> leyó mis buenas obras, y el Justicia
> Mayor del Cielo, que es aquel que espanta
> de la infernal morada la malicia,
> las puso en dos balanzas, mas levanta
> el peso de mi culpa y mi injusticia
> mis obras buenas tanto, que el Juez Santo
> me condena a los reinos del espanto. (149)

A key aspect of this judgment is the fact that even though Paulo is aware that he has a Guardian Angel , he does not have much confidence in the spiritual being's role as an intercessor. In his view, his Guardian Angel serves only as a part of the judicial action that will sentence him to Hell rather than as a spiritual helper that God has graciously appointed to him.[120] Furthermore, Paulo's faith in the dream's message underscores

[120] While it is true that the Church accepts the existence of Guardian Angels to some degree, the details of the doctrine have never been clearly defined, leaving ample room for speculation. Hugh Pope cites St. Thomas to show that while Guardian Angels will remain with human beings in Heaven after the Final Judgment, their purpose will not be "to help us attain salvation" ("Guardian Angel"). This does not necessarily mean that

again that he doubts God's goodness and mercy. Consequently, he begins to expect that he will ultimately be condemned for his sins.

When the Demon appears for the first time, he does so "*en lo alto*" so as not to be seen by Paulo until the appropriate time arrives (150). In this manner, the Demon is able to explain to the audience his plan before executing it.[121] The first thing that the Demon shares with the audience is that Paulo has exhibited great strength in resisting his repeated attacks over the past ten years: "Diez años ha que persigo / a este monje en el desierto, / recordándole memorias / y pasados pensamientos, / y siempre le he hallado firme / como un gran peñasco opuesto" (150).[122] In this quotation, the Demon reveals his function as an accuser: he brings to mind past sinful deeds in hopes of discouraging human beings from doing penance.[123] Ironically, the Demon also admits that until now, Paulo has successfully resisted his attacks.

---

the Guardian Angels will take no part in the Final Judgment, but neither does it indicate that presenting evidence of human beings' good deeds is a function they will perform. The fact that this scene is included in the play, despite its lack of dogmatic basis, could illustrate popular belief from Tirso's day about Guardian Angels, which the play would then reinforce. However, absent any proof from the period, this conclusion also is highly speculative.

[121] Daniel Rogers shows that this dramatic technique is one of the many ways in which Tirso uses staging techniques in order to enhance the drama's effectiveness: "'Lo alto' refers to the gallery above the back of the stage. If Paulo as he prays is facing the front he will have his back to this gallery. The audience sees the devil, as a devil, long before Paulo sees him disguised as an angel. The devil points down at his unseeing victim and tells the audience his plan. Having seen the trap set, they watch Paulo step into it. This favourite device of comedy, daringly used against a tragic hero, ensures that, almost from the first, Paulo is seen to be in the wrong" (2).

[122] According to *Autoridades*, a "peñasco" is a "[s]itio elevado todo de piedra, ſin mezcla de tierra" ("Peñasco"). By comparing Paulo to a high, stone cliff, the Demon indicates that Paulo has been inaccessible to his attacks. The absence of earth in the rock formation further emphasizes the strength at which he has resisted. Ironically, this terminology is similar to Paulo's view of God as distant, cold, and hard-hearted.

[123] This theme is reiterated when Paulo awaits Enrico in Naples: "¡Oh vil Contrario, / livianos pensamientos me fatigan, / Oh cuerpo flaco! Hermano, escuche / . . . / El

The Demon's first speech also reveals aspects of his knowledge. For example, he discerns from Paulo's actions that the hermit has begun to doubt: "Hoy duda en su fe, que es duda / de la fe lo que hoy ha hecho" (150). Even though Paulo is alone when he makes his statements about the dream and subsequent demand to God, the Demon is aware of what has transpired. These statements illustrate what St. Thomas Aquinas described as the knowledge that comes not from the thoughts as they appear in the mind but as they outwardly manifest themselves (1a.57.4). The Demon also understands the way of salvation: "porque es la fe, en el cristiano, / que sirviendo a Dios y haciendo / buenas obras, ha de ir / a gozar de Él, en muriendo" (150-51). St. Thomas also affirmed that angels (and, consequently, demons) can possess this type of knowledge at an even greater level than human beings (1a.57.5).

Due to his intuitive knowledge of grace, the Demon also manages to discern the severity of the sin Paulo has committed: "En la soberbia también / ha pecado, caso en cierto. / Nadie como yo lo sabe, / pues por soberbio padezco" (151).[124] The Demon has observed that Paulo has proudly put more confidence in the dream than in God: "Un sueño la causa ha sido, / y el anteponer un sueño / a la fe de Dios, ¿quién duda / que es pecado manifiesto?" (151). Due to the knowledge of Paulo that the Demon possesses, he is able to plan his future attacks with greater precision in hopes of seeing another soul damned.

Contrario me tienta con memoria / de los pasados gustos" (180). Here Paulo refers to the Devil as an enemy with whom he is currently in battle. According to *Autoridades*, the word "Contrario" can mean "[e]l que tiene enemiſtad con otro, y eſtá encontrado con él, que comunmente ſe llama Enemígo" ("Contrario"). The reference to the enemy recalls the biblical description of the Devil as an adversary who seeks to destroy.

[124] The Demon's reference to pride as the source of his fall identifies him more specifically as Lucifer. It also reiterates St. Thomas's assessment of the cause of his fall: *superbia* (1a.63.2).

While the Demon reveals much about the extent of his knowledge, his intellect is still limited. His problematic statement that for the last ten years he has continually reminded Paulo of past memories and thoughts cannot mean that he knows the actual thoughts as they were in Paulo's memory, but rather that he perceived them from Paulo's outward manifestation of them. Additionally, even though the Demon knows that Paulo has begun to doubt, he does not know at this point whether or not Paulo will indeed be condemned in the end: "y responderé a su intento / cosas que le han de costar / su condenación, si puedo" (151).

The Demon also demonstrates two additional aspects of his ability in his opening speech. The first is that, even though he seeks to lead human beings into perdition, he is in himself unable to force them to sin: "Y así me ha dado licencia / el Juez más supremo y recto, / para que con más engaños / le incite ahora de nuevo" (151). Second, the Demon is able to change his appearance in order to deceive more effectively: "De ángel tomaré la forma" (151). The stage directions indicate the way in which this transformation occurs: "*Quítase* El Demonio *la túnica y queda de ángel*" (152). St. Thomas explained that even though angels are non-corporeal beings (1a.50.1), they are able to take on a bodily form for the purpose of a specific task (1a.51.2). However, this scene presents certain complications for representing this teaching. The Demon has indicated that he will "take an angelic form" (151). Technically, as a spiritual being, he never lost his form as an angel. However, in order to illustrate for the audience that a change has taken place, the Demon removes his cloak—a visible symbol

that associates him as a demon.[125] By uncovering an angelic form, the dramatist is able to establish a connection to his fall and also to the fact that he can change his appearance so as to deceive Paulo.[126]

Once the Demon has finished his initial speech, he then appears to Paulo. Paulo's reaction upon seeing the supposed angel further emphasizes his proud condition. First, he immediately repeats his request to God: "¡Dios mío, aquesto os suplico! / ¿Salvaréme, Dios inmenso? / ¿Iré a gozar vuestra gloria? / Que me respondáis espero" (152). It is important to note that Paulo does not react by prostrating himself in fear and respect as did those in Scripture who encountered angels.[127] Rather, he resists the natural response in his hope that God will grant his demand: "¡Que mal el temor resisto!" (152).

The instructions that the Demon gives to Paulo illustrate the crafty way in which he uses his knowledge as a deceptive tool. In the play the Demon seems to know Enrico's current location in Naples, that he is the son of Anareto, and that the father is a pious man (152-53). Consequently, the Demon hopes that Paulo, if he heeds the

---

[125] The idea of the covering to represent the character as a demon employs imagery similar to that of the account in Genesis when God covered Adam and Eve after they sinned. Prior to that point they did not require clothing.

[126] This quotation recalls the Devil's ability to appear as an angel of light as described earlier in *La madrina*. Even though this particular quotation does not reference light, when the Demon does appear, Paulo makes reference to the light that radiates from the supposed angel: "Ciego en mirarlo he quedado" (152). Interestingly, when St. Paul states that Satan has the ability to appear as an angel of light, in context he is discussing false teachers in the Corinthian church that had disguised themselves as God's apostles. They appeared convincing, yet they proclaimed a false message. St. Paul emphasizes the point that appearances often deceive, just as the Devil seeks to trick human beings by making himself appear in a beautiful and attractive form (2 Corinthians 11:1-15). Ironically, in *El condenado*, the Demon changes his appearance so he can effectively deliver his false prophecy in order to lead Paulo into condemnation.

[127] Some examples include Abraham in Genesis 18:2, Zachary (also known as Zechariah from the King James Version) in St. Luke 1:11-12, and the shepherds in St. Luke 2:9.

message, will be able to see enough truth in the prophecy that the doubter will be more likely to believe what the Demon does not know, namely, the eternal destiny of each individual. The Demon does place one restriction on Paulo by instructing him simply to observe Enrico: "Verle y callar, / contemplando sus acciones, / sus obras y sus palabras" (153). The Demon knows that Enrico's actions are extremely wicked. He also knows Paulo's weakness in desiring knowledge reserved for God.[128] Thus, he aptly lays a clever trap.

As the case in his first speech, the Demon's conversation with Paulo contains some additional theological problems regarding his knowledge. One of the points St. Thomas often reiterates in the *Summa* is that only God is omniscient. While it is true that angels possess a higher knowledge than do human beings, their knowledge is not perfect as is God's (1a.54.3). One area of limitation regards future events. While the angels do know the future as relates to God's overall plan, they are not informed about the specific actions that human beings will perform, unless, of course, they have perceived them by some outward expression that individuals have made (1a.57.3). There is no indication in this passage that the Demon has discerned such information. By portraying the Demon as having more knowledge than he truly possesses, the

[128] Lewis J. Hutton explains this key aspect to Paulo's sin: "Paulo craves timeless and absolute verification of divine reality at the finite, personal, human level. As a human being he wishes to know as God knows and so repeats all over again the sin of Adam with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This desire blinds Paulo to all the evidence in the world as well as to the special revelation in the young shepherd that God is reaching out to give him the salvation he wishes to earn" (60).

dramatist is able to create an intriguing situation and heighten the level of suspense for the audience who, more than likely is unaware that the representation is problematic.[129]

Once the Demon has taken leave of Paulo, the success of his deceit becomes evident throughout the play as the doubter reiterates multiple times the faith he has placed in the Demon's message. When Enrico and his companions arrive, Paulo initially believes he has mistaken Enrico for someone else. However, Paulo has remembered important details of the supposed angel's message and carefully compares them to what he observes. When he discovers that the wicked man speaking is the son of Anareto, Paulo exclaims: "Las señas que me dio el ángel / son suyas" (198). A few lines later as the reality of Enrico's sinfulness becomes manifest, Paulo reaffirms the authority of the angel's message by stating, "El ángel de Dios me dijo" (198). Now he no longer questions whether or not the dream, and by extension, the prophecy, could have originated from the Devil. He resolutely accepts the divine nature of the message:

> Enrico, pues imitarte
> te tendo, y acompañarte,
> y tú te has de condenar,
> contigo me has de llevar,
> que nunca pienso dejarte.
> Palabra del ángel fue.
> tu camino seguiré. (229)

His deception continues until the end of the play when he is condemned to Hell. Only then does Paulo realize what the Demon has effectively accomplished (310).

The third area for analysis concerns the scene in the forest when Paulo tests Enrico. This episode contains two references to angels. The first comes when Paulo recounts to Enrico all the events that have transpired, beginning with the angel's

[129] They also are very likely unconcerned with doctrinal purity on this issue and more interested in the entertainment value of the play.

appearance and ending with Paulo's expected condemnation. Enrico's response contains the second reference: "Las palabras que Dios dice / por un ángel, son palabras, / Paulo amigo, en que se encierran / cosas que el hombre no alcanza" (255). His comment emphasizes a key difference between the two men. While Paulo has placed ultimate confidence in the angel's message, Enrico admits that as a human being he cannot understand the mysteries of God. His statement reflects a truth about God found in Isaiah's prophecy: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts" (Isaiah 55:8-9). Even though there is no reference to angels in these particular verses, the surrounding context connects to Enrico's speech in two ways. First, the preceeding verses submit a call to repentance:

> Seek ye the Lord, while he may be found: call upon him, while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unjust man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God: for he is bountiful to forgive. (Isaiah 55:6-7)

This plea incorporates the balance that Paulo lacks. He has earnestly sought the Lord, but he has not repented of his arrogance and proud thoughts. Consequently, he no longer has faith in God's mercy. Enrico, despite the appearances of what the supposed angel has revealed, exhorts Paulo not to lose faith, but rather to continue to seek God:

> No dejara yo la vida
> que seguías, pues fue causa
> de que quizá te condenes
> el atreverte a dejarla.
> Desesperación ha sido
> lo que has hecho, y aun venganza
> de la palabra de Dios,
> y una oposición tirana
> a su inefable poder. (255)

Second, the subsequent verses from Isaiah describe the power and surety of God's Word:

> And as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return no more thither, but soak the earth, and water it, and make it to spring, and give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper in the things for which I sent it. (Isaiah 55:10-11)

In the context of this passage, the prophet states that God will always keep His promise, even if human beings do not understand His ways. The entire emphasis of the passage is to foster faith in God, the One who has promised that He is merciful, and that those who seek Him will find Him. Enrico seems to retain this aspect of faith. As he continues admonishing Paulo, Enrico states that even though he considers himself to be "el hombre más malo / que naturaleza humana / en el mundo ha producido" (256), he does not despair. He realizes that God is merciful and gracious:

> mas siempre tengo esperanzas
> en que tengo de salvarme,
> puesto que no va fundada
> mi esperanza en obras mías
> sino en saber que se humana
> Dios con el más pecador,
> y con su piedad se salva.[130] (256)

Nevertheless, Paulo refuses to believe that God is merciful. He places his faith in his ability to discern what he has heard and seen apart from what God has revealed. He exhibits his pride by not heeding the instruction given by the apostles. In his first epistle, St. John writes, "Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 St. John

[130] According to *Autoridades,* the verb "humanarse" oftentimes refers to the incarnation of the Christ ("Humanarse"). In this context, the dramatist not only affirms that God is merciful, but he also connects His mercy to the Incarnation with a word play that highlights not only that Christ came to earth to save, but also that He became a human being and, consequently, can relate to the struggles people face. See Hebrews 4:15.

4:1). Additionally, St. Paul states, “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema” (Galatians 1:8). The reality is that Paulo has been deceived by a false prophet disguised as an angel. Consequently, for placing his faith in a false message, he despairs and is ultimately condemned.

The fourth area for analysis explores the prison scene in which Enrico contemplates the conflicting messages of the mysterious voices. The first voice, that of the Demon, promises to set him free from the prison: “Librarte, Enrico, pretendo” (275). True to his nature, the Demon mixes some truth with his deceit. Even though he verifies his power by visibly appearing and opening a door in the wall for Enrico to escape, the freedom he offers is only temporal. He promises liberty from the cell in exchange for the enslavement of Enrico’s soul. Meanwhile, the other voices present their contrasting message in song: “Detén el paso violento, / mira que te está mejor / que de la prisión librarte / el estarte en la prisión” (277). The Musicians encourage him to remain in the cell, rather than take the immediate solution to his problems. They seem to know that if he chooses not to escape, he will have another opportunity to repent before his death.

Enrico, in a rare change of character, does not immediately react to the situation according to his passions. He desires freedom, but he also wants to know the identity of those who address him. When he asks the first speaker, “¿Quién eres?” (277), the Demon replies, “Salte al momento / y no preguntes quién soy; / que yo también preso estoy / y que te libres intento” (277). The Demon knows Enrico well enough to keep his

true identity a secret. He admits that he too is a prisoner, but he does not explain the reason for his captivity.

Furthermore, as Enrico contemplates the other voices encouraging him to remain in the cell, the Demon again tries to deceive him by saying, "Esa, Enrico, es ilusión / que te representa el miedo" (278). Now the Demon appeals to Enrico's pride by insinuating that fear is what truly keeps him from taking the escape offered him. However, the Musicians' voices again contradict the Demon: "Detente, engañado Enrico; / no huyas de la prisión, / pues morirás si salieres / y si te estuvieres, no" (278). Enrico decides to heed the advice of the hidden voices, and the Demon departs. His final words are "[a]tribúyelo a temor; / pero, pues tan ciego estás, / quédate preso y verás / cómo te ha estado peor" (279).

Ironically, even though Enrico has chosen well, he does not yet fully understand the message that he has believed. In fact, when appearances indicate that the Musicians had lied to him, he becomes angry and says,

> Voz, que por mi mal te oí
> en esa región del aire,
> ¿fuiste de algún enemigo
> que así pretendió vengarse?
> ¿No dijiste que a mi vida
> le importaba de la cárcel
> no hacer ausencia? Pues di:
> ¿cómo quieren ya sacarme
> a ajusticiar? Falsa fuiste.
> Pero yo también cobarde,
> pues que me pude salir
> y no dar venganza a nadie. (285)

Upset by the apparent deceit, Enrico begins to accept the Demon's explanation and attribute his own actions to cowardice. However, by remaining in the prison as the Musicians had instructed, he gains one more opportunity to confess before his

execution. His father, whom he continues to respect, pleads with him to repent. Moved by the love of his father, Enrico finally yields. As soon as he confesses, his spiritual eyes are opened: "La enigma he entendido ya / De la voz y de la sombra: / la voz era angelical, / y la sombra era el demonio" (291). Enrico realizes that, despite appearances, the angels spoke the truth and the true illusion was that of the Demon's cunning deceit.[131]

In sum, *El condenado por desconfiado* represents similar functions of angels and demons to those of *La madrina*. The Devil is cunning and deceptive. He is an adversary and an accuser. He tempts human beings and seeks to lead them into eternal destruction. The angels serve God, encourage human beings toward faith in God, and accompany souls into Heaven.

A key trait in the play is the central role the Demon occupies in the overall plot development, especially as relates to the thought processes of the main characters. The dramatist develops the theme that the Demon deceives by using his superior knowledge to mix truth with error. Likewise, he presents the way in which the characters contemplate the Demon's messages and their reactions to his lies. Both of these elements potentially increase the dramatic tension for the audience and intensify the level of suspense as they try to anticipate the eternal destinies of the two men.

---

[131] The only additional appearance of angels in the play occurs near the play's end when Enrico is escorted to heaven. According to the stage notes, "*Con la música suben dos ángeles al alma de* Enrico *por una apariencia, y prosigue* Paulo" (299). This note indicates that the ascent was apparently visible to those present at Enrico's death. When Pedrisco recounts the event to Paulo, he states, "[F]uera de aqueso, en muriendo / resonó en los aires claros / una música divina, / y, para mayor milagro, / dos Paraninfos se vieron, / que llevaban, entre ambos, / el alma de Enrico al Cielo" (305). *Autoridades* defines "paraninfos" as follows: "En su riguroso significado es el padrino de las bodas. Comunmente se toma por el que anuncia alguna felicidad" ("Paraninfo"). This spectacular ending again underscores the didactic nature of the work.

El condenado is not as complete in its doctrinal treatment of angels as is *La madrina* due perhaps to the differences in genres. The words and images the dramatist employs do not recall as much of the scriptural basis for the Demon's actions. Rather, he represents the Demon's capabilities more flexibly and imaginitively than in *La madrina*. The liberties he takes most likely reflect a purposeful attempt to increase the entertainment value and heighten the dramatic effect of the play. Finally, *El condenado*, as was true for *La madrina*, does evidence a strong moral and didactic intent as it seeks to inspire faith in God for salvation and to promote orthodox doctrine.

The Hagiographic Plays

In her study on hagiographic dramas in the Spanish Golden Age, Elma Dassbach identifies four key criteria of the genre: 1) the person represented must be a canonized saint or, on occasion, a person that the public commonly perceives to be holy and devout in a similar manner to beatified saints; 2) the play must dramatize some aspect of the process through which the person became a saint; 3) the intent of the work as a hagiographic drama must be clear from the outset; and 4) the play must record supernatural evidence of the special grace bestowed on the person (*Comedia* 1). Additionally, she includes a taxonomy of hagiographic plays based on the way in which the saint achieves beatification. The types of saint plays she includes are mendicants, converts, martyrs, and miracle workers (*Comedia* 3). Since the plays for analysis in this study meet these qualifications to varying degrees, discussion of genre classification, as well as any related problems, will precede the textual analysis.

El caballero de gracia

El caballero de gracia details the struggles that the protagonist, Jacobo, faces as a result of his desire not only to live a pious life but also to encourage others to do so as well. As the play opens, the Caballero, Jacobo, tries to explain to his brother-in-law, Lamberto, why he is uncomfortable with the plan for him to marry Sabina.[132] Lamberto, motivated by the financial gain the union would bring, tries anyway to convince Jacobo to talk to her. He finally agrees. However, when the two meet, Jacobo only succeeds in offending the lady. Lamberto becomes angry and forces the Caballero to leave.

Jacobo then decides to go to Bolonia. During his departure, he is attacked by bandits, stripped of his clothing and other belongings, and left tied to a tree. Ricote, the Caballero's servant, returns to Lamberto to inform him about what has happened. However, Lamberto decides not to help his brother-in-law because he expects Julio Cataño, nephew of the Cardinal of San Marcelo, to arrive soon. What Lamberto does not know is that Cataño has just met Jacobo in the forest. When Julio stops to pray, the Caballero responds instinctively to Julio's act of devotion by uttering the subsequent lines of the prayer, despite the fact that his enemies have left him bound and humiliated. Impressed by Jacobo's singular devotion, Cataño decides to make him his secretary.

The second act reveals that Lamberto has plotted to ruin the Caballero's reputation. When Jacobo tells Don Cristóbal de Mora of Lamberto's plan, the latter intervenes and forces Lamberto to make restitution, resulting in the loss of his fortune. Meanwhile, Doña Juana, a Portuguese princess residing in Madrid, plans to establish a monastery and hospital within the city. Julio sends Jacobo to assist in the process. When

[132] Sabina is Lamberto's sister.

he arrives, the Princess offers the Caballero a position in her service and Portuguese citizenship, two honors he readily accepts. Later, as he is passing through the city, Jacobo arrives at the Puerta del Sol and determines that it would be the ideal spot for the construction. When Jacobo discovers that the place is a brothel, he informs the Cardinal about the problem. However, the Cardinal does nothing to resolve the issue, and Jacobo determines to take it before the Princess. Meanwhile, Lamberto and Sabina find themselves in financial trouble. Jacobo, moved by their need, generously decides to pay their debt.

In the third act, the Caballero appears before the King and Princess to appeal to them about the state of the Puerta del Sol and his desire to transform it into a holy place. Doña Juana, pleased by his desire, instructs her servants to give him some money for the expenses and then requests that he become her chaplain. As he leaves the court, he encounters a captain who is planning to steal in order to feed his family. Jacobo compassionately gives him one hundred ducats from the money he has just received to keep the captain from having to commit sin to meet his family's physical needs.

Upon returning, the Caballero discovers that Ricote has committed adultery. Outraged that his own servant could engage in such wickedness, Jacobo decides to dimiss him. Later, the captain returns and demands two hundred additional ducats. Jacobo promises him the money, even though he is not sure how to procure it. Suddenly, an angel appears and supplies him with the amount he needs. Humbled by such a gracious act, Jacobo praises God and determines to continue being generous. He gives the money to the captain but warns him to live virtuously. The play then quickly ends with a fury of activity: Lamberto and Sabina ask for forgiveness, Ricote returns

penitent to Jacobo, and the group decides to return to Rome for the installation of the new Pope.

In *El caballero,* a great deal of mystery surrounds the identity of the saint represented. Although Ríos identifies the protagonist as either "Jacobo Gratis o de Trenci (1517-1619)," she provides no additional information about his life, apart from the convent and church he founded in Madrid (3: 261). Other references to the man appear in two articles from the archives of the Spanish newspaper *El País*. First, Carlos Gurméndez's 1989 article briefly recounts the legend of Jacobo de Gratis. However, the details of the man's life are quite different from those of the play. Both the play and the article indicate that Jacobo was of Italian origin; and Gurméndez describes him as "un hombre muy rico [y] poderoso" who behaved as a "perfecto libertino" ("Misterios"). This description contrasts starkly with the humble, pious man from the play. The second article, by Rafael Fraguas (1999), briefly describes the status of the restoration of the church *El Oratorio del Caballero de Gracia*, located in Madrid near Gran Vía. He also affirms some of the legend of "Jacopo Trenci de Grattis," but he attributes the reputation to an unnamed *zarzuela* that portrayed the man's life as "desenfrenada y concupiscente" ("Caballero"). Fraguas goes on to clarify that in reality he was "un noble italiano, diplomático y consejero pontificio, que destacó como intérprete en el Concilio de Trento antes de profesar votos" ("Caballero"). However, even after dispelling the myth behind the man, he then proceeds to state that Trenci did not actually found the church.[133] Rather he insists that the "Oratorio" was established in 1654. This particular date is problematic with regard to the play if Tirso indeed was the

[133] Fraguas in his article asserts that the dates 1517-1619 apply to de Trenci ("Caballero").

author, for the dramatist died in 1648. Key details of the saint's life would then be unknown to the dramatist.

Despite the conflicting information, *El Oratorio del Caballero de Gracia* still exists today. According to its official website, "El Oratorio pertenece a la Asociación Eucarística del Caballero de Gracia, fundada por Jacobo Gratii, el Caballero de Gracia, a finales del siglo XVI" ("Real Oratorio"), contradicting the information in Fraguas's article. The additional information the website provides verifies the man's origin, dates of birth and death, and pious deeds. Interestingly, the webpage notes that much confusion exists about his name, listing "Gratis, Grazzi, Grattils, Gratil, Gracia, etc." as last names people have used to refer to him ("Real Oratorio"). While the website does state that four biographies have been written about Jacobo Gratti's life, there are no citations within the text to clarify sources for the information provided. It simply lists the names of the biographies in a note.[134] Consequently, it appears as though popular belief about the saint has overshadowed much of the documentation available, explaining in part why Ríos may have listed his name as mentioned previously.

When evaluating the play according to Dassbach's four criteria for hagiographic plays, all prove true of the work with the exception of one. The protagonist does not appear to be an officially canonized saint, although the historic figure does appear to have been a priest. Thus, one could classify the play as a hagiographic drama about a mendicant who through popular belief merits sainthood. Further supporting this classification is the fact that the dramatist, who very likely lived at the same time as the

[134] The fact that Alonso Remón, a contemporary of Tirso and a fellow dramatist, authored the first biography listed does lend a greater level of credibility to the website's information ("Real Oratorio").

saint, represented Jacobo as a dedicated, pious, selfless servant of God and others despite the obstacles he faced in his life.[135]

In *El caballero*, the Angel appears only once in one of the final scenes. However, as was true in the first two plays, the characters make multiple references to angels and demons as a part of their ordinary speech. For example, once Jacobo discovers the brothel, he begins to compare the evil deeds committed in the place to the work of the Devil. The first of these references underscores the theological teaching that evil's authority was technically conquered when Christ came to earth in order to minister and sacrifice Himself for sin. As Jacobo laments the presence of the brothel he has encountered, he responds by calling out to the Virgin and exclaiming, "Ya tengo casa que os dar; / del mundo salió por Vos / el demonio, que habitar / juntos, mal podréis los dos" (288). This quotation reveals the paradox with which he struggles. Using a word play about light and darkness, Jacobo speaks of his desire to consecrate to the Virgin this "Puerta del Sol" (288), yet darkness has permeated the area through the Demon's work. Ironically, he states that because of the Virgin and her role in the Redemption, the Devil has already been conquered. Nevertheless, evil still pervades and

[135] Hughes classifies the work as a historic-religious play, a subgenre she defines as follows: "By successfully augmenting the religious element with material inspired by the people and events of the Iberian Peninsula, the historic-religious plays break the restrictive bonds of the hagiographic works. In many cases, these plays deal with the persons who contributed to the growth of the Catholic church, but the temporal aspect is not ignored, as was the case in the hagiographic plays" (111). With regard to the historic figure represented, Hughes states, "One year after the death of the centenarian Jacobo de Gratis (1517-1619), Tirso de Molina presented a dramatized account of his life in *El caballero de gracia* (1620). The play concerns the pious life of the Italian ascetic who transferred his residence to Madrid, where he directed his energies to the founding of convents, hospitals, and churches. Today his memory is kept alive in the capital city by the street that bears his name and by the institutions that owe their existence to his efforts" (112).

attempts to destroy human beings while dwelling with the good. He concludes by calling on the Devil to depart so that all will see that virtue ultimately conquers wickedness: "Salga de aquí, pues abrasa / la corte su vil noticia, / verá la gente que pasa, / si fué casa a la malicia, / que es ya de la virtud casa" (288).[136] At the close of the scene, Jacobo ends by asking God to give him victory in this battle: "Dios me le ofrece / para que le suplique que al demonio / quite el colegio vil de gente infame" (288). His ultimate desire is to take away the territory the Devil has occupied and replace it with a new community that will teach virtue.[137]

In the scenes that follow, Jacobo makes several other references to the Devil regarding the sinful activity at the Puerta del Sol. In his statements he incorporates a variety of images that describe his belief concerning those who do not act against unrighteousness. When he speaks to the Cardinal, he asks, "Ilustrísimo Príncipe: ¿es posible / que en mitad desta corte se consienta / tienda al demonio que le pague renta?" (289). Here he uses monetary images to convince the Cardinal that inaction is in reality a form of payment to the Devil that ensures the persistence of prostitution in the city. Later, when he learns that the Cardinal will not close the house, he prays to the Virgin, "¿Casa dan al demonio en esta corte / y os la niegan a Vos?" (289). In this quotation he emphasizes the notion of a home. By refusing to take away a house of the Devil, the

[136] In this quotation Jacobo addresses the Virgin's role in the process of Redemption as the sinless mother of the Messiah and, consequently, co-redeemer. In this way he aligns himself not only with the official teachings of the Church but also within the tradition seeking to promote veneration of the Virgin and devotion to her. This trait is similar to that of *La madrina*. However, he very likely references St. Paul's teaching in Romans 6-8 in which he explores the paradox of Jesus' sacrifice on the cross conquering sin combined with the reality of the continued struggle with sin that Christians experience.
[137] One of the definitions that *Autoridades* includes for "colegio" designates the word as a community of people that live together under the rules of a certain governing body ("Colegio").

Cardinal also refuses to honor the Virgin by establishing a house for her. Finally, when he speaks to the King and Princess, he employs the imagery of political exile to describe his actions, ridding the house of the demonic deeds and filling it with imagery from the monastery: "desterré al demonio y puse / celdas, iglesia y campana" (294). By evicting the Devil from the Puerta del Sol, he is able to transform the area into a house of devotion.

Another context in which references to demons appear relates to Ricote's illicit sexual relationship with Inés. Before he is found to be an adulterer, he foreshadows what will happen when he exclaims, "¡Válgate el diablo, amor impertinente!" (296). In this context, the reference to the Devil serves as a curse Ricote utters. Later, once Jacobo has discovered the two lovers, Inés admits, "Ya lo ve; / engañónos el demonio" (302), underscoring the Devil's function as a deceiver.

A final reference to angels occurs as Jacobo contemplates the opportunity offered to him by the Princess to become a priest. As he struggles with whether or not he should accept the offer, he evaluates his own worthiness by comparing himself to the angels. First he says, "Los ángeles sin diezmo han alcanzado / la dignidad del sacerdocio eterno" (297). Here he emphasizes the fact that the angels are minstering spirits by God's grace—they have obtained it without paying tithes.[138] Likewise, this opportunity represents God's favor to him in allowing such holy service. Later, when talking to a painter, he states, "Angeles que habéis servido / a Dios de escabel y asiento.

[138] The expression could also relate to the fact that the priests lived from the tithes that people gave. The angels, on the other hand, do not receive tithes. Nevertheless, they have an eternal priesthood. However, given the overall context of the scene and the deliberation about whether or not he is worthy of such a position, the above interpretation seems more appropriate.

/ Y en honra de las bellezas / de vuestras jerarquías santas, / ponéis debajo las plantas / de María las cabezas" (299). In this quotation he references the fact that the angels are organized into hierarchies and that they also serve the Virgin Mary. He finally makes up his mind to accept the Princess's offer when he overhears two men make the following statement: "Aunque se asombre / de un presidente el poder, / si un ángel no lo ha de ser, / forzoso es el sello un hombre" (299). In context, the men are discussing the results of an election. However, Jacobo interprets these words as a sign that he should accept the position as chaplain, implying divine approval of the decision.

The second area of analysis probes into the scene in which the angel enters the play. As Jacobo agonizes over how he will secure the money he has promised the captain, the Angel suddenly and miraculously appears, although he does so in a disguised form. At first, the two carry on a basic conversation. The Angel asks if Jacobo is the Caballero de Gracia. Jacobo affirms that he is. Then the Angel delivers the following message: "Cierta persona me envía / a que en alguna obra pía, / de las muchas en que estáis / todo el tiempo entretenido, / gastéis docientos [sic] ducados / que os traigo en oro" (305). The Caballero responds respectfully and takes out a book in order to give a receipt to the Angel and states that in reality he has given the money to God. However, the Angel responds, "¿Para qué a Dios los cargáis / si al fin los recibís vos?" (306). Finally, the Angel informs him of the money's origin: "Dios, Jacobo, os los envía, / agradecedlos a Dios" (306). Then the Angel drops his disguise and flies away. Jacobo, amazed, asks, "¿será mucho que imagine / que es ángel vuestro mi Dios?" (306).

This scene contains several noteworthy points. First, the Angel appears in bodily form so as to hide his identity. Even though Jacobo is unaware that an angel has appeared to him, he is respectful and demonstrates the uprightness of his character. He has heeded the teaching from the book of Hebrews that angels sometimes appear to human beings in disguise (Hebrews 13:1-2). Second, the Angel performs two specific tasks: he serves as God's messenger, and he delivers a needed gift to Jacobo so that he can continue in his pious deeds. Third, the angel gradually reveals his true identity to Jacobo. When he initially appears, he states that a "certain person" has sent him (305). Later, he identifies God Himself as the One who has sent him to deliver the money (306). Finally, the Angel's appearance shows that Jacobo has earned God's approval, and, thus, has been rewarded in a spectacular way for his dedication to God. Jacobo is surprised by this fact. He does not consider himself to be worthy of such favor, just as he debated whether or not he should be so bold as to accept the chaplaincy (297).

In sum, in *El caballero* the spiritual being's role is far less extensive than those of *La madrina* and *El condenado*. However, the Angel in this play still fulfills a vital purpose in the drama as a hagiographic play. The miraculous appearance not only serves as a sign but also shows divine approval that the life of the devout servant the work portrays is worthy of sainthood. By choosing to represent the angel in this role, the dramatist effectively incorporates a spectacular element which underscores the devotional and inspirational qualities of the play, potentially encouraging the audience to live just and generous lives.

La joya de las montañas

La joya de las montañas relates a story of love and martyrdom. The first act of the play describes the relationships between the main characters. Orosia, the protagonist and princess of Bohemia, has dedicated her virginity and purity to her divine Husband, being motivated by her love for and devotion to God. However, she quickly learns through her brother, the bishop Arcisclo, that the Pope wishes her to marry the prince of Aragón, Fortunio Garcés. Torn between her vow to God and her duty to honor the Pope's wishes, she agrees to marry the Prince, leaving the outcome in God's hands.

The action then moves to the mountains of Aragón where the Count of Aznar and his servant, Mosquete, have been fighting against the Moors. As they discuss the victories they have experienced, the conversation turns to Leonor. The Count loves Leonor, but she has resisted him because she has been engaged to the Prince. Soon thereafter, Fortunio, Leonor, Laura, and the King of Aragón arrive on the scene.[139] The King has been discussing with the Prince the proposed marriage to Orosia instead of to Leonor. When Fortunio sees a portrait of the beautiful princess, he gladly accepts the proposition. The King, then, decrees a marriage between the Count and Leonor.

In the second act, the scene shifts to the group of Moors in the mountains. Atanael, the group's leader, discusses with his men the defeat they have suffered at the hands of the Count and promises to take swift revenge. Suddenly, several Moors enter with Mosquete, the Christian they have just captured. As the Moors interrogate the captive, the Count and Fortunio enter with swords drawn and begin to fight against the enemy. The overpowered Moors decide to flee, resulting in Mosquete's release. The

[139] Laura is Leonor's maid.

Prince then exits, leaving Mosquete and the Count to discuss the damage done by the Moors. As they talk, they learn that Leonor and her maid had followed them into the battle and have been wounded. The two men, concerned for their well-being, rush to the women only to discover that they had fabricated the story in order to test the men's love.

The scene then transitions back to Orosia and her brother who have begun the trip from Bohemia to Aragón. When they stop to rest, Orosia takes leave of the group to contemplate her coming union with her husband. She then produces two portraits, one of Christ on the cross and the other of the Virgin Mary. As she prays to her two loves, she begs God to allow her to be a martyr rather than break her vow of chastity. Arcisclo and Bodoque, their traveling companions, overhear her prayer and determine that she must have some secret lover. However, when they learn that the two images are those of Christ and the Virgin, her brother praises her dedication and virtue and then reminds her that the Virgin herself married Joseph and yet retained the favor of God. Likewise, he encourages her to pursue the union with the Prince as an equally noble service to God.

In the final act, the audience finds Mosquete wandering the mountains in search of Leonor and Laura. In fear, he had abandoned the women when he saw two Moors approaching. As he searches, he again is captured by Atanael's men. The Moors are about to kill him when he convinces them instead to spare his life by telling Atanael of the coming marriage of Orosia and Fortunio. Atanael, enfuriated by the political union about to take place, determines to take vengeance and stop the marriage at all costs.

Meanwhile, the group traveling from Bohemia has become lost in the mountains. As they discuss what to do, Mosquete, who has apparently escaped from the

Moors, discovers them and informs them of Atanael's plan. Fear grips all in the group except for Orosia, who affirms her faith in God's sovereignty.

Before the group of travelers is able to flee, Atanael overhears them talking. He instructs his men to kill all except the beautiful Orosia of whom he has heard. He attempts to convince her to renounce her faith and marry him. Orosia remains steadfast in her resolve and dedication to purity to her divine Husband despite the Moor's threat to torture her and eventually kill her. She then performs a miracle. Following the instructions of her Guardian Angel, she strikes the ground three times, and water springs out. The Moors then carry her off to execute their heinous plan. The play ends with Mosquete, who again appears to have escaped, finding Laura and returning to the Count and Prince.[140]

As was true for *El caballero*, very little information is available regarding the life of Santa Orosia.[141] According to Ríos, Orosia is the patron saint of the town of Jaca, located in Huesca, Spain (1: 162). Although Ríos provides no further information of the saint's life, the website for the city of Jaca does include the legendary details of her life, many of which coincide with the main events of the plot ("Santa Orosia"). However, the play does contain the minimum criteria established by Dassbach for hagiographic plays: the work represents details in the protagonist's spiritual journey toward sainthood; the dramatist includes comments by Arcisclo about his sister's exceptional piety and saint-like behavior; and the play includes a miracle performed by Orosia as verification of

[140] The abrupt ending fails to resolve the action of the play. As indicated in chapter one, Ríos states that the text Hartzenbusch consulted was incomplete. She provides a more complete ending in which the Prince learns of all that has transpired. However, this ending fails to provide a satisfactory denoument.
[141] Also known as St. Eurosia.

God's special favor on her. Thus, the play could be classified as a hagiographic drama of martyrdom.

In *La joya* the Angel appears in two scenes in addition to the multiple references to spiritual beings that are present in the ordinary speech of the characters. As Arcisclo informs Orosia that he has some important news to share with her, Bodoque retorts, "Esto se anda en cumplimientos, / y lleve el diablo sus vidas / si el Obispo no anda a caza / de alguna sobrada mitra" (1: 168). In this quotation, Bodoque uses the Devil as a figure of speech as in order to question the Bishop's motivation for arranging the marriage between his sister and the Prince. According to *Autoridades*, the word "mitra" has several different possible definitions: 1) "El adorno y toca de la cabeza que uſaban los Perſas, de quien lo tomaron otras Naciones;" 2) "El ornamento de la cabéza que trahen los Arzobiſpos y Obiſpos por inſignia de ſu diginidad;" or 3) "Llaman vulgar, impropia è indignamente à la coróza que ſe pone à los hechicéros y otros delinquentes" ("Mitra"). As a bishop, Arcisclo most likely would wear such an adornment as a sign of his office. However, the additional meanings add an alternative, ironic perspective: if Orosia were to accept it, the proposition the bishop brings would further his prestige in the unification of Aragón and Bohemia. It would serve as a new jewel for his crown, one that he has won by taking captive another nation or, in this case, a person. Furthermore, by mentioning the Devil, the possibility of less than virtuous motivation on the part of the bishop cannot fully be excluded.[142] Thus, this reference seems to

[142] "Sobrado," in addition to its primary definition of excessive or abundant, can have two additional meanings: 1) "lo miſmo que atrevido, audàz, y licencioſo" and 2) "lo miſmo que rico, y abundante de bienes" (*Autoridades* "Sobrado").

function as an idiomatic expression in which Bodoque questions the sincerity of the bishop's motivation.

In the scene where the King arranges the marriages between the Prince and Orosia and the Count and Leonor, Mosquete, the *gracioso*, continually goads Laura about love. After he has insulted her a great deal, she exclaims, "¡Los diablos lleven tu alma, / que el corazón me has sacado!" (1: 176). Here she refers to the imagery of devils taking the soul captive to Hell as an oath of frustration against Mosquete's harassment. Shortly thereafter, when the Prince commands them to stop fighting, he asks who it is that dares to behave in such a way in front of the king. Mosquete replies, "Este dimoño de Laura" (1: 176). He employs the comparative function of devils to imply that he seeks to plague her incessantly just as the Devil does to human beings. These colloquial uses of the word are colorful expressions that enhance the imagery of the character's speech by utilizing familiar terminology and its common associations to describe their actions.[143]

In another context, references to the devils function as boasts. When the Prince and the Count rescue Mosquete from the Moors, Mosquete shouts, "¡Qué sangrienta está mi espada! / Yo les haré con los diablos / que se acuerden de Mosquete / más de cuatrocientos años" (1: 182). Ironically, Mosquete has done very little to fight against the Moors. Later in the play he behaves as a coward by hiding, fleeing, and becoming a

[143] Mosquete utters a similar phrase when the Moors capture him: "Soy el dimoño que os lleve" (1: 180). In this instance the expression is less playful and more a coloquial expression in which he wishes ill toward his enemy. Here it carries a spiritual dimension as he underscores the key difference between their religious beliefs: he is Christian and they are Moors. This key religious distinction supplied the primary reason for the war in which they were involved.

traitor. Yet, in this instance, when he has been liberated, he proudly touts his valor by claiming that he will do the same with the devils.

Mosquete also references the devils when he speaks of an incident he observed from the past. After he and his master learn that Leonor and Laura have feigned their injuries in order to test the men, he states:

> Pienso que han resucitado,
> porque todas las mujeres
> tienen astucia de gatos.
> Pues yo me acuerdo haber visto
> agora cuatro o diez años,
> con una herida de a geme[144]
> a una mujer de los diablos,
> y no hacía caso de ella
> aunque se iba desangrando. [145] (1: 184)

The extreme example he presents of a woman "of the devils" refers to the determination of the women even though suffering wounds. Furthermore, by comparing them to cats, he emphasizes their ability to survive by their wits in dangerous circumstances.

In the same scene, Laura refers to the Devil to describe Mosquete: "Por vida mía que tienes / habilidades del diablo; / no fiara en ti, Mosquete, / ni en tus promesas un clavo" (1: 185). After he and the Count have expressed their concern and love for the two women, Laura retorts that he has a demon-like ability to deceive.

The play also contains two references to the Devil as expletives. When the Count describes the way in which Leonor has resisted him, Mosquete says, "¿[Q]ué diablo te ha de entender?" (1: 172). Additionally, when the group from Bohemia is lost

[144] A "geme" refers to the length of the index finger as a unit of measurement ("Xeme").
[145] He repeats the same expression later when he meets the group from Bohemia (1: 198).

in the mountains, Bodoque says, "¿Quién diablos es el estruendo / que alborota aquestos montes?" (1: 196).

The final reference to angels in the play is uttered by Mosquete. After all the terrorizing events and narrow escapes he has experienced, when he finally sees Laura again, he exclaims, "Laura mía, ¡qué [sic] te veo! / ¿Eres Laura o eres diablo? / ¡Si, por vida de San Pablo, / que te veo y no lo creo!" (1: 204). This final reference returns to the comparative use of the terminology: the whole situation has been a devilish nightmare.

The two scenes in which the Angel speaks serve primarily as verification of divine favor in the saint's life. The first time the Angel speaks, he does so without appearing to the other characters. After Orosia has learned of the Pope's desire that she marry the Prince, she reacts physically: "¡Ay de mí! ¿Qué turbación / es la que tiene mi pecho?" (1: 170). She then prays for divine wisdom. As soon as she prays, the Angel states: "El fin es bueno y honesto" (1: 170). Orosia, as a sign of the favor she receives from God, hears the utterance and discerns that her Guardian Angel has just spoken to her: "Si es el ángel de mi guarda, / que así lo juzgo y lo creo, / bien podré yo dar el sí / sin que Dios se ofenda de ello, / que si le ofrecí gustosa / mi virginidad al cielo, / no ha de permitir me falte / valor para el complemento" (1: 170). Not only does the Angel's message affirm God's favor, but it also serves as a sign giving direction to Orosia as to the decision she should make in this moment. She does not yet know that God will allow her to be a martyr for Him. Nevertheless, the delivery of this divine message prefigures the honorable end she will be privileged to experience.

The second scene in which the Angel speaks is even more spectacular. In the climactic ending where Atanael tries to force Orosia to commit apostasy and become his bride, the Angel appears as an answer to Orosia's prayer: "Cielo divino, / doy las muy debidas gracias / a tanto favor: no olvides, / Angel santo de mi guarda, / esta feminil criatura / que tienes encomendada" (1: 202). In her prayer she not only boldly calls upon her Guardian Angel for supernatural help, but also reminds the Angel of the responsibility he has to aid her. The confidence that Orosia displays probably relates to the previous confirmation she received of the divine favor she will experience. She seems aware that she will become a martyr for God. Since God has permitted her this highest of honors, she does not hesitate to invoke her Guardian Angel for the help she needs.

When the Angel appears at the play's end, he does so visibly to all. The stage notes record the reaction of those present: "*Baja un* Angel *de lo alto y caen los* Moros *en tierra*" (1: 202). The Angel then respectfully asks Orosia what sort of assistance she requires: "¿En qué quieres mi asistencia, / Orosia, divina esposa / de Jesús?" (1: 202). The ability to converse with the Angel constitutes a special grace for the soon-to-be martyr. The terms the Angel uses are personal and kind. The Angel then instructs Orosia in what action to take:

> Con esta vara excelente,
> en esta montaña amena
> sacarás luego una fuente
> cristalina y aparente
> con que aliviarás tu pena.
> Toma la vara y darás
> con ella en la tierra dura,
> y a los tres golpes verás
> que raudales sacarás
> que coronen esta altura. (1: 202-203)

Orosia responds by speaking of her unworthiness. She is about to be sacrificed and she thirsts, yet she remembers that Christ too suffered thirst on the cross. She understands that her death, just as Christ's, would bring forth water to refresh the earth. The Angel then reaffirms the significance of the miracle she is about to execute: "No sólo en aquesta sierra / tu Esposo merced te fragua, / mas en cuanto el mundo encierra / tendrás dominio en el agua / para que riegue la tierra" (1: 203). She has been given special favor because of her piety and dedication. Consequently, she, even in death, will continue to have special authority and influence over the earth's refreshment.

In sum, the Angel in this play fulfills several functions: not only does he serve as a messenger, but he also provides strength, encouragement, and help to the saint in the special task God has given her to accomplish. As with *El caballero*, the spectacular nature of the Angel's appearance confirms divine approval on her martyrdom. However, unlike the previous play, in *La joya* the relationship between the saint and the Angel carries a new dimension: Orosia experiences a physical confirmation of the divine nature of appearance. Unlike Jacobo, she discerns the true identity of the being that visits her and, therefore, becomes filled with confidence and strength for the task that awaits her.

The spectacular nature of the final scene also reveals the effect that the angels have on the enemies that God's servants face. The Moors have no control over the Angel. They are powerless to resist while the Angel delivers the message of hope to Orosia. Even though they will win the temporary physical battle when they take her life, God's kingdom still triumphs through the death of His saint. Her life and death are

symbols of His life and death for the salvation of humankind and serve as ongoing evidence that no one can thwart God's plan.

La ninfa del cielo

La ninfa del cielo, condesa bandolera y obligaciones de honor relates the story of a spiritual journey that begins with betrayal, passes through revenge, leads toward despair, and results in salvation. As the first act begins, Carlos, the Duke of Calabria, and his servant, Roberto, have gone out to hunt. When they encounter Ninfa, the Countess of Valdeflor, Carlos and the lady are immediately enamored with each other. The Duke, overtaken by his passion, decides that he must have Ninfa, despite the fact that he is already married to Diana. Consequently, he visits Ninfa's house, seduces her, and then steals away as she sleeps. When the Countess awakes, she is enraged to find that he has used and abandoned her. Therefore, she decides to take vengeance on all men.

In the second act, Diana notes that the Duke has been overcome by a peculiarly melancholic state, which causes her to worry. The Duke, claiming that Ninfa's absence has rekindled and strengthened his desire for her, decides to seek her out and affirm his true love for her.

Meanwhile, Ninfa has created a reputation for herself as a blood-thirsty, homicidal animal. She boasts of killing hundreds of men as retaliation for the Duke's crime against her, and by extension, against all women. However, when Carlos finds her, although she threatens to kill him, she does not carry out the deed. Instead, she

instructs him to murder his wife so that the two of them can marry. Carlos agrees and takes his leave.

Once the Duke has departed, a group of men under orders from the king seek out Ninfa in order to execute justice. As she flees, the Countess falls into a deep depression under the weight of all the crimes she has committed. When she stops to rest, she dreams that a group of laborers begin to dance around her. They then lead her to a well of water. Having arrived almost at the point of despair, Ninfa decides to end her life by throwing herself into the sea. Suddenly, the Angel appears, hinders her from taking her life, and instructs her to follow him.

The third act opens with an extended speech in which Ninfa describes her exceeding wickedness and the desire she has to be saved from her sin. She confesses and begs God to forgive her. At this moment, Carlos reenters the stage and tries to convince her to return with him. She refuses, stating that she has decided to leave behind the world and follow God. She then departs into the woods. Carlos follows her and calls her name, but she does not heed him.

When Ninfa arrives at the cave of Anselmo, a hermit, she enters and confesses her sin. Anselmo gives her the Eucharist and provides her with a chain for penance. Ninfa then proceeds to walk, dragging her chain behind her, and searching for God, her promised Husband.

As she continues her trek, she arrives at a river and meets a boatman. The man asks her if she wishes to cross over the river, and she agrees and enters the boat. Carlos and Roberto arrive just in time to see the boatman trying to drown Ninfa. Suddenly, a character named Custodio appears and defeats the boatman, saving Ninfa from death.

Ninfa then continues walking until she comes to a fountain where she encounters Christ. When Carlos catches up to her again, she explains to him that she has repented of her sin, is now the wife of God, and cannot marry him. Then she proceeds to exhort him to seek God and make amends with his wife.

In the final scenes of the play, Ninfa has walked behind a bush just as Diana appears on stage. Diana, thinking she has seen an animal, throws her javelin and pierces Ninfa. The Countess then staggers into view and tells Diana of all that has happened. Ninfa tells the Duke's wife not to fear because God has sovereignly allowed her to execute justice, although unknowingly. She then exhorts Carlos and Diana one final time to seek God. Just before she dies, God Himself appears and descends to receive His bride. The Duke and Duchess observe the miraculous event and decide to repent and make Ninfa their patron saint.

Of the hagiographic dramas, *La ninfa* is the first play that does not seem to represent the life of a real person. According to Ríos,

> [E]l Santoral que rige en la Iglesia Católica, los años cristianos y almanaques y la Enciclopedia Espasa, no mencionan más Santa Ninfa que la virgen y mártir que se conmemora el 10 de noviembre con San Trifón y San Respicio. Pero esa Santa es del siglo III de nuestra Era, y la protagonista de Tirso, contemporánea de los duques de Calabria, no podía ser anterior al siglo XVI, a lo sumo a las postrimerías del XV. (1: 912)

Consequently, Ríos posits that the play is entirely of Tirso's imaginative creation (1: 912).

Since *La ninfa* represents the life of neither a canonized saint nor of a popular and exceptionally pious, historical figure, the work does not qualify as a hagiographic drama based on Dassbach's criteria. Furthermore, the play lacks extensive references to the saintly nature of the character by the other personages in the play. The only time

anyone asociates sainthood with Ninfa, at least prior to the miraculous appearance of the Angel, is when Carlos and Roberto first meet Ninfa. When Roberto states "que también Ninfa es mujer," Carlos responds, "Roberto, es ninfa del cielo" (1: 934). In context Carlos's statement refers more to her physical beauty. However, it does provide a small hint to the play's ending.

Despite the lack of these two key traits, several elements do exist that suggest the play was indeed written following the hagiographic model. First, the play ends with the Duke and Duchess in awe of the miraculous scene they have just witnessed and their subsequent decision to make Ninfa their patron saint as they dedicate themselves to seek God and do penance (1: 970-71). Second, miracles fulfill important functions in the play. Both the angel's supernatural intervention in Ninfa's attempt to commit suicide (1: 956) and Christ's glorious appearance to receive the soul of His bride into Heaven indicate special grace granted to the protagonist (1: 970). Third, the play does represent a story of conversion, which is one of the four types of hagiographic plays that Dassbach mentions in her taxonomy.

In addition to its similarities to the hagiographic tradition, *La ninfa* also bears likeness to the *auto sacramental* due primarily to the allegorical nature of the play.[146] David H. Darst's article on *La ninfa* explores the dual levels of meaning, both the literal and the allegorical, as a means of demonstrating how the action and development of the plot reveal a deeper "moral significance" (210). Understanding the deeper purpose for

[146] The fact that critics also attribute the *auto*, *La ninfa del cielo*, to Tirso strongly indicates that the play may have been a source of inspiration for the shorter work. See Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti's edition of Tirso's *Autos sacramentales* for further technical study of the work. See also Hughes's analysis of religious imagery (22-31). Darst's article "The Two Worlds of *La ninfa del cielo*" also includes a brief summary of the similarities between the two plays.

the play lies in its connection to "the four spiritual stages in the life of Mary Magdalene as expounded by Pedro Malón de Chaide" (210).[147] Darst summarizes Tirso's creation of these two interpretive lines as follows:

> Ninfa has progressed from the very human state of innocent nature to a celestial *hieros gamos* [holy matrimony] with Christ. Tirso has executed this movement by framing the argument of his piece with the life of Mary Magdalene and the four stages through which she passed: naïveté, sin, penitence, and grace. Concomitant to this linear penitential way, the Mercedarian has structurally organized a dramatic action that begins with events steeped in the world of nature, but that continually approaches the supernal regions of grace. In the final act, the two worlds converge to present a fused action that is both allegorical and literal. The overall effect is thus an omniscient glimpse into the eternal interpenetration of the visible and invisible worlds of matter and spirit. (220)

The two interpretive lines of meaning that Darst describes closely resemble the allegorical nature of the *auto sacramental*. The purpose for this duality in the *auto* is to enhance further the didactic nature of the work and to inspire praise for God. In this play, a similar purpose exists: to inspire the audience through a miraculous story of conversion so that the public will respond by devoting themselves anew to Christ and His mercy. Thus, *La ninfa* functions as another hybrid genre.

In the play, angels and demons appear in two key scenes.[148] The first appearance takes place just as Ninfa is about to throw herself into the sea. When the Angel speaks,

---

[147] The connection Darst establishes to Mary Magdalene provides an alternative to Everett W. Hesse's theory in which he analyzes the drama through the framework of "the four stages of the mystic way: awakening, purgation, illumination, and union" ("Two Worlds" 209).

[148] As with the previous works, references to angels in the characters' ordinary speech also occur in the play. However, due to the similarity of these references, from this point on they will appear as footnotes. In *La ninfa*, three such references exist: 1) When Carlos and Roberto first meet Ninfa, Roberto introduces himself humorously by saying, "Y para lo que mandéis, / yo Roberto, y seré agora / por vos Roberto el Diablo" (1: 935); 2) When the Countess arrives at Anselmo's cave, she begins her confession by describing herself as a slave of the Devil: "Soy una esclava / del demonio, una mujer / la mayor y la más mala / pecadora que ha tenido" (1: 960); and 3) When Carlos and Roberto finish crossing the river in their pursuit of Ninfa, Roberto states, "Nunca más

he first addresses her immediate spiritual need: "Ninfa, no te desesperes" (1: 956). Despair is one of the most deadly sins because it reveals a loss of all hope in God and in His mercy. However, the Angel does not simply tell her not to despair, but he also gives her reason to hope: "que no has de serlo del mar, / que más hermoso lugar / te han dedicado" (1: 956). Using the imagery of the water as her destiny, the Angel encourages Ninfa by telling her that a better place has been prepared for her than the dark waters of death she seeks.

When the Angel appears, the Countess does not seem to understand that a celestial being has just addressed her.[149] Consequently, she inquires as to the identity of this unknown speaker. The Angel responds that he is "[u]n amigo, el más amigo / que en tus sucesos tuviste; / que desde que tú naciste / ha andado siempre contigo" (1: 956). Even though he does not explicitly reveal his identity to Ninfa at this time, his statement reveals that he is her faithful Guardian Angel. His appearance alone indicates that God has not removed His grace from Ninfa's life, despite the wickedness of her life. On the contrary, He has continued to allow her Guardian Angel to accompany her and to appear to her in a miraculous way in her moment of greatest need.

The Angel next makes a promise and issues a command: "Después, / Ninfa me conocerás, / y si me sigues, tendrás / bien de mayor interés" (1: 956). Up to this point, Ninfa's life has been characterized by wickedness. She has followed her passions and reacted in vengeance to Carlos's abandonment. Since she has not yet come to

---

burlas con ríos, / que tienen bellacas armas; / nade un delfín que lo entiende, / hijo y vecino del agua, / que de aquí adelante soy, / si el demonio no me engaña, / de parte de los mosquitos / que en pipas de vino nadan" (1: 961).

[149] Later, Ninfa expresses that she has discerned that the messenger was indeed a celestial one, and speaking to Carlos she says: "Aquí ha de estar mi remedio, / conforme la soberana / voz del Cielo me dió aviso / que por su Ninfa me aguarda" (1: 959).

understand God's grace, she has not known or trusted in the ministering spirit that God has ordained to assist her. She now has the opportunity to experience that grace, but only if she will follow him.[150]

Just before the Angel departs, he reiterates his plea to the sinner, "Deja el ser ninfa del mar / que has de ser *ninfa del Cielo*" (1: 956). This final statement employs a word play in which Ninfa is admonished to leave behind her old life, symbolized by the water that a few moments before almost overcame her, and be converted into a heavenly ninfa. According to *Autoridades,* "ninfa" can refer either to a "[f]abulosa deidad de las aguas, bosques, selvas," or it can be understood as a reference to "qualquier muger moza, y particularmente la que se tiene por dama" ("Ninfa").[151] The double meaning of this term as a reference to the gods of the river or as a servant not only creates a word play on the protagonist's choice between committing suicide or submitting to Christ but also underscores the change in master that accompanies the decision. Her position as a slave to the Devil has pushed her toward the river as the solution to her pain. However, by becoming the bride of Christ, she effectively becomes a servant to Him, a fact she comes to understand when she tells Carlos,

> ya con otro dueño estoy.
> Dios ha tenido de mí
> lástima, y me ha remediado,
> y matrimonio he tratado
> con El, Carlos, vuelve en ti;
> ya que soy de Dios esposa,

[150] This example illustrates the cooperation of human and divine wills, a similar theme that Fiorigio Minelli studies in *Quien no cae, no se levanta.*

[151] Darst cites Sebastián de Covarrubias to define the term as "*Nimpha, latine sponsa,* y es nombre griego, *nymphe*, y porque las desposadas son muchachas, donzellas y bien apuestas, vinieron a llamar a las deidades de las fuentes y los ríos ninfas" (Covarrubias qtd. in Darst, "Two Worlds" 211). Darst then posits that the term "symbolically refers to the final destiny of the Countess as the 'bride' of Christ ("Two Worlds" 211).

y tuya no puedo ser;
vuélvete con tu mujer. (1: 968)

The second scene in which both the Devil and the Angel appear occurs when Ninfa encounters the boatman. In the cast of characters at the beginning of the play, the boatman appears as "El Diablo Barquero" (1: 927). However, when Ninfa meets him, she does not know that he is indeed the Devil. He has disguised himself as a boatman in hopes of deceiving her into a position of vulnerability so that he can kill her. He then reveals his identity when they reach the middle of the river:

No saldrás, Ninfa,
con lo que intentas esta vez, ni el Cielo
ha de poder librarte, ni ese viejo
Anselmo, mi enemigo. ¡Muere, ingrata,
que el mismo a quien serviste, ése te mata!
No has de lograr la penitencia, ¡muere¡
pues has sido mi esclava en mi servicio,
que no te has de alabar de la vitoria
del haberme dejado a tan buen tiempo. (1: 964)

In this quotation the Devil reveals two of his functions: he seeks to deceive human beings and discourage them in their struggle for pious living, and he presents himself as Ninfa's rightful lord. The first he endeavors to accomplish by ridiculing her attempts at penance and telling her that she will never be successful. His statement is, of course, false. He does not possess that type of knowledge. On the contrary, what he observes about her behavior would strongly indicate that she will indeed be saved. However, in order to thwart her efforts, he lies to her and tries to sow the seeds of despair so that she will be condemned. The second function he indicates through his use of the phrase "mi esclava en mi servicio." He claims that he has rule over her because,

as Scripture states, he does possess authority over sinners on earth. It is his usurped realm.[152]

Even though the Devil has enjoyed his power over Ninfa, he now realizes that she has turned to Christ, and he will lose the battle for her soul. Consequently, he attempts to kill her before she has a chance to complete her penance so that she will be condemned. His actions mirror what the book of the Apocalypse reveals about the Devil at the end of time when he realizes that his opportunity to deceive and lead human beings into perdition is about to expire. St. John describes this understanding as follows:

> And I heard a loud voice in heaven, saying: Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: because the accuser of our brethren is cast forth, who accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of the testimony, and they loved not their lives unto death. Therefore rejoice, O heavens, and you that dwell therein. Woe to the earth, and to the sea, because the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time. (Apocalypse 12:10-12)

Despite the Barquero's plan, he is unsuccessful in his attempt, for Custodio appears and states, "Ya no es tu esclava, cese tu castigo; / Ninfa es del Cielo; apártate, enemigo" (1: 964). Custodio appears to be another name used in the play for the Angel, especially considering the power he wields over the Devil.[153] There is no physical battle. Rather, Custodio conquers the Barquero with the superior power of his words: Custodio speaks the truth that Ninfa is free from his tyranny, and the Devil has no recourse but to flee.

---

[152] The Scriptures provide several passages in support of this teaching. One appears in St. John's account of the gospel when Christ rebukes the Pharisees: "You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he stood not in the truth; because truth is not in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof" (St. John 8:44). Another is found in Ephesians 2:1-3.

[153] *Autoridades* defines "Ángel custodio" as an alternate name for Guardian Angel ("Ángel custodio").

In addition to the angelic and demonic functions he includes, the way in which the dramatist represents these beings departs from the examples of the previous plays in several ways. First, the scene in which the Demon tries to drown Ninfa forms a part of the action of the play. In the previous plays, the spiritual beings have spoken to the characters and influenced their actions but have never interacted personally and physically with them. Here the Demon, disguised as a boatman, offers to help Ninfa. The two interact not only verbally but also physically as he begins to transport her to the other side of the river. The action intensifies when the two begin to struggle, at which point the Demon reveals his true identity not only to Ninfa but also to the audience. In this way the dramatist increases the suspense of the scene by creating physical events in the plot that allegorically represent the spiritual battle that Ninfa faces.

Second, Ninfa's interaction with the Angel also includes an element of suspense. When he first appears, she does not realize that he is her Guardian Angel. He only identifies himself as her friend. When he appears the second time, not only does his name reveal his true identity, but his actions also demonstrate the superior power he possesses over the Demon. However, the interaction between Ninfa and the Angel does not parallel the interaction she has with the Demon. The Angel conquers the foe by the power of his words. He does not physically rescue her. A true struggle effected on stage might have pleased the audience by providing additional action, yet the dramatist chooses to resolve the situation verbally, rather than dramatically. Even though some might consider the ending anticlimactic, it does elevate the power of the Angel over the brute force the Demon exerts in his attempt to keep her from earning Heaven through penance.

Although angels and demons only appear two times in the play, the final scene merits some attention for its unique treatment of the soul's ascension into Heaven. When Ninfa is about to die, Christ Himself descends to receive her. Ordinarily, this function is fulfilled by an angel. However, in this instance the dramatist chooses to send deity instead, as a potent affirmation of God's loving acceptance of the repentant sinner. This miraculous act of grace completes the general trend in this play toward heavy supernatural involvement. Even though this particular ending departs from the traditional practice, the dramatist's decision allows him to explore the dramatic possibilities of such an ending in order to further awe and inspire the audience.

In sum, the spiritual beings in *La ninfa* execute important roles in the protagonist's journey toward salvation. The Angel not only hinders Ninfa from self-destruction but also rescues her from the Demon's final attack as she does penance. The Demon's attempt to obstruct her spiritual progress is allegorically represented through the character of the boatman and the struggle between the two. Finally, both the Angel and the Demon add an element of suspense to the work as the audience along with the protagonist learn of their true identities and the functions they fulfill in the story of Ninfa's salvation.

Chapter 4: Angels and Demons in the Plays of Undisputed Authorship

This chapter will analyze the representation of angels and demons in the five works that are undoubtfully Tirso's: *Santo y sastre, Quien no cae no se levanta,* the *Santa Juana* trilogy, and *El mayor desengaño* (hagiographic works); and *La mujer que manda en casa* (the biblical play). The format will follow the same organizational scheme of the third chapter: plot summary, genre and related issues, textual analysis, and summary.

The Hagiographic Plays (cont.)

Santo y sastre

Santo y sastre relates a story of the grace of giving. In this play Tirso represents the life of Homobono and his desire to give generously and sacrificially to meet the needs of others despite the opposition he faces from his own family members. The play begins when Dorotea, a lady, and Pendón, the *gracioso,* discuss the many suitors that have written love letters to her in hopes of winning her affection. Several times as the two read the letters, a voice calls out that Dorotea will marry a tailor. The final time the voice calls out, it announces that her husband will not only be a tailor, but he will also be a saint.

While Pendón and Dorotea are laughing at the notion that a tailor could be a saint, Homobono arrives at the house. When he announces that he has come to make a dress, the two scorners begin to take interest in the apparent fulfillment of prophecy.

Dorotea notes his handsome appearance and decides to question Homobono only to discover that, in addition to making clothes, he also likes to make sermons out of all that he observes. Despite his tiresome preaching, she determines that she will become his wife. However, when she proposes the marriage, the tailor, frightened by the prospect, refuses and quickly takes his leave.

Offended by the tailor's refusal, Dorotea begins to bewail the fact that Homobono has committed an injustice to her honor. At that moment, Roberto, the tailor's father, enters. When he discovers that it is his son Dorotea is describing, he takes interest in the matter and promises her that he will command him to accept the proposal. As soon as Roberto leaves, Lelio and Grimaldo, two of Dorotea's suitors, arrive. However, they quickly learn that she will not see them, and they must wait until the next day to discover whom she will marry.

The second act opens as Roberto's servant is dressing Homobono for the wedding. As they prepare, the father and son debate about the marriage. Homobono does not want to enter into the union because he prefers his freedom so that he can pursue works of charity. Roberto tries to convince his son that the marriage is honorable and beneficial to both, especially since Dorotea is not only beautiful, but rich. Homobono, ever the obedient son, prays to God to excuse him from his duty, surrenders to his father's will, and agrees to accept the marriage.

When the father and his son arrive at Dorotea's house, Homobono proves himself incapable of speaking to her with the flattering language of love that everyone expects. He remains focused on his piety and devotion to God. Nevertheless, when Dorotea affirms that she will marry him and submit to him as her master, he begins to

list the changes she will have to accept in her lifestyle as his wife so that they will be able to use their wealth to meet the needs of others. Dorotea agrees and the two are married. When Lelio and Grimaldo learn that she has married the tailor, the two become upset and promise to seek vengeance.

Later, Homobono's generosity becomes apparent when he gives the clothes he is wearing to a destitute man that he meets. Christ then appears to commend the tailor for his pious deed. Shortly after Homobono sends Pendón back to the house for a change of clothes, the servant returns shouting that the house is on fire. The two men run back to the house and rescue the women inside.

In the third act, Dorotea has become frustrated with her husband's generosity. She complains bitterly to him that he has wasted the entire fortune on others just as the prodigal son had done. The tailor reminds her that earthly goods are temporal and good deeds hold eternal worth. Dorotea angrily takes her leave, and Homobono prays that God will protect his house. In response, a celestial voice confirms to the saint that God will protect the house because of Homobono's pious and unselfish lifestyle.

Shortly thereafter, Pendón comes to the tailor to inform him that there is nothing left in the house. Consequently, they have no more to give to others who come to the door in need. Homobono rebukes him and sends him back to check again. This time the servant finds the store room replenished with an abundance of food. Homobono then delivers a sermon on faith and God's provision. Dorotea, having seen God's miraculous provision because of her husband's faith, asks for forgiveness.

That evening while Homobono is preparing a wedding garment for a customer, Lelio and Grimaldo return to the house because Lelio has decided to damage

Homobono's honor by violating his wife. Grimaldo warns his companion against committing this heinous deed because God obviously has granted special favor to the tailor. Lelio chooses not to heed the advice. However, just as he is about to enter the house, an angel appears with a flaming sword, and Lelio falls to the ground. Homobono and Pendón, hearing the commotion, come to the door. Once they take Lelio into the house, they discover that he cannot speak. Homobono intercedes for his enemy, and God restores his speech. When the tailor returns to his room to complete the suit he was sewing, two angels appear and begin to finish the task. In the final scene, a man brings word that Homobono has died. Dorotea and Pendón discuss his saintly life and dedicate themselves to lives of piety.

Santo y sastre is the first of the hagiographic plays that represents the life of an official, canonized saint (St. Homobono).[154] Dassbach classifies the play as a hagiographic drama detailing the life of a miracle worker (*Comedia* 10). While it is true that many of the hagiographic plays represent the extraordinary powers that the protagonists possess, this particular type of hagiographic work requires the presence of the miracles in order to "autenticar una santidad que, de otro modo, no sería totalmente evidente a ojos mundanos" (*Comedia* 69). Such is the case with *Santo y sastre*. Much of the action of the play revolves around the fact that the characters accept Homobono as a favored saint of God. It begins with Dorotea and Pendón as they ridicule the idea that a tailor could possibly be a saint (647) and ends when the characters stand in awe at the

[154] According to Ríos, "San Homobono, sastre y mercader de telas, hijo de un sastre y mercader de telas de Cremona, murió, según el santoral, en 1197, es decir, al terminar el siglo XII. Murió en la iglesia de San Gil como describe Tirso, el 13 de noviembre de 1097, errata por 1197. Fué canonizado por Inocencio III en 1198" (3: 49).

supernatural approval of the man (732-38).[155] Thus, the ability to work miracles becomes a necessary part of the drama, "para probar la santidad de Homo y despertar veneración popular" (Dassbach, *Comedia* 69).

Apart from the references to celestial beings that characters make as a part of their normal speech, no angels appear until the very end of the play when Lelio returns to Homobono's house in order to violate the saint's wife.[156] Before Lelio enters the house, Grimaldo gives a solemn warning to his companion: "Dios el alcaide de su casa ha sido; / sus ángeles la guardan; contra tantos / ¿osaréis ser valiente?" (725). By this point in the play's action, the fame of the tailor has spread. Prior to Grimaldo's statement, no indication had been given about the angelic protection that the tailor receives. Nevertheless, Grimaldo's warning shows that Homobono is no ordinary person, at least according to popular belief.

Grimaldo's statement reveals the scriptural teaching that God appoints angels to protect His special servants. Even though no direct reference exists in the play, this aspect of the play parallels the Old Testament account of Eliseus, the successor of Elias,[157] in two ways. First, both stories illustrate the protection God provides through the angels. In the biblical account the Syrian King had sent his army to destroy the

---

[155] Jaime Garau affirms this trait of the play's structure in the introduction to the piece: "el desarrollo de la pieza va a consistir en el proceso que conduce de la burla del sastre hacia la aceptación de la santidad de Homobono" (624).

[156] While Dorotea considers the love letters she has received, Pendón makes several references to demons. After reading one letter from Lelio, he utters a curse: "¡Dale al diablo!" (645). Later, he makes the following statement to Dorotea: "Mira que te han de agarrar / cuando la muerte te arrastre, / como el ánima del sastre / suelen los diablos llevar" (648). According to Garau, these particular lines are quoted from a poem by Quevedo in which he satirizes the profession of the tailors (648).

[157] The King James translation of the Bible uses Elisha instead of Eliseus and Elijah instead of Elias.

prophet because of the special ability that Eliseus possessed to overhear plans the King discussed in secret. However, God had appointed a host of angels to protect the prophet from the army that sought him (2 Kings 6:8-18). Second, God also enabled Eliseus to work other miracles. Just prior to this account, he miraculously causes a lost axe head to surface from the river by throwing a piece of wood into the water where the object was lost (2 Kings 6:5-7). In the play, the tailor also has gained the reputation as a pious and just man of God. He has performed miracles and now has gained popular support. Consequently, when Grimaldo states, "sus ángeles la guardan; contra tantos / ¿osaréis ser valiente?" (725), his reference to the group of "so many" angels that guard the house implies that a host also protects Homobono from those who seek to do him harm, just as God protected servants from the past.

Grimaldo's warning proves not to be without warrant. When Lelio refuses to heed the advice he has received, an angel appears. The stage notes describe the event as follows: "*Da una coz a la puerta, ábrese. Está en ella un ángel con una espada de fuego, cae Lelio desmayado, huye Grimaldo y sale Homobono*" (726). This stage direction provides two important insights to the play. The first relates to the imagery of an angel with a flaming sword. The first reference in Scripture to such an image can be found in Genesis. When God casts out Adam and Eve from the garden for their sin, he ensures that they cannot return by placing the Cherubim as guards: "And he cast out Adam; and placed before the paradise of pleasure Cherubims, and a flaming sword, turning every way, to keep the way of the tree of life" (Genesis 3:24). According to John Arendez, the Cherubim are most commonly associated with the presence of God, and, in the Old Testament, artistic representations of them often accompanied the

tabernacle and the temple as the earthly houses of God ("Cherubim"). Since the timing of the Angel's appearance in this play coincides with Lelio's attempt to break into Homobono's house, the appearance of an angel in a function similar to that of the Cherubim greatly intensifies the visual impact of the moment. God views an attack on Homobono and his house as equal to an attack on Himself and His house.

The second significance relates to the effect the Angel has on Lelio. The stage notes indicate that Lelio falls down and becomes unconscious. However, when Homobono and Pendón revive him, Lelio is unable to speak. The appearance of the angel has taken from him his ability to communicate. Homobono recognizes the biblical parallel when he states, "Cantará después de mudo / del modo de que Zacarías" (728-29). When an angel announces to Zechariah that he and Elizabeth would have a son, the sign that accompanied the announcement was that the priest would not be able to speak until after the baby's birth (St. Luke 1:1-20). Homobono, seeing that the angel's appearance has so affected Lelio, announces that the man's speech will return as a sign of God's favor for his repentance.[158]

The final appearance of angels in the play takes place when Homobono returns to his sewing. When the characters arrive, they see that two angels are working to finish the task he had started. Pendón exclaims,

> ¿No ves los ángeles dos
> cosiendo, o no estoy despierto?
> ¡Oh aprendices celestiales!,
> tu profesión autorizan,
> y mientras rezas sastrizan.

[158] It is also interesting to note that in the previously cited story from 2 Kings, the Syrian army also was struck with blindness. In that case, it was a direct answer to prayer by the prophet who subsequently gave the Israelites an easy victory in the battle. Nevertheless, the sign accompanied the angelic host's appearance.

¡Qué lindo par de oficiales!
Sastres, desde hoy os abono. (732)

In this scene Tirso chooses to represent a common function of angels in an unconventional way. Both biblical and theological evidence support the idea that the angels are servants.[159] However, in the previous plays, the angels always assisted the characters in their spiritual work. Here, the angels complete the physical work Homobono has neglected so that he can attend to the spiritual activity God has allotted to him.

Tirso further describes the angels as "aprendices celestiales" (732). An apprentice is a person who learns a trade from a master. In this case, rather than refer to Homobono as an apprentice to a higher being, the angels are the ones who learn from Homobono. He is the skilled craftsman under whom they study. Not only is he a paragon of Christian generosity, but he also is an excellent tailor. His life serves to teach others the priorities by which they should live.

Pendón's response to the scene provides further insight into the possible reaction of the audience. When he first notices the angels, he questions whether what he has seen is true or merely some sort of dream: "¿No ves los ángeles dos / cosiendo, o no estoy despierto?" (732). However, once he understands the spiritual significance of the situation, he responds by changing his opinion about tailors: "Sastres, desde hoy os abono" (732). According to *Autoridades*, the word "abonar" means "[a]probar y dár por buena alguna coſa, y aſſegurarla por tal" ("Abonar"). Pendón, the one who had ridiculed Homobono for his profession at the beginning of the play, now realizes from the saint's example that humility is a virtue that God exalts. This message is then reaffirmed by the

[159] Hebrews 1:14 states that they are "ministering spirits." St. Thomas related the service of the angels particularly to their ability to take on a bodily form (1a.51.2).

Angel in his final comment to the group: "Ansí honra el cielo / las virtudes de Homobono" (732). Not only does he underscore God's approval of the saint, but his statement also reiterates the moral lesson of the play for the audience and seeks to inspire them to cultivate the Christian virtues of humility and generosity.

In sum, *Santo y sastre*, like the plays from the preceding chapter, presents the angels as protectors and servants for the saint. However, Tirso chooses to represent them in an unconventional manner by assigning to them menial, physical work so that Homobono can occupy himself with more meaningful, spiritual labor.

Quien no cae, no se levanta

Quien no cae, no se levanta portrays a story of a sinner's miraculous salvation from passion and near despair. In the first act of the play, Margarita, after having been rebuked by her father for her licentious lifestyle, makes plans to elope with Valerio that evening. The latter arranges to send two servants with a litter to retrieve her. However, Lelio, Lisarda's husband, also burns with passion for Margarita. After learning of Valerio's plan, Lelio and Britón disguise themselves by painting their faces black and abduct Valerio's servants. The two then proceed to Margarita's house and fight with Alberto, another of Valerio's messengers. After defeating him, Lelio and Britón discover that Clenardo, Margarita's father, has hidden the litter.

The second act begins at Lelio's house. He wants to take some jewels from his wife so that he can sell them. When Lisarda accuses him of secretly trying to give them to Margarita, he becomes angry, tears them from her neck, and slaps her. Roselio, upon learning of Lelio's abusive behavior, vows revenge. Meanwhile, as Margarita and her

servant, Leonela, discuss the two rival lovers, a voice warns Margarita about her sinful lifestyle and presents her with two images. The first is of a beautiful, flower-filled staircase that leads up to fire and destruction. The second is of a rosary-adorned staircase leading to a throne and a golden crown. Margarita discerns that she must repent or she will be condemned. However, her repentance is short-lived and she decides to continue her illicit relationship with Lelio. Later, she listens to an eloquent sermon delivered by Fray Domingo and immediately becomes convinced of her sin. She begins to strip herself of her clothing in penance and vows to live a holy life hereafter in isolation at home, away from the world and the negative influence of Lelio.

In the third act, Lelio enters and discusses with Leonela the passionate burning he still experiences for Margarita even though an entire year has passed since she resolved to repent of her sin. Leonela agrees to arrange a meeting between the two even though Margarita has forbidden her to speak of the former lover. After Leonela returns to the house, some men bring Valerio into Margarita's home. He has fallen off of a horse and appears to be badly wounded. When he revives, he aggressively begins to woo Margarita. She resists Valerio, but when Lelio arrives, she is unable to control her passion and agrees to follow him. However, each time she attempts to leave, she falls down. The third time she falls, she is unable to get up. Then her Guardian Angel, disguised as a handsome young man, appears to her. He offers her his hand in marriage. Margarita, still torn between her desire to keep her promise to God and her passion for Lelio, begins to despair. Yet, the Angel reveals to her that what she needs is God's grace. She finally yields to the Angel's wooing, takes his hand, and accompanies him to Heaven. Leonela announces the miracle to all. The play ends with the remaining

characters repenting of their sins, dedicating themselves to God and to holy living, and affirming the title of the play that no one can get up unless s/he has first fallen.

Even though this play has been grouped with the hagiographic dramas, it, like many of the previous plays, fails to meet the first of Dassbach's criteria for the genre in that the identity of the saint portrayed in the play is uncertain. Margaret Wilson states that the protagonist "seems to recall the Margaret of Cortona whose religious cult became popular in 1623; though there may have been other models too" (*Tirso* 102). Since the play does not necessarily represent the life of a canonized or popularized saint, it cannot technically be classified as a hagiographic play. However, the remaining characteristics of the genre do seem to apply to the extent that Dassbach includes *Quien no cae, no se levanta* in her study.[160]

Dassbach classifies the work as a hagiographic drama detailing the life of a convert:

> LOS [sic] convertidos son pecadores que se arrepienten de sus pecados, cambian de vida y después exhiben un comportamiento santo, o bien paganos o infieles que se convierten al cristianismo y alcanzan la santidad. Estos pecadores no son gente corriente que ocasionalmente sucumba a tentaciones, sino individuos cuya vida pasada está caracterizada por el pecado, bien sean pecados reiterados o una ofensa grave. Margarita, en *Quien no cae, no se levanta*, es un ejemplo del pecador cuya vida pasada consiste en una serie de graves pecados. (*Comedia* 37)

This particular type of drama does not simply tell a story of conversion, but rather it dramatizes the spectacular nature of the spiritual regeneration of the protagonist. Dassbach underscores the fact that not only are these saints controlled by sinful passions, but they also face great obstacles in their journey toward salvation:

> Puesto que el dramaturgo necesita complicar el proceso de conversión para así resaltar el mérito del santo, todos los convertidos, ya sean pecadores, paganos o infieles, se enfrentan con un difícil camino hacia la conversión. El convertido

[160] Dassbach does not present any further details as to the saint's life.

> habrá de superar una serie de obstáculos que entorpecen su conversión y, por tanto, su camino hacia la santidad. En el caso de los pecadores, los obstáculos que éstos han de superar son las tentaciones, mientras que en el caso de los paganos e infieles, los obstáculos vienen dados por las persecuciones o bien por ambas, persecuciones y tentaciones.[161] (*Comedia* 37)

Margarita's story aptly illustrates such a struggle against the potency of her desires. For example, despite the three supernatural signs she experiences, Margarita continues to fall back into her sinful ways. Fiorigio Minelli traces the stages through which the protagonist passes in her spiritual journey, drawing specific attention to the way in which she responds to the three signs. According to Minelli, Margarita, despite her determination to repent from her sinful ways, fails to find the strength within her to experience full salvation from her licentious passions, identifying her vanity as one of her primary obstacles (189-95). The critic further contextualizes Margarita's belief that she can free herself from her sinful passions through human merit within the larger theological debate of the day on grace:

> Pero Margarita, que sólo cuenta con sus propias fuerzas, hace ver que no puede levantarse, no puede abrirle la puerta a Dios, no puede cooperar. A lo que el Angel contesta que en realidad podría, pero solamente con la ayuda de la gracia. (189)

He also explores the relationship between the theology undergirding the play's action and the way in which Tirso represents her conversion dramatically:

> En este 'Dame la mano' del Angel está, creo yo, la clave para la interpretación de la postura teológica de Tirso frente a las controversias alrededor de la concordancia de la gracia con el libre albedrío, y es donde la representación teatral, con sus múltiples signos de comunicación, puede aventajar en claridad a la disputa teológica. (191)

[161] Dassbach further clarifies that for those plays dealing with a sinner's struggle against temptations, the particular sin they most often face threatens their chastity (*Comedia* 38).

Affirming his belief that the Angel's action in this scene represents divine initiative and authority (191-92), Minelli then elucidates the dramatic effects Tirso incorporated into the play by utilizing the very vice that has caused Margarita to stumble to effect her salvation. By presenting the Angel as a handsome young man, the act of succumbing to the Angel's wooing ensures her entrance into Heaven, and, consequently, lends greater verisimilitude to the work (195). Furthermore, he also cites ways in which Tirso employs symbolism and imagery to unify the internal structure of the play within the theological framework, using such recurring images as the horse (196-97), the chair (197-98), and the pearl (198). Thus, Minelli concludes that

> la conversión es el efecto de la operación de la gracia sobre la libertad humana . . . [p]ero una cosa es la teología y otra la representación en la escena. Dramáticamente, la conversión final es la culminación del movimiento dramático de la pieza, el blanco en que confluyen todas las fuerzas del drama. Tirso no sólo logra concordar la eficacia de la gracia con la libertad humana, mas las pone de acuerdo con las leyes de la comedia, que exige unidad orgánica y verosimilitud. (203)

In addition to the internal struggle Margarita experiences, she also faces opposition from the other characters in the play. When a group of characters discusses Margarita's response to St. Domingo's sermon, Finardo scoffingly replies, "¿Ella santa?" (389). Her bad reputation is so firmly established in the minds of the townspeople that they seriously doubt the possibility of her conversion. Later, after she has successfully maintained her purity for a year, Lelio enters and conquers her again, and rather than focus on what she has been able to accomplish, her father immediately condemns her and minimalizes her virtue:

> Valerio descolorido,
> de mi casa y descompuesto
> contra mis canas . . . ¿Qué es esto,
> aún no ha escarmentado herido?,
> pero no sin causa ha sido

según lo que llego a ver.
¡Ah inconstancia de mujer!
No es mucho sienta los lazos,
si toma el honor abrazos,
que otra vez vuelva a caer.
[. . .]
¡Qué presto te arrepentiste
De la virtud que profesas¡ (423-24)

Margarita faces obstacles not only from her own passionate desires but also from the skeptical attitude of the townspeople, the persistence of Lelio's wooing, the unfaithfulness of her servant, and the untrusting nature of her father. These impediments to her salvation accentuate the miraculous and spectacular scene in which Margarita finally experiences full pardon and acceptance by God. Thus, given that the play intricately develops the details of the protagonist's conversion, *Quien no cae* has been grouped with the hagiographic plays.

The sole scene in which an angel enters in the play takes place near the end when the Guardian Angel appears to Margarita.[162] When Margarita first sees the Angel, she does not know who he is. She only sees his physical appearance. The stage notes indicate "[*u*]*n mancebo muy galán sale y la levanta, que es el ángel de la guarda*" (432).

The Angel then engages Margarita in conversation about her situation. He first addresses her immediate fear: "Si su justicia os espanta, / mi Margarita, levanta" (432). When the sinner admits that she is unable to stand, the Angel then informs her of her deeper need: "Por ti sola no podrás, / si la gracia no te ayuda" (432).

[162] References to angels and demons in the characters' speech follow many of the same patterns of earlier plays. For example, Alberto attributes a mishap to demonic activity (322); Lelio and Britón reference demons as an expletive (334); Alberto mentions the devil when expressing shock or surprise (348-49); and Leonela quotes a poem that compares demons to poets (325).

As the two continue to converse, the Angel seeks to help Margarita have faith in God's grace. When she asks if grace can truly help her act as she ought, the angel responds, "Sí" (432). He then adds, "Llega, / que Dios su gracia no niega / al que hace lo que es en sí" (432). The Angel does not encourage Margarita to inactivity but rather endeavors to readjust her focus to understand the relationship between grace and works. In this way the heavenly messenger begins to give Margarita hope.

Despite the initial exhortation Margarita receives, she still struggles with her own failure as symbolized by her fall. When she presents this objection to the Angel, he replies, "Quien no cae no se levanta: / no hay natural tan robusto / que pueda tenerse en pie" (433). The fact that Margarita is a human being guarantees that she will fail, which is part of human nature due to the Fall. Consequently, the Angel reminds her that, rather than focus on her own strength and merit, she must accept her limitations in the overall scheme of salvation.

Expressing theological truth is not the only way in which the Angel seeks to persuade Margarita. He also employs classical allusions. When Margarita explains that her sin is mortal and, consequently, insurmountable, the Angel replies, "El gigante que luchaba / de la tierra que tocaba / se levantaba más fuerte" (433). According to Lara Escudero Baztán, his statement is an "alusión mitológica al gigante Anteo, invulnerable cada vez que tocaba la tierra (su madre). Fue derrotado por Hércules levantándole sobre sus hombros" (433). Margarita contextualizes her objection about her sin being mortal rather than venial by comparing it to a quotation from Scripture about the just person who falls seven times and rises again (Proverbs 24:16). However, the Angel, rather than quoting Scripture to her, references antiquity as a way to encourage her to rise again and

learn from her fall. Nevertheless, the Angel makes it clear that the source of her strength will not be herself: “Dame la mano, que así / no volverás a caer” (433). Her responsibility is to take the Angel’s hand. The power that will sustain her is not human but divine in nature. The Angel promises security.

Once the Angel has commanded her to take his hand, Margarita begins to experience a physical reaction to his presence:

> ¿Quién eres tú que a encender
> mi pecho vienes aquí,
> desde que tu mano toca
> las mías? Dichoso empleo
> desde que tus ojos veo,
> desde que vierte tu boca
> no palabras, sino almíbar,
> desde que tus labios bellos
> contemplo y en tus cabellos
> arma lazos de oro Tíbar. (433)

However, this physical reaction causes Margarita to fear; she has struggled against her passion for so long that she cautiously asks who the young man is with whom she speaks (434). The Angel replies, “Quien por quererte / ha dado entrada la muerte. / Soy un Fénix del amor, / que muerto por los desvelos / con que mis méritos tratas, / hoy a tus manos ingratas / me rinden preso los celos” (434). Baztán notes that Fénix is a “símbolo de la vida eterna” (434) and a reference to Christ’s death and resurrection. The word “méritos” refers to the grace that prompts each action: “[l]os ángeles disfrutan de la presencia de la gracia eterna . . . y de las tres virtudes principales: fe, esperanza y caridad, siendo meritorios desde el principio” (434). In this way, the Angel begins to connect his identity and his actions within the framework of divine Redemption while still utilizing his attractive appearance to appeal to Margarita.

When she continues to resist, the Angel then exclaims,

¡Ay Margarita perdida!
¿No me has visto? Pues yo sé
hasta el menor pensamiento
de tu amoroso cuidado;
y, trayéndome a tu lado
en fee del amor que siento
y que le pagues aguarda,
tanto te he dado en celar
que me pudieras llamar
al propio tu ángel de guarda. (434-35)

The Angel now openly identifies himself in order to demonstrate to the doubting sinner that he is her Guardian Angel who, motivated by love, seeks to protect her and help her attain salvation.

Once Margarita becomes aware of the identity of the Angel, she begins to realize the alternative before her. Her earthly lovers brought only pain and sorrow, while her heavenly lover offers her true love and salvation:

En la celestial belleza
con que a amarte me provoco,
ángel eres, y aun es poco.
Si celos te dan tristeza,
Piérdelos, mi bien, que ya
Lelio es mi muerte y Valerio
mi tormento y vituperio.
Solo en mi pecho hallará
entrada alegre y suave
tu amor, que por dueño queda,
y porque otro entrar no pueda,
cierra y llévate la llave. (435)

The final lines of the previous quotation reveal Margarita's desire to surrender fully to her celestial suitor. Her spiritual eyes have begun to open. She now begins to see that the desire she feels for the Angel is holy: "Y no entiendo lo que es esto, / pues en tan dichoso paso / siento que por él me abraso, / y el fuego es santo y honesto" (436).

The Angel then extends his offer to Margarita again, but this time he appeals not simply to her passions, but to another part of her being: "Y si persuadida estás / a ser mi

querida esposa, / no en tálamos de la tierra / donde amor no es paz que es guerra, / sino entre el jazmín y rosa / del deleite, que es eterno, / nos hemos de desposar" (437). It is true that Margarita has lived a life controlled by her passions. Even though the Angel initially assumes a human appearance to attract her, his action does not reflect an appeal entirely to her senses. The Angel reasons with Margarita and fulfills a vital role in the evolving thoughts of the protagonist. While her physical attraction to and desire for the Angel may be what initially draw her to him, before the two ascend to Heaven, he appeals to her thinking. When the Angel initially offers his hand to her, Margarita hesitates. He has not yet fully convinced her that what he offers is true. However, once he does, she readily accepts. She does not simply follow her feelings, as she has in the past; she exercises faith in the Angel's message.

The way in which Tirso represents the Angel in this play departs substantially from the methods employed in the previous works. Generally speaking, the functions the angels perform in the plays align within the theological framework of the day. The dramatist does take some liberties in how those functions are accomplished, most likely as a way to impress the audience and, consequently, enhance the plays' effectiveness as didactic literature. In this play, although the functions of the Angel are orthodox, the way in which Tirso realizes the role presents a theological problem regarding the relationship between human beings and celestial beings; the marriage analogy between the Angel and Margarita lacks biblical support. In the first gospel account, St. Matthew writes, "And Jesus answering, said to them: You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they shall neither marry nor be married; but shall be as the angels of God in heaven" (St. Matthew 22:29-30). According to Scripture

God is the spiritual Husband and the Church is His bride (Ephesians 5:22-33). Nowhere in the biblical sources does an Angel ever take the place of God in this role.

The fact that Tirso chooses to represent the Angel in this non-traditional role does not necessarily indicate doctrinal error. He could have intended the Angel's offer to serve as a picture of the spiritual union that God offers to His bride. Nevertheless, the departure from the existing biblical framework allows greater thematic unity as Tirso uses the Angel to appeal to Margarita's vice in order to effect her salvation.

In sum, the Angel in *Quien no cae* fulfills a vital role in the ultimate salvation of Margarita. The relationship between the two is much more personal than in other plays from this study. The Angel not only appeals to the sinner physically, but he also appeals to her thinking in order to convince her to trust the message of hope that he delivers.

La Santa Juana, trilogy

The trilogy, *La Santa Juana*, differs from the other works in this study not merely due to its length but also for the extensive role of the Angel. The first play details Juana's escape from an unwanted marriage and her entrance into the Franciscan Order.[163] The play opens with the marriage of Gil and Elvira, two servants of Juana's father. During the festivities, Francisco Loarte and his servant, Lillo, enter and note Juana's extraordinary beauty. Francisco requests permission to spend the night, and the next day he asks Juana's father for her hand in marriage. Juana objects to the proposal and decides to flee. Dressed in her cousin's clothes, she leaves the house and makes her

[163] This play contains several subplots that complicate a succinct summary of the work. Consequently, the main action of each play will be presented at this time, and appropriate connections to the subplots will be made as necessary in the section devoted to textual analysis.

way toward the monastery of San Francisco. En route, Loarte recognizes her. When he tries to stop her, she miraculously disappears, safely escaping. When she finally arrives at the monastery, her father and Francisco find her and try to convince her to return home. Juana, surrounded by the nuns, determines to devote herself to God and join the Order. In the final act of the play, all are amazed by Juana's unparalleled piety, the spectacular miracles she performs, and the special ability she possesses to communicate with her Guardian Angel and God. The Maestra de Novicias is the only member of the monastery that protests to Juana's quick rise to fame, foreshadowing the tensions that arise between the two during the subsequent section of the work.

The second play begins with a visit from the King, Carlos V, who is about to set off on a campaign against the spread of Lutheranism. Juana, after discussing the evils of the cult with her Guardian Angel, blesses the King in his endeavor. The town now has a new Comendador. He is very friendly with the ladies and falls in love with Mari Pascuala, whom he abducts at a baptismal service. When her uncle rescues her, they decide to hide her at the monastery. Juana tries to convince the girl to join the Order. Mari Pascuala resists at first, escapes, and has relations with the Comendador. Afterward, burdened by the weight of her sin, she almost commits suicide, but is hindered by Juana. Having realized the danger of her rebellion, Mari Pascuala repents and decides to enter the Order.

Meanwhile, the Maestra de Novicias has become the Vicaria. Due to her ever-increasing distrust and envy of Juana, she decides to spread lies about the young lady, and, consequently, Juana is punished. However, even throughout her suffering she maintains a holy, submissive, and joyful attitude. In the final act of the play, the

audience learns that Vicaria is dying. Juana intercedes for her enemy and for the Comendador, who has also died. God honors her request, allowing Vicaria to enter Heaven and the Comendador to suffer in Purgatory rather than be condemned to Hell.

The action of the final play develops around a dispute between César and Don Luis, both of whom love Inés. César claims to have been in a relationship with the lady for more than a year. He accuses Luis of interfering and coming dangerously close to damaging his honor. César appeals to Luis's father. The father agrees with César, but is unable to convince his rebellious son to repent of his ways. To further complicate the situation, Aldonza, a peasant girl, approaches Juana and tells her that Luis, who had once promised her marriage, has now abandoned her. Don Diego, Luis's father, eventually comes to Juana and confesses his faults in raising his son and requests punishment for his failures. Juana intercedes for Luis and for the Comendador, who is still in Purgatory. God answers her request and sends the spirit of the Comendador to Luis to convince him of his need to repent. Luis realizes the sinfulness of his lifestyle and repents. He returns to the monastery and asks forgiveness from those whom he has offended. They agree and Inés decides to marry him. The play ends with Juana's death. She has grown tired and weary from her years of ministering to others and now looks forward with great anticipation to her eternal reward and union with her Husband. In the final scene, Jesus Himself descends to receive her and escort her to Heaven as His bride.

La Santa Juana easily qualifies as a hagiographic drama. First, the trilogy represents the life of Juana de la Cruz. According to Hughes, "She was born in 1481 in the tiny village of Cubas, near Toledo, and died in 1534. Since her miracles and

ecstasies were widely recognized, the Church has given her the title *beata*; however, it has not yet seen fit to canonize her" (46). Dassbach classifies the play as a mendicant and miracle worker drama (*Comedia* 10). First, she explains how Juana fulfills four of the five stages through which mendicants must pass in the hagiographic plays: 1) Juana separates from the outside world in order to enter a religious Order by refusing the marriage her father seeks to impose on her and escaping to the monastery in order to dedicate herself solely to God; 2) she commits to a vow of poverty by choosing the habit of St. Francis over that of Santo Domingo when the two appear to her; 3) she dedicates herself to a vow of chastity not only by maintaining her own sexual purity, but also by making amends for Inés and her lack of chastity in the Order; and 4) she submits to a vow of obedience by willingly and cheerfully enduring all the demands placed on her by her superiors, even when they have wrongfully accused her (*Comedia* 20). Juana does not technically fulfill the fifth criterion in which the saint must have dedicated herself to some sort of religious service in the world. However, Dassbach posits that the protagonist must have fulfilled this stage as well, even if not clearly stated by the dramatist, especially considering the miracles that she performs. She writes,

> Tirso no es muy específico acerca del tipo de actividad mundana asociado con la orden, pero esta actividad sería probablemente una labor caritativa o humanitaria. Se dramatiza la cura de una endemoniada y hay alusiones a milagros realizados por Juana, pero no se menciona la naturaleza de los mismos. (*Comedia* 20-21)

The fact that Juana's supernatural feats are abundant in the work also designates her as a miracle worker. First, Dassbach highlights multiple instances in which the saint demonstrates special ability to communicate with celestial beings, including her Guardian Angel, the Virgin Mary, and God Himself (*Comedia* 74-75). She also

experiences miracles of protection, particularly in her journey to the monastery (*Comedia* 75) and from the envious attacks of Vicaria (*Comedia* 76). Furthermore, the protagonist performs several miracles of healing, casting out demons, and even bringing a dead girl to life (*Comedia* 76-77). The way in which these supernatural events permeate the play distinguishes the work from the other hagiographic dramas, making it a superlative example of the miracle worker tradition.[164]

Nancy K. Mayberry also explores the similarity between *La Santa Juana* and the ascetic literature from the period. For her, the play demonstrates

> the traditional three stages of the soul's journey to perfection. The first play shows Juana in the purgative way as she struggles to free herself from the things of this world and escape to a convent. Part II, in which the saint is in the illuminative way, dramatizes the sufferings and struggles that are the property of this state. The fulfillment of this way raises one to the final level of union, which is dramatized in the third play. Tirso, a Mercedarian friar steeped in theology, was of course fully cognizant of these three stages of the Christian soul, described by [St.] Thomas Aquinas as well as the Pseudo-Dionysius [sic]. (14-15)

In addition to these three stages of development, Mayberry also elucidates a unity between the play's subplots and the different stages through which the protagonist passes. In this way the dramatist successfully creates a dual plane, both profane and spiritual, by which he adds "tensions and conflicts" (14), and, thus, enhances the dramatic quality of the work.

The first of the three plays contains six scenes in which an angel or a demon appears.[165] In the first scene, Juana leaves her house dressed in her cousin's clothing in

---

[164] Wilson goes even so far as to state that representing the miracles is in reality the reason for the play's existence "rather than any deeper spirituality or moral teaching" (*Tirso* 99). Citing Serge Maurel, she states that the play contains forty-nine instances in which Juana experiences or effects some kind of supernatural event (*Tirso* 99).

[165] References to spiritual beings in the characters' ordinary speech follow many of the same patterns of the other plays. However, greater variety exists in *La Santa Juana.* For

order to escape the unwanted marriage and enter the monastery. When she begins to have doubts, she considers returning home and submitting to her father's will. As she begins to turn back, the Angel, without visibly appearing, stops her and says, "Tente, Juana. ¿Dónde vuelves? / Esfuérzate, no desmayes" (1: 794). The Angel knows that it is God's will for Juana to enter the Order. However, Juana, as a human being, struggles with doubt. Consequently, the Angel's intervention serves as a confirmation of her feeling that God wants her to dedicate herself to Him alone and not enter into matrimony with Francisco. This first action of the Angel is the most subtle of all the scenes.[166] He does not actually appear but rather works invisibly. Juana's reaction also

---

example, at the beginning of the play when the guests are praising the bride's beauty, instead of simply describing her as angelic, they state that she is beautiful "[c]omo un serafín" (1: 770). The Seraphim are those angels that serve at God's throne and reflect His glory (as opposed to the Cherubim who guarded the Garden of Eden with flaming swords). They usually are associated with fire and purification (Gigot "Seraphim"). This reference to angels complements the overall themes of the hagiographic genre. Later, when Juana hears the voice and sees the habit of St. Francis, she exclaims, "Estas son galas de Cristo / y de Francisco librea, / Santo en quien Dios hermosea / las llagas con el carmín, / que el alado Serafín / en vuestras carnes emplea" (1: 791). This reference to the Seraphim could allude to the vision of the Seraph that St. Francis experienced (Robinson, "St. Francis of Assisi"). Later, the Abadesa of the monastery refers to Juana when she states, "La grande virtud contemplo / que encierra este serafín" (1: 805). Here she compares Juana's righteous virtue to the type of angel that represents God's glory. The Maestra, prior to the onset of her jealous vengeance, refers to Juana's holiness by exclaiming, "¡Hay tal ángel!" (1: 805). Juana appears almost non-human for her extreme piety and graciousness. Finally, once the Maestra begins to view Juana as a threat to her own personal advancement in the Order, she begins to submit that Juana is in fact demon-possessed rather than favored by God to work these miracles. She states, "Esta es hechicera; en ella / hay, sin duda, algún encanto. / ¿Por qué el Espíritu Santo / había de hablar por ella? / ¡Cómo finge! Es disparate; / yo sé que está endemoniada / cuando se queda arrobada / cada punto" (1: 817). The Maestra, motivated by envy, commits the same error as the Pharisees when they accused Christ of casting out demons by "Beelzebub the prince of devils" (St. Matthew 12:24-28).

[166] One could consider the voice Juana hears prior to her decision to leave the house as an angelic encounter as well. In that scene the habit of St. Francis appears and a voice tells her "Estas son mis galas, Juana" (1: 791). However, the character is listed simply as "voz." Thus, it is excluded from the criteria used in this study since it focuses only on

confirms that while she recognizes that God is at work, she is not yet aware of the special privilege of frequently conversing with her Guardian Angel that she will enjoy: "¡Jesús! Qué notable fuerza / sin ver a nadie he sentido / que la vuelta me ha impedido. / La voz sonora me esfuerza; / ánimo cobro ya nuevo. / Eterno Esposo, ya os sigo, / que, pues os llevo conmigo, / suficiente guarda llevo" (1: 795).

In the second scene, the Angel comforts Juana. Prior to the Angel's appearance, Juana accidentally breaks a clay jar. She then prays, and God miraculously causes a new jar to appear. The Maestra, envious of the favor she has received, accuses Juana of being "[v]anagloriosa [y] arrogante" and states that "estas cosas son / hechicerías" (1: 809). Juana responds by falling to her knees and asking forgiveness. When the Maestra leaves, Juana continues to examine herself to see whether she truly is guilty of the sins of pride and arrogance. While she is still lying prostrate on the ground, the Angel appears and causes her to stand to her feet. He tenderly addresses her by name and reminds her, "El Angel soy de tu guarda / que he venido a consolarte; / yo propio he de levantarte" (1: 809). Juana responds with reverence and awe:

> El temor que me acobarda
> viendo tan grande beldad,
> Angel, no me deja hablaros,
> porque vuestros rayos claros,
> esa hermosa majestad
> me ciegan
> [. . .]
> Pues la humana cortesía,
> llama al señor señoría,
> y al Príncipe y Rey Alteza;
> desde hoy mi lengua procura,
> ayo mío venturoso
> (pues sois tan bello y hermoso),

---

scenes in which an angel or demon appear as characters or when a supernatural event is clearly attributed to a spiritual being in the context of the passage.

llamaros Vuestra Hermosura.
Este título he de daros,
mas no os habéis de partir,
que ya no podré vivir,
Angel mío, sin miraros. (1: 809-10)

Juana, struck by the intense beauty of the Angel, decides to honor him by giving him a special title, just as one does to a King. In this way she shows respect for his position. At the same time, she accepts the favor that God has granted her to see and speak to her Guardian Angel. Now that she has experienced his beauty, she cannot live without it. The Angel then affirms to her that she will indeed be able to see him because God has decreed it: "Dios quiere que hables conmigo / siempre que hablarme quisieres / dondequiera que estuvieres, / y como a hermano y amigo / me veas y comuniques" (1: 810). Unlike the other saint plays in which the angels typically appear to perform some task such as delivering a divine message or providing deliverance from danger, here the Angel becomes, in a sense, Juana's best friend. She has been granted power to call her Angel when she desires.

Before departing, the Angel delivers a final message to Juana that she will one day rule over the Order. He explains that Juana's presence there is part of a divine plan to restore honor to the Order:

[T]ú la has de gobernar, Juana,
tu protección la defienda;
que después que la pastora
Inés se dejó vencer
del mundo, como mujer,
la Reina, nuestra señora,
a su Hijo soberano
pidió que al mundo enviase
quien su casa gobernase;
y su poderosa mano
te crió para este fin. (1: 810)

The Angel then informs her that later that day she will be honored with a new position within the Order: "Hoy te harán, Juana, tornera" (1: 810).[167] Thus, the Angel informs her of future events as a way to verify God's approval of her ministry and reaffirm His plan for her.

The third scene contains a demon that has possessed the body of Gil's daughter.[168] The characters learn from a priest that the girl is demon-possessed. Gil explains to Juana that he has come to her "porque tien la chica / espirtos, según dice nueso Cura / que la da con la estola y la conjura" (1:814). However, even though the priest discerns the problem, he is unable to cast out the Demon. The fact that he lacks this ability demonstrates the extent to which the Demon has control of the girl. In Scripture Christ gave to His disciples the ability to cast out demons (St. Matthew 10:1). However, even they were sometimes incapable of casting out the worst kinds (St. Mark 9:15-28). Likewise, Juana is unable to cast out the Demon immediately. The first three times that she commands the Demon to leave, he refuses. The fourth time she prays to God that He will allow her by St. Francis's cord to cast him out. This time she successfully saves the girl from the evil spirit.

Several terms are used in this scene to refer to the Demon. Gil calls it a spirit (1: 814); the other workers refer to it as a devil (1: 814). Juana uses two different terms to refer to the Demon: "maldito" and "padre de mentiras" (1: 815). Both of these terms are derived from Scripture. The Demon is a condemned spirit, just as Satan himself has

---

[167] *Autoridades* defines a "tornera" as a nun who serves in the "torno." A "torno" is a "ventanilla cerrada con una caxa con varias diviſiones por donde ſe mandan Religioſas, y perſonas recogidas, dandole vueltas" ("Torno").

[168] Gil is the servant that was married two years ago at the beginning of the play. His wife has now died, and he brings his demon-possessed daughter to Juana to be healed.

been condemned (St. Matthew 25:41). Likewise, Satan is referred to in Scripture as the "father of lies" (St. John 8:44).

Throughout the interchange between Juana and the Demon, the evil spirit demonstrates a great deal of arrogance and confidence about his power. When Juana initially commands him to depart, he replies, "Ni tú ni el Cielo / no me podrán echar, que ésta es mi casa" (1: 815).[169] His belief that he is more powerful than Heaven itself reveals the root sin that caused the initial fall: pride or *superbia*. The second time Juana attempts to cast him out, the demon replies in Latin: "*Nolo exire*, vil Juanilla, / *in domo mea maneo; haec est mea domus / sine me*" (1: 815). The third time the demon says, "¿*Potestatem / habes ut me ejicias? Accipe higam* . . . ¡Idiota! ¿No me entiendes?" (1: 815).[170] Here the Demon becomes even more vile in his response. Not only is he proud, but he is also obscene to the saint. Additionally, the fact that the Demon speaks in Latin causes those present to marvel. Gil exclaims, "¡Aho, Llorente! ¿Los dimoños / van cuando son mochachos al estudio?" (1: 815). To which Llorente replies, "Sí, que también hay diablos estodiantes" (1: 815). The association of Latin with learning and culture surprises Gil because the Demon represents all that is base and evil. Llorente shows that one's possession of knowledge and learning does not necessarily equal

[169] The play does not list the Demon in the cast of characters. Rather, it includes only the girl. Nevertheless, given the context of the episode, it is clear that in reality it is the Demon who has taken control of her body and speaks through her, although the script indicates that the girl utters the Demon's lines.

[170] *Autoridades* defines "higa" as "la acción que ſe hace con la mano cerrado el puño, moſtrando el dedo pulgar por entre el dedo índice y del en medio, con la qual ſe ſeñalaba à las perſonas infames o torpes, ò ſe hacía burla y deſprécio de ellas" ("Higa").

holiness.[171] The demons are learned, intellectual beings, yet they are still evil and condemned.[172]

The fourth scene relates the conversation between Juana and her Angel about the many souls in Purgatory. Juana begins by addressing the Angel as "Angel santo" (1: 818). She then tells him of the great burden she has as the Abbess of the Cross for those who are in Purgatory. She feels insufficient for the task and prays to the Angel for assistance stating, "pues asiste en la presencia / de Dios" (1: 818). As she finishes her prayer, she begins to cry. The Angel responds by presenting a series of questions to her in order to remind her that not only has God called her to the task, but that he, as her Guardian Angel, will help her with it:

> ¿Por qué lloras?
> Juana: ¿es esa tu obediencia?
> ¿Es bien que la voluntad
> de Dios resistas, que ordena
> que gobiernes esta casa?
> ¿No te crió para ella?
> ¿No puedo ayudarte yo?
> ¿Conmigo ese temor muestras?
> ¿Es eso lo que me estimas? (1: 818)

Consequently, she should be strengthened in her faith and confidence, knowing that she will be successful in what God has called her to do.

Juana responds by affirming again that the Angel is a great encouragement to her. Then she begins to ask the Angel why he has never told her his name. He replies,

> San Laurel Aureo es mi nombre;
> hízome la mano eterna

---

[171] Later, Gil issues another humorous statement that reveals his ignorance. When the demon says, "*Patrona: / sentite una parola, per mea vita, / mi che volo parlar Chichiliano*" (1: 815), Gil replies, "No debe ser cristiano este demonio" (1: 815).
[172] The comment could also serve as a light satire against education. The seventeenth century in Spain saw a significant emphasis on satire of most aspects of life and most types of people.

de Dios de sus más privados;
dióme gracias tan inmensas,
que el Angel del Privilegio
me llaman, y en verme tiemblan,
las infernales moradas
que a mi nombre están sujetas.
Yo fuí el Angel de la Guarda
de David, rey y profeta;
de San Jorge y San Gregorio,
columna de nuestra Iglesia.
Mira lo que a Dios le debes,
pues tu guarda me encomienda
y a tales santos te iguala,
y en tu misma boca y lengua
habla el Espíritu Santo,
y hablará lenguas diversas
por trece años, predicando
su ley divina y excela.
Su predicadora te hace. (1: 818)

The names that the Angel utters demonstrate the clear position of authority that he holds over other spiritual beings. His speech also reveals that individuals have specific Guardian Angels and that God assigns the best angels to the most influential people in the Church. By connecting Juana to famous people such as King David, he affirms to her again that God has chosen her for a specific purpose and has equipped her for the task by assigning to her a very powerful and capable Angel as a helper. The Angel concludes by informing her of a new role God has for her as one of His preachers. God's Spirit will work through her, and she will have new abilities as a result. Juana responds with a grateful heart and prays that she will be worthy of such love shown to her. As the Angel departs, he tells her that the other nuns are coming to see her and reminds Juana that he will always be with her.

In the fifth scene the Angel appears to Juana and delivers to her some petitions from the souls in Purgatory. He tells her that they know of the efficacy of her prayers, and they have requested her intercession (1: 819-20). Juana agrees. The Angel then

informs Juana that some of the nuns are coming, and he must depart because "no quiero que me vean / del modo que tú ves" (1: 820). He realizes that Juana has received special grace from God that the others have not been given. Consequently, in order to protect the unique relationship between them, he departs.

The final scene records the answer to Juana's prayer. As the nuns gather together to pray, they begin to hear music and then receive a heavenly vision: "*Todas de rodillas, suena música, ábrese una apariencia de la Gloria. Cristo, sentado en un trono, el* Angel *de rodillas dándole los rosarios y muchos ángeles alrededor*" (1: 823-24). The image represents a typical heavenly scene of the throne of God surrounded by ministering spirits. The Angel kneels before Christ and presents Juana's intercessory request saying, "Autor eterno de gracia: / estos rosarios suplica / vuestra esposa y tierna Juana / que bendigáis" (1: 824). Christ responds by granting the request. Then the vision fades, and the Angel descends to earth. The nuns, amazed by the scene they have just witnessed, listen to the Angel's final speech:

> A estos rosarios, Juana,
> ha concedido tu Esposo
> los privilegios y gracias
> que tienen los *Agnus Dei*.
> Quien rezare en ellos saca
> de penas de Purgatorio
> cada día muchas almas,
> y gana tantos perdones
> como hay hojas, flores, plantas
> media legua alrededor
> deste monasterio y casa,
> y las indulgencias propias
> de Asís, famosa en Italia.
> Saldrán los demonios luego
> de los cuerpos con tocarlas;
> librarán de enfermedades,
> torbellinos y borrascas.
> La misma virtud tendrán

las cuentas a estas tocadas;
todo lo concede Cristo,
con tal que las que da el Papa
se estimen como es razón.
Ven, esposa soberana,
adonde tu Esposo veas. (1: 824)

Here the Angel summarizes what has happened and prophesies about what further miracles will be performed. His speech serves as a recapitulation of the spiritual lessons of the play, and ends with a final miracle, leaving the nuns amazed at the special favor God has showered on Juana.

In the second play of the trilogy, the saint's Guardian Angel appears in five different scenes.[173] In the first scene of the play, Juana and the Angel discuss the dangers of Lutheranism. Their conversation takes place in the air between Heaven and earth. The stage directions describe the scene as follows: "*Música, y salen la* Santa *y el* Angel de la Guarda, *arriba, que va bajando hasta la mitad del tablado, y la* Santa, *subiendo dél al mismo tiempo, hasta emparejar los dos, y entonces cesa la música*" (1: 825). The Angel begins the scene by exalting Juana and her role in the Church's victory over the dangerous Lutheran heresies. He refers to Luther as the "dragón terrible / de las siete cabezas que en Sajonia / niega la ley católica infalible" (1: 825). This description utilizes biblical imagery from the book of the Apocalypse: "And there was seen another sign in Heaven: and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads, and ten horns: and on his head seven diadems" (Apocalypse 12:3). The Angel then labels Luther a false prophet by stating, "y que el rebaño del Pastor cordero, / este lobo, en oveja disfrazado, / despedazase con estrago fiero" (1: 825). This description comes from the gospel account of St. Matthew when Christ warns against the false teachers that will come into

[173] References the characters make to angels and demons as a part of their conversation continue to appear in the same contexts as in the other plays.

the world (St. Matthew 7:15). Finally, the Angel compares the heretic to Lucifer and his fall from Heaven:

> Llorabas que se hubiese dilatado
> su blasfema y pestífera dotrina
> por Alemania y su imperial Estado,
> y que, cual de la máquina divina,
> derribó la tercer parte de estrellas
> la angélica sobrebia [sic.] serpentina,
> este Anticristo austral, las leyes bellas
> de la alemana Iglesia derribase. (1: 825)

Juana proceeds to lament the spiritual downfall of the world along with the Angel, stating that now three quarters of the entire world has been lost to false teaching:

> De tres partes del mundo están perdidas
> las dos, porque Asia y Africa no adoran
> sino de Agar las leyes pervertidas;
> los más la luz de la verdad ignoran,
> y perdido el camino verdadero,
> al despeñarse sin remedio lloran,
> pues si agora el apóstata Lutero
> este rincón de nuestra Europa abrasa
> con la doctrina falsa y el acero;
> si a Europa, que es columna firme y basa
> de nuestra militante Monarquía,
> los límites que Dios la puso pasa,
> ¿quién duda que la bárbara herejía
> de mar a mar ensanchará el imperio
> que tuvo antes la ciega idolatría? (1: 826)

Despite the dire situation the two have just described, the Angel and Juana begin to contemplate the spiritual victories that the Church experiences through warriors such as Hernán Cortés in New Spain (1: 826). The two then fly to another corner of the stage and contemplate another hero, "Alonso de Alburquerque, lusitano" (1: 827), and the victory he experienced over the Moors in northern Africa. Having considered the victories of both Spain and Portugal in the battle against heresy, the Angel and Juana then discuss the unification of the two countries under Felipe II, comparing the glory of

his reign to that of King Solomon's (1: 827). The Angel then concludes, "Aquí la cristiandad está segura; / la justicia en su punto y la prudencia" (1: 827), and states that they must pray that God will open the eyes of those contemplating the heresy (1: 827). Upon finishing his speech, the Angel informs Juana that the King is coming to visit her, and then he flies away.

This initial conversation fulfills several functions in the play. First, the dramatist uses the opportunity to re-establish the special relationship between the saint and her Guardian Angel. Second, he takes the opportunity to preach a common message of the day against Lutheranism and affirm the sovereignty of the Church. Finally, he exalts the role of Spain in the fight against heresy and underscores how her leaders have fought to keep the Church pure. The conversation has very little bearing on the action of the play itself, except for the fact that shortly thereafter, King Carlos V comes to receive a blessing before going out to battle against the heretics. It does, however, reiterate the standard values of the day while placing the sermon in the mouth of an angel in order to intensify the importance of the message and the urgency of the situation.

If the tone of the first scene is militaristic and confident, that of the second is characterized by sadness. When the Angel appears to Juana this time, he does so to inform her of the suffering she is about to experience at the hand of Vicaria. When the Angel appears, he does so crying. He prefaces his message with a description of Juana's singular holiness: "Segura está tu conciencia, / Juana; nunca has cometido / culpa mortal; siempre has sido / monja vieja en la inocencia" (1: 833).

The Angel then reveals an aspect of his being when he states, "Aunque lloro en la apariencia / no lloro por propiedad, / que los que ven la deidad / infinita y soberana /

jamás pueden llorar, Juana, / ni sentir penalidad" (1: 833). According to *Autoridades*, "propiedad" can refer to "propension, ó inclinacion de costumbre, que alguno tiene á alguna cosa" ("Propiedad"). According to the Angel, he cannot weep for sorrow as an aspect of his being because angels are not inclined that way. Unlike human beings, they cannot experience sorrow and fear because they have more direct access to God and more perfect knowledge.[174] He then explains that his weeping is more symbolic based on the message he is about to deliver:

> Hete parecido ansí
> en muestras y testimonio
> de que ha pedido el Demonio
> licencia a Dios contra ti;
> si te regaló hasta aquí,
> como a Job, probarte intenta,
> y el común contrario inventa
> un tropel de tempestades,
> trabajos, enfermedades,
> desprecio, agravio y afrenta.
> Dios los trabajos amó
> en el mundo, de tal suerte;
> Jamás, Juana, los dejó.
> ¿Qué santo no los pasó?
> Ninguno; que son favores
> de Cristo, y en sus amores
> son su escogida librea,
> y quien amalle desea
> justo es traiga sus colores. (1: 833-34)

The Angel's message reveals the testing Juana is about to undergo. Just like Job, she has been found faithful and upright before God. Consequently, the Devil, who always seeks to destroy, desires to test her in hopes that she will reject God. A key difference, though, is that the Angel has revealed this news to Juana in advance. Job, on the contrary, did not know of Satan's plan at the time of his troubles. While he did not

[174] His explanation to Juana in this passage reiterates statements made by St. Thomas about the angels being intellectual beings, and, consequently, not having a sensistive part of their being (1a.54.3).

lose faith in God, he did question God about the purpose of the trial. Not until the end of the book does God appear to Job to explain the mystery of His working and help Job adjust his perspective. By announcing the testing in advance, the message serves more as an encouragement to the saint; she knows from the outset that God will not abandon her. It also serves to encourage her that God deems her worthy of testing, just like all other saints before her. Juana, as a result, responds with joy and looks forward to the suffering as another way to experience God's grace and presence (1: 834).

In the third scene the Angel appears and assigns a new task to the saint: "Juana: Dios manda que tu misma historia / y los milagros que contigo ha hecho / escribas, porque todo sea en gloria / de su eterno poder y en tu provecho" (1: 837). When Juana responds that this task may produce vanity and pride in her heart and cause her to fall, the Angel assures her that God has commanded it, and, therefore, He will help her (1: 837). Juana then objects that she cannot write the book because "la virtud es muda" (1: 837). The Angel replies that virtue and humility work together in obedience to God's command, and, furthermore, the act of recording these wonders will exalt God's power and abase the saint because all will truly see that she has unworthily received such favor from God (1: 838). Juana agrees that she is unworthy but still requests that the Angel allow someone else to write the book in her place.[175] Her Guardian Angel agrees to allow one of the other nuns to perform the task for her. Even then Juana asks how the task will be possible if the nun is illiterate. The spirit simply replies, "La omnipotencia

[175] In this particular request, Juana also addresses the Angel by referencing one of his heavenly functions: "pero, Angel santo, tú que siempre cantas / en la presencia de mi Esposo eterno, / de el [sic] *Sancto, Sancto, Sancto,* el himno tierno" (1: 838). The reference again identifies the Angel as a Seraph by connecting his function to the passage in Isaiah 6.

suma / no hay cosa que no pueda y que no acabe; / ella es quien rige ya su mano y pluma" (1: 838). Before taking his leave, the Angel reminds Juana of the testing that she will face: "Gran torbellino contra ti levanta / el Demonio; de afrentas perseguida / de todos has de ser" (1: 838). Juana replies that she does not fear his attacks. The Angel then returns to Heaven.

In this particular scene, in addition to delivering his message, the Angel also reasons with Juana. Despite her role as a saint, Juana is still a human being who struggles with sin. Here, although veiled by her pious concern that she not be lifted up with pride, her doubt that she can perform what God has asked illustrates her imperfection. The Angel explains to her that all things are possible with God but also exercises authority to approve a substitute to perform the actual act of writing. These acts, while not necessarily unorthodox, provide additional examples of the liberties that the dramatist takes in his representation of the angels.[176]

The fourth scene contains an extensive passage by the Angel. The scene begins with the Angel's affirmation that he is always with her (1: 846). She responds by declaring to him that he is her best friend (1: 846). The Angel reminds her that even though she is suffering at the hands of Vicaria, God is pleased with her quiet suffering: "[m]irando está tu humildad / tu Esposo, a quien enamoras / con las lágrimas que lloras" (1: 847). Because of her piety, the Angel tells her that he wishes to talk about the future: "te quiero, Juana, decir / los milagros que tus cuentas / tienen de hacer en España" (1: 847).

The Angel begins by asking Juana to sit down to have a conversation:

[176] He also portrays the Angel as a character who seeks to influence the thinking of the saint through reason, rather than simply delivering a message.

Aunque no cobra
mi angélica agilidad
cansancio del movimiento,
por no ser en mí violento,
con más familiaridad
y amor en esta ocasión,
porque consolarte espero,
sentarme, mi Juana, quiero
contigo a conversación. (1: 847)

The way in which their conversation begins provides an opportunity for the Angel to emphasize the special relationship the two have. He has no need to sit and rest; weariness is not a feeling he experiences as an angel. However, because of their friendship and the love he has for Juana, he sits down with her as a friend to talk. His speech consists largely of informing her of the miracles she will perform in the future as well as of events yet to take place in Spain. He makes several references to rulers such as Felipe II and Felipe III and speaks of the future Pope, Clement VIII. He describes what lies in store for her Order, lists the many miracles that will take place, and reaffirms to her that God loves her and that her suffering for His sake is well worth the eternal reward He offers (1: 847-48). Their conversation then returns to the present as the Angel reminds her to stay strong in her time of trial. He again promises he will always be with her, and he then returns to Heaven (1: 848).

The final scene for analysis takes place in the cell where Juana has been incarcerated in a small room within the monastery as punishment for her supposed wicked deeds. As she is delivering a sermon to some fish that have appeared, San Antonio, the Christ child, and the Angel appear to her. The Angel carries with him a crown of flowers (1: 857). Jesus speaks to Juana and tells her that Vicaria is going to die. Juana intercedes for her soul, and Christ decides to forgive her out of love for Juana. Then the Angel crowns the saint and Jesus states, “Con esta corona hermosa /

que Laurel, tu ángel, te pone, / tu constancia te corone" (1: 858). The crown symbolizes that Juana has passed through the time of testing, and now she will be vindicated before all.

The role of the Angel in this scene differs from his role in previous scenes in the play. Instead of being a central figure that interacts with the saint, here he fulfills a secondary role as a servant to Jesus. In this way the dramatist respects the theological order of being. The Angel, when God is not visibly present, becomes more active as he completes his assigned tasks. When deity is present, the Angel still fulfills his function as an attendant to God but does so in a way that demonstrates the fact that he is subservient to his Creator. Likewise, Juana's actions are distinct in this scene. Previously when the Angel appeared, she greeted him joyfully and spoke to him. In this scene she does not even address him. Rather, she is consumed with Jesus, her heavenly Husband. Thus, the dramatist reinforces the established hierarchy, giving due reverence to God as the Supreme One.

The final play also contains five scenes in which the Guardian Angel appears.[177] The first scene takes place immediately after Juana has spoken with Christ about His

[177] In addition to the typical references to angels and demons by the characters in their regular speech, this third installment of the trilogy introduces two new contexts. The first appears when the townspeople take vengeance on Lillo for his part in the Comendador's abuses. In order to purge Lillo of his sins, the townspeople give him a laxative. Lillo responds by saying, "Extraordinario / castigo el diablo inventó; aún no ha entrado y ya me hurga / las tripas" (1: 881). Here the character attributes the punishment to the Devil because of its disgusting nature. However, his belief does not align with Scripture. God is the One who determines punishment for He is the One that is offended by sin. Of course, the humorous intent here is well taken. The second reference is made by Luis after Aldonza has confronted him about the promise he had made to marry her. As he laments the tyranny of love, he states, "¡Oh, quién al ángel que a los Cielos mueve / pudiera detener la diestra mano!" (1: 884). Luis's statement reveals the belief that an Angel has been assigned the task of keeping the heavens in motion. As a part of

crucifixion. As Christ disappears, Juana descends to earth with the cross, the crown of thorns, and the nails that Christ has given her. The Angel accompanies her back to earth. When they arrive, the Angel asks her if she is happy. She joyfully affirms her happiness at the beautiful jewels that her Beloved has given her. Because they are so precious to her, the Angel states, "Pues porque puedas gozar / el bien que en ellos apoyas, / quiero ser tu guardajoyas: / en mi poder han de estar" (1: 874). After Juana agrees to his offer to serve as protector of the relics, he takes his leave.

The second scene returns to the theme of intercession. After learning that Ana Manrique, the widow of Jorge, the Comendador, has become ill, Juana returns home and sees the Angel. As a part of his greeting, he underscores his role as a servant of God: "Aunque yo no he merecido, / Juana mía, el ser tu amante, / Dios es por quien he venido, / y en tu amoroso semblante / su paje de guarda he sido" (1: 888). Next, an image appears of Jorge suffering in Purgatory. Jorge expresses the agony that he suffers, stating that it is even greater than the rich man's from Scripture (1: 888).[178] Jorge pleads with Juana to intercede for him, explaining that her prayers are like water for his dry lips (1: 888). Juana shares that she desires to help him. At that point the Angel comes down to her and says, "Basta el deseo que tienes / para que a Don Jorge valga / la ayuda que le previenes; / por ti querrá Dios que salga / a gozar, Juana, sus bienes" (1: 888). The Angel then offers to go see Jorge's wife and bring her Juana's greetings. Juana agrees, but only if he does so in God's name and not for her glory. The two then leave for Ana's house (1: 888-89).

---

the divine will, no one can stop it. He uses this reference to illustrate that nothing can stop the course of love.

[178] The story is found in St. Luke 16:19-31. In it the rich man looks up from Hell and asks for Abraham to send Lazarus down to dip his finger in water and cool his tongue.

In the third scene, Juana begins to feel tired, and she knows that her time of death draws near. As she thinks about these things, the Virgin, the baby Jesus, her Angel, and another angel appear. After greeting Mary and then Christ, the baby Jesus asks her what she has been doing. She replies that she has been reproaching her aging body for succumbing to tiredness when there is still much work to do. The three begin to talk about the saint's departure for Heaven. Juana then states her desire to make two requests to Jesus. She asks first that God have mercy on Jorge in Purgatory and, second, that God extend mercy to Luis and save him from his sinful ways. Jesus agrees to grant both requests, and the group departs (1: 894-95).

This passage, like the final one from the second play, represents the Angel as a servant to God. However, in this scene he neither does nor says anything. He simply awaits in silence any task that he might receive. Tirso could have written this scene without the Angel. Nevertheless, he includes the spiritual being as a necessary member of the celestial entourage accompanying deity.

The fourth scene again finds Juana contemplating her eternal home. As she sings a song about Heaven, the Angel appears and asks about the song. The saint replies with joy for having seen him again and in anticipation that the next day will be the day she departs for Heaven. The Angel then affirms that God plans to take her home to Heaven, just as surely as He willed for her to be born for the Franciscan habit. He then reminds her that he has guarded the cross and other relics that she entrusted to him. He has placed them inside a small chest with her other jewels. The Angel instructs her to go look at them, and then he departs. When Juana finds the chest, she discovers inside it the Holy Eucharist (1: 901). The Angel then reappears and explains the significance of

the Sacrament: “Esta forma, amada Juana, / comulgó un hombre en pecado / que está muerto y condenado, / y saliendo de él se vino / a tu poder” (1: 901).

In this scene the Angel not only delivers his message and performs the miracle, but he also highlights an important Catholic doctrine. Obviously, Juana had no need to be instructed in the significance of the Sacrament. Rather, in this scene the dramatist uses the Angel as a way to review the doctrine for the audience in order to remind them of the devotion they owe to Christ for His sacrifice for them.

The final scene for analysis takes place at the end of the play when Juana is received into Heaven by her Husband. When she arrives, the Angel welcomes her by saying, “Aquesta corona y silla / es para la Santa Juana” (1: 908). In this way he offers her the reward she has eagerly awaited and announces that she has become a saint. The Angel’s role has once again shifted. Throughout the majority of the trilogy, he has enjoyed a special relationship with Juana. Now that she has come to her eternal reward, she is joined to Christ. While the Angel is still present, his role of service to the saint on earth has ended. He still ministers at the throne but in his role as an attendant and servant to God.

In sum, the role of the Angel in *La Santa Juana* is quite extensive. Like the previous plays, he functions primarily as a messenger, a helper, and a servant of God. However, the relationship between Juana and the Angel is very close, not in a physical sense as was the case with *La ninfa*. Rather, the two possess a special bond of friendship that is uncommon between human beings and spiritual beings.

An additional distinction between the trilogy and the other plays lies in the sermons that the Angel delivers. He speaks of the dangers of heresy and the importance

of Spain in maintaining doctrinal purity. In two separate instances he comments on his nature as a spiritual being as a way to explain his actions. Finally, he clarifies that his primary role is to serve God. He does not act independently of his Creator but rather behaves with perfect decorum as God has ordained in the overall hierarchy of being. These sermon-like passages do little to enhance the overall plot development in the plays. On the contrary, they serve as a way to instruct the audience about the various topics of interest during the period.

The Demon in the play also reflects a function that the previous dramas have not included: possession and control of a human being. This scene serves to demonstrate the character of the demons. They seek to control and to destroy the lives of people. It serves in part as a warning to the audience of the spiritual battle which surrounds them. However, it also underscores the special power and favor that God has granted to Juana. She manages to cast out the Demon even though others have failed to conquer him. Thus, the scene seeks to magnify the saint and the experiences that she encounters in order to inspire devotion and, ultimately, strengthen faith in God.

El mayor desengaño

El mayor desengaño, the last of the hagiographic plays, relates the story of Bruno's search for satisfaction in his spiritual journey. In the first act, Bruno tries to convince Evandra to marry him. The girl resists initially, but when Bruno's father comes and threatens to disinherit him if his son abandons his studies and marries the girl, Evandra defends her lover. After the father leaves, Evandra refuses to provide lodging for Bruno but suggests that he stay with her friend Lorena. Later, as Bruno

recounts what has happened to Count Próspero, his friend decides to help him win Evandra's favor and even offers to serve as his godfather at the wedding. Nevertheless, when Próspero sees Evandra, he falls in love with her and decides to steal her from his friend. When Bruno learns of the deception, he becomes disillusioned with love and learning and decides to become a soldier.

The second act opens as Bruno has proven himself valiant in battle. The German Emperor, Enrico IV, honors Bruno and makes him a favorite. The Emperor then sees and falls in love with Visora. When he asks Bruno's advice about whether or not to take the girl by force, Bruno first suggests that Enrico win her instead by cultivating her love. However, when the Emperor becomes upset by his advice, Bruno quickly agrees with the King's original plan. The Emperor then gives him the key to her room and instructs Bruno to bring the girl to him. At this moment the Empress enters and inquires as to what has just happened. Enrico leaves in great disgust, and Bruno blames the key for his problems and gives it to the Empress. However, Bruno's servant, Marción, under threat of torture, tells the Empress all that has happened. Moved by jealousy, the Empress gives the key to Milardo. As Milardo tries to woo Visora, Bruno, Enrico, and the Empress enter. Milardo lies about Bruno, saying that he had tried to take the girl by force. The Emperor becomes upset and strips Bruno of his honors. Bruno, disillusioned again by his misfortune, decides to give up the life of a soldier and become a pilgrim.

In the third act, Bruno has returned to the academic-religious scene in Paris. There he studies under Dión, a saintly scholar, well-respected by all in Paris. Bruno wins favor among his peers for his ability to reason and argue. After he defends his position on whether or not a human being can know God of his own will, he learns that

Dión has died. The entire city mourns his death and discusses his saintly life. However, during his funeral service, Dión states that he is about to appear in judgment before God. Later, he declares that God has condemned him to Hell. All those present are shocked and begin to make vows to God. Bruno, having suffered the greatest disillusionment yet, questions whether knowledge and piety are indeed superior to ignorant devotion. At that moment, the Angel appears and instructs him to found a monastery in Cartuja. Bruno accepts the task as a sign of God's gracious acceptance of him.

Although often categorized as a hagiographic drama, this work resists easy classification into the genre. One problem relates to the historic figure the play represents. Although the protagonist, St. Bruno, is an officially canonized saint of the Church, the details presented in the drama hardly coincide with the saint's biography.[179] The first two acts of the play appear to be entirely fictional. The only verifiable aspect of the third act lies in the reference to his role as the founder of the Carthusian Order. Consequently, Ríos describes the play as representing the lives of two men:

> *El mayor desengaño* es, en sus dos primeros actos, la vida secular de Bruno de Hartenfaust, nacido en Colonia en 1032, que murió en Calabria el 6 de Octubre de 1101, y mundialmente célebre por su sabiduría y su elocuencia, vida convertida por Tirso en comedia de capa y espada de las de su tiempo; y en el Acto III es la dramatización del escalofriante suceso que determinó la vocación monástica de Bruno, su sanctificación y su fundación de la Orden de la Cartuja. (2: 1177)

Ríos later offers a possible solution for the extreme liberty taken by the dramatist in composing the work:

> Tirso no pudo ofrecer a su público de los corrales, ávido de historias de amores y aventuras, la vida de un santo austero y estudioso recluído siempre en las

[179] See Mougel's article in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* for further detail ("St. Bruno").

> escuelas, y reservó para el final de su drama la vida escolar y universitaria de Bruno. (2: 1178)

The fact that Tirso utilized a popular genre of his time required that he adapt his works to appeal to public taste. Even though Golden Age Drama often included a heavy moral tone and issues of theological import, the success of a play depended more so on whether or not it held the attention of the audience.[180] By inventing exciting details in the life of the saint, Tirso managed to offer the audience the experiences they sought while still maintaining the religious framework of the drama.

The liberties taken in the plot construction also complicate the categorization of the play within the subgroups of the hagiographic dramas. Of the four types of plays presented by Dassbach, one could argue that *El mayor desengaño* contains elements of the mendicant and convert works. The work does relate the life of a religious man who eventually founded a religious Order. Nevertheless, in three acts Tirso never passes beyond what Dassbach called the separation stage. Not until the very end of the work does the dramatist relate the taking of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience (297). These statements refer to the plans Bruno has for the future. The play does not represent the process of making and keeping these vows. Neither does Tirso explain the works of charity realized by the saint. Thus, if the play is considered a mendicant work, it departs from the basic characteristic of representing the process of keeping a vow in order to focus on the circumstances leading him to take the vow in the first place.

Since the play does detail the spiritual journey of conversion, one could classify it as a convert work. However, a similar problem arises. Although Tirso develops the spiritual journey of the protagonist within the context of his ultimate salvation, the play

[180] This point reiterates Thacker's assessment from chapter 1 that the use of *admiratio* was a key factor in the success of religious themes during the time period (68-69).

fails to record the excessively sinful lifestyle of the saint as do the other convert plays.[181] Bruno's struggle lies more in his search for satisfication through love, military service, and academics. The only sin the protagonist mentions is the sin of pride. The dramatist does not represent this sin, although the most serious of the seven deadly sins, in the same graphic way as the sins of the converts of other saint plays.

Ríos does not classify *El mayor desengaño* solely as a hagiographic play. She prefers to call it a "drama hagiográfico teológico de ambiente universitario" (2: 1177). This designation references both the importance of the themes of grace and salvation at the heart of the play's plot development and what Ríos describes as "la transcripción fidelísima de un acto universitario de los tiempos de Téllez, con la escenografía y las fórmulas latinas propias de tales solemnidades" (2: 1179).[182] Additionally, she connects the play's ending to *El condenado*:

> su tesis teológica es la misma: 'El que lo espera todo de sí mismo y nada de la misericordia de Dios, se condena.' Terminantemente nos lo dice el autor por boca de Roberto . . . fué la soberbia que derribó al Querub la que condenó a Dión.[183] (2: 1181)

Thus, even though the play resists classification as a hagiographic play, for the purposes of this study, it has been grouped within this subgenre for the simple fact that the protagonist is a canonized saint, and the work does have some, although few, connections to the mendicant and convert types of plays. Additionally, the

---

[181] Mario F. Trubiano analyzes this work as a part of his larger study on Tirso's position regarding the doctrines of grace.

[182] Ríos summarizes the scene as follows: "Bruno, que viste de clérigo (según otra acotación que advierte que los demás visten de estudiantes), habla primero de 'la competencia entre las armas y las letras,' tema del celebérrimo Discurso de Cervantes en el *Quijote*, y después mantiene sus conclusiones acerca de la incomprensibilidad de Dios" (2: 1179).

[183] Wilson also adds the following: "This last disenchantment comes after the death of the studious and holy Dion [sic], who had prayed to be judged on his own merits; it is revealed that his prayer is answered, and that he is consequently damned" (*Tirso* 115).

representation of angels in the play, as will be seen, follows the general mold of the other hagiographic plays.

In *El mayor desengaño* an angel appears only one time, and this appearance occurs during Dión's funeral.[184] After those attending Dión's funeral learn that he has been condemned, they all begin to react by examining themselves and making vows to do penance, enter religious Orders, and repent of their sinful ways. Bruno, contemplating all that has just transpired, delivers an eloquent sermon in which he summarizes the lessons learned by what they have seen and proposes a plan of action for them to follow. First, he realizes that learning alone is futile and incapable of saving the soul (294). Second, he meditates on the deceptive nature of appearances. Dión was the most pious and revered man that Paris had known, yet he was condemned. For Bruno, this realization qualifies as the biggest disillusionment of all (294-95). Third, he asks those present to examine themselves and discern where they stand spiritually (295). Fourth, he declares that he has now come to the conclusion that he must repent and live in penance (295-97). Finally, he proposes to teach those with him how to live such a life and asks who among them will follow him (297-98).

[184] References to angels and demons in the speech of the characters include the following: 1) humorous remarks by the *gracioso* in which he alludes to a function of the Devil as a way to poke fun at Evandra: "¿Almas llevas? Serás diablo" (188); 2) expletives: "¿qué diablos hemos de hacer?" (213); 3) comparisons to describe beauty: "Di, serafín celestial… / Cuando solo conquistaras, / Bruno, esta sin par belleza" (225), and "Esa divina hermosura / en tu lealtad deposito, / sé alcaide de ese tesoro / y ángel dese paraíso" (230); 4) analogies relating to one's surroundings or circumstances as incapable of preventing a spiritual fall: "Aun en el cielo no tuvo / seguridad Lucifer, / pues no hubo más de un instante / desde el privar al caer" (239); and 5) references to the cause of one's damnation: "Yo pienso que la soberbia, / que al Querub ha derribado / y engaña a la hipocresía, / a Dión ha condenado" (292).

As Bruno closes his sermon, he stops when he notices the appearance of the Angel. The stage notes describe the scene as follows: "*Ponense de rodillas, suena música y parece en un sitial sentado el papa Hugo, y un ángel va bajando por invención con siete estrellas en la mano*" (298).[185] The Angel then delivers the following message:

> Piloto, que este gobierno
> de la nave, que surcando
> almas para Dios fluctúa,
> tienes dichoso en tu mano:
> Dios quiere que prevalezca
> a tu sombra y con tu amparo
> una nueva religión,
> que Bruno desengañado
> comienza a fundar agora.
> A tus pies, con seis letrados
> que con él el mundo dejan,
> vendrá. Procura animarlos
> que todos siete han de ser
> fundamentos soberanos
> desta fábrica divina,
> significada en los rayos
> destas siete estrellas puras;
> ya les da sitio y espacio
> el valle de la Cartuja,
> de quien el renombre santo
> tomará su religión. (298-99)

In his message, the Angel addresses St. Bruno. He refers to him as the captain of a ship in search of wandering souls. This metaphor describes the previous scene in which the

[185] According to Baztán, the imagery of the seven stars relates to a dream that St. Hugo experienced: "Pareciole que veía cómo en un yermo de su obispado, que se llamaba la Cartuja, que Dios Nuestro Señor edificaba una casa para su morada, y que siete estrellas resplandecientes a manera de corona, y levantadas algún tanto del suelo, [. . .], iban de guías, enseñándole el camino" (*Flos sanctorum* qtd. in Escudero Baztán 298). In Scripture the imagery of an angel with seven stars in his hand occurs only one time in the book of the Apocalypse. However, in that context it is God who holds the stars (Apocalypse 1:10-18). According to Pope, Origen and St. Augustine interpret the stars to refer to the angels of the seven churches ("Angels of the Churches"). If Tirso did intend to reference this passage through his imagery in the play, in doing so he attributed a function reserved only for deity to an angel.

saint called those to him who wished to learn how to live piously. The Angel then confirms to St. Bruno that God wills that he found a religious Order. Furthermore, the Angel identifies who will be the chosen ones to join the new Order and explains that the seven stars he carries represent these seven men.[186] The Angel concludes by identifying where he is to found the Order and then returns to Heaven, leaving behind an audience awed by the special grace God has bestowed on Bruno.

In sum, as is the case with many of the saint plays, the Angel in *El mayor desengaño* serves as a heavenly messenger to Bruno. However, for Bruno the message serves a multi-faceted purpose. First, it verifies that his assessment of the situation's lesson is accurate: great learning does not earn one favor with God; the only way one can be saved is humbly to have faith in God and do penance. Second, it confirms to the saint that he will not only be saved, but also that God will allow him to found a religious Order and lead others into salvation. Finally, the Angel accomplishes this task by means of an allegorical speech. In the other saint plays, the angels typically deliver literal messages. However, here the Angel speaks allegorically as a way to illustrate the special task that God has for Bruno.

The Biblical Play: *La mujer que manda en casa*

La mujer que manda en casa recasts the Old Testament story of Queen Jezabel. At the play's opening, King Ahab discusses the victories that Israel has won in battle. However, Jezabel is not satisfied because some of the people still worship Jehovah

[186] This explanation is one of the reasons why the passage in Apocalypse 1 appears to apply as well. In the final book of the Bible, St. John receives special instruction for the seven specific churches revealing God's will for each one. In this final scene of the play, the Angel fulfills a similar function for the men he addresses.

instead of Baal. She is particularly angered by the prophets who oppose her, such as Elías,[187] and vows to destroy them.

The scene then shifts to the house of Naboth and Raquel, who are discussing the deplorable state of Israel under Jezabel's rule. As they speak, Obadiah, a servant of the King, arrives and announces that the Queen wishes to see Naboth. Raquel objects to her husband going alone to see Jezabel in her garden, but her husband reassures her that his faith in God is strong and he will not abandon it.

Meanwhile, Jezabel has decided to feign sleep in order to tempt Naboth. When he arrives, she begins to speak as though dreaming. She tells him of her longing for him and tempts him to leave his faith and become her lover. Naboth refuses in no uncertain terms. He reaffirms his faith in the One true God. When Jezabel awakes, she tempts him again, this time to be disloyal to the King. He refuses, reiterating his devotion to his King and his wife. As soon as Naboth takes his leave, Jezabel angrily promises to take vengeance on him.

Next, Ahab enters the scene and reports back to Jezabel on the status of the execution of the prophets. He states that he doubts that any could have survived the slaughter. However, at that moment Elías enters and prophesies against the King and Queen and the idolatry they promote. Jezabel commands her guards to kill the prophet, but as the soldiers approach, Elías escapes.

In the second act a group of shepherds in the mountains discusses the famine brought on by the prophet Elías that has gripped the land for the past three years. Jezabel and Ahab also discuss their hatred for the prophet and their attempt to find him

[187] Elías is translated as Elijah in the King James Version.

and kill him. As they speak, two birds fly into their garden, snatch away some of their food, and carry the food back to the prophet who is hiding in the wilderness. The prophet, grateful for God's provision, shares the food with the birds.

Meanwhile, Ahab visits Naboth and Raquel and asks to buy their vineyard. When Naboth refuses, citing the Hebrew's inheritance laws, the King becomes angry and leaves. In the palace, Jehú arrives and informs the Queen about the showdown between the prophets of Baal and Elías. When Jezabel learns that Elías has slain her prophets, she vows that she will have him killed and will drink his blood.

The third act begins just as Elías, suffering from discouragement, prays that God will take his life and end his suffering and pain. As he makes his complaint to God, the Angel appears and ministers to him.

In the next scene, King Ahab complains to Jezabel about Naboth's refusal to sell him the vineyard. Jezabel requests Ahab's signet ring and promises to secure the land for him. Once the King departs, Naboth enters. While he waits for the Queen, a servant enters and instructs him to move to another room and draw the curtain. When he follows the servant's instructions, he sees a table with three place settings. The first contains a crown, a cord, and a note accompanying the plate. The note states that he is to use the rope to kill Raquel, and the crown will be his. The second setting contains a sword to punish him and a veil to love him, which Naboth interprets as a reference to Jezabel's authority as Queen and her beauty as a woman. The final setting reveals bloody stones. These symbolize the type of death in store for him. The Queen then arranges to have him accused of blasphemy and stoned. Raquel, outraged at the

injustice that has been done, protests and is thrown into prison. Before she leaves, Obadiah tells her that the King and Queen will both die for their deeds.

In the last few scenes of the play, the audience learns that Elías has been taken to Heaven and the King killed in battle. Finally, Jehu leads a group of men against the Queen. They kill her by throwing her out of the window. The play ends with Jehu's solemn warning that kings should not let their wives rule their kingdoms.

La mujer que manda en casa is one of the five biblical plays Tirso composed.[188] As Hughes states, "All five are faithful reproductions of the Holy Record, with many scenes appearing to be direct paraphrases from the original source" (87). Such is the case for this play. Dawn Smith identifies four specific episodes from the biblical account, found in 1 Kings 16-22, that the dramatist represented: 1) the marriage of Ahab and Jezabel, 2) the supplantation of Baal worship for the worship of the God of the Hebrews, 3) the story of Naboth and his vineyard, and 4) the death of the King and Queen (*Mujer* 362).

However, despite the biblical source, the play does not simply reiterate the scriptural narrative. Rather, Tirso expands the biblical texts in an imaginitive way in order to explore further dramatic capabilities. Smith elucidates the fact that Tirso has created the entire storyline about Raquel, Naboth's supposed wife, and inserted the additional details about the relationship between Jezabel and Naboth. He also invented the comic shepherd characters to help further develop the continuity of the plot and to help adapt the play for the Spanish stage (*Mujer* 363).

---

[188] The other biblical plays are *La vida y muerte de Herodes* (a play about King Herod), *La venganza de Tamar* (the story of Amnon's rape of his sister, Tamar, and Absalom's revenge), *La mejor espigadera* (a dramatization of the story of Ruth), and *Tanto es lo más como lo de menos* (a fusion of the parables from St. Luke 15-16).

In addition to the reproduction and creative expansion of the biblical sources, other possible purposes for *La mujer* have been suggested. Smith's introduction to the play underscores the allegorical nature of the work, particularly noting the famine motif as symbolic of the weakness of Spain's kings during the time when the play was written (*Mujer* 360-61). Wilson sees the biblical plays less as moral literature and more as "records of human conflict occurring at critical moments in the development of a race" (*Spanish Drama* 110). Nevertheless, despite the plot variations and the additional interpretive possibilities, the connection between the play and the biblical themes is apparent. As Hughes explains,

> Within the biblical cycle, a stylistic fluctuation is fairly obvious, although each play is contrived to maintain a religious tone. Where the plot is more profane, religious images are introduced as one means of recapturing the biblical atmosphere; however, in a play whose plot is essentially religious, Tirso did not always feel the need for such imagery, preferring to rely on the innate religiosity of the story itself.[189] (87-88)

When analyzing the representation of the Angel in the play, Hughes's position proves accurate: the Angel replicates almost exactly the biblical account. According to 1 Kings, the Angel appears to the discouraged prophet twice in order to comfort him and provide him with food and drink (1 Kings 19:1-8). In the play, when the Angel appears the first time, he says, "Despierta y come" (449). The second time, he adds, "Despierta y come, que tienes / mucho camino que andar" (450). Only two differences between the play and the biblical passage exist. The play's stage notes state, "*Baja un ángel y déjale a la cabecera un vaso de agua y una tortilla de pan, y vuela*" (449). Later, the notes say, "de dentro dice el ángel" (450). The first distinction relates to the physical position of the Angel. In the play he comes and delivers the food and water and

[189] With regard to this specific play, Hughes points out that Tirso incorporated "more religious images . . . than any other of Tirso's biblical plays" (89).

then departs before speaking. There is a physical distance created. In the biblical text, the Angel descends, touches Elías, and then speaks to him. When the prophet awakes, the food is already awaiting him.

The second difference relates to the terminology employed to describe the Angel. In the play he simply is designated "un ángel" and "el ángel" (449-50). However, although the first phrase in 1 Kings refers to the celestial being as "angelus [angel]" (1 Kings 19:5), the second time the passage identifies him as "angelus Domini (angel of the Lord)" (1 Kings 19:7). Tirso's decision simply to refer to the being as an angel rather than retain the more specific title is quite logical. The probability that the audience would discern the subtle reference to the pre-incarnate appearance of Christ is highly unlikely. Furthermore, given the fact that Tirso chose not to represent much of the narrative regarding the prophet, the dramatist would gain almost nothing by utilizing the terminology.

Apart from the scene in which the Angel appears, references to demons occur multiple times in the work. Each time the characters discuss Jezabel's attempt to promote Baal worship, they associate the imagery of the idols with the Devil. Raquel states, "¿Qué será, Nabot mío, / la causa que con tanto desvarío / Jezabel arrogante / persiga a nuestro Dios, aras levante / al ídolo sidonio / y a tanto simulacro del demonio?" (392). Later, Elías utters a similar phrase: "Simulacros del demonio / erige, porque después / que Samaria te obedezca / la transformes en Babel" (409). The connection between the idol and the Demon underscores the overall theme of the faithful and their devotion to the One true God versus the wickedness promoted by the

followers of Baal. Jezabel's god, from the Jewish perspective, is not simply another god; he is the Devil himself.[190]

In sum, the biblical play, true to its source, represents the Angel as a ministering servant. He delivers the necessary food and water to the prophet at the moment he needs them most. He delivers the message he has been given and returns to Heaven. There is little personal interaction between the characters, and the dramatist does not attempt to embelish the appearance of the spiritual being. The Angel's presence merely reproduces the biblical account.

[190] Other references in the characters' speech occur primarily in humorous remarks made by the *gracioso*, Coriolín: "Si los vuesos son del talle / que los que Jezabel da, / el dimuño os trujo acá" (414); "Un sastre conocí yo, / que tuvo por nombre Herbías, / y al tiempo dell expirar / le llevoren para lastre, / como all [sic] ánima del sastre / suelen los diabros llevar" (439-40); and "Quiéroos yo, que sois bonita; / de allá os pienso llevar yo / dos diablitos como un oro, / que vos barran, que vos rieguen, / que vos guisen, que vos frieguen" (471).

Conclusion

This study has attempted to demonstrate not only the importance of spiritual beings in the dramatic works of Tirso de Molina, but also the extent to which the dramatist's representation of them coincides with or deviates from the theological framework of his time. While certain attributes of these beings seem to remain constant in his works, the textual analysis reveals a wide array of functions, ranging from simple repetitions of biblical narratives and teachings, to spectacular stories of miracles and special grace. These differences many times relate directly to the subgenre and specific purpose for each work.

Although the way in which Tirso represents the spiritual beings varies from work to work, two underlying traits appear to remain consistent across the entire spectrum of these ten works. First, each of the plays relates a story of spiritual struggle and portrays the roles that the angels and demons fulfill in that process. Many times the plot revolves around the eternal destinies of the main characters, as is the case in *La madrina, El condenado, La ninfa, Quien no cae,* and *El mayor desengaño*. Other times the dramatist details the struggles a saint experiences as s/he attempts to accomplish the special task that God has appointed to him or her (*El caballero, La joya, Santo y sastre, La Santa Juana,* and *La mujer*). In each case the theme of spiritual battle presents a unifying thread. Second, each play presents the good angels as messengers between God and the characters. Likewise, the demons reflect their most basic roles of seeking to tempt, deceive, and lead human beings into perdition. Both groups of spiritual beings remain subject to the overall hierarchy of being that St. Thomas Aquinas describes in his *Summa Theologiae*.

Much of Tirso's representation of angels and demons in the works depends on the four different subgenres he utilizes. The *auto* provides the most extensive reproduction of the spiritual beings in their biblical and theological roles as they battle for Dionisio's soul. The play also incorporates multiple biblical images particularly with regard to the Demon. This rigid adherence to the official doctrine of angelology is quite natural given the didactic and devotional nature of the *auto*.

Likewise, the theological drama portrays the Demon in his traditional role as tempter and deceiver. However, the dramatist takes certain liberties in exploring the beguiling tactics of the fallen creature, particularly as relates to the being's knowledge. Much of the play's action revolves around the prophetic statements the Demon makes to Paulo and Enrico and the way in which those statements affect the characters' developing thoughts. Similarly, the stage notes elucidate the visual problem of representing the Demon's ability to change his appearance before visibly presenting himself to Paulo. While it is theologically true that such changes are possible, the method that the dramatist elects serves primarily to make the audience aware of knowledge withheld from the protagonist, thus increase the dramatic tension and suspense of the work.

The hagiographic works provide the most spectacular uses of the spiritual beings. Many times the angelic characters appear at the end of the plays in order to provide a climactic ending in which God reveals the special grace He has bestowed upon the saint. In *La joya, Santo y sastre,* and *El mayor desengaño* the angels' appearances are public and surprising to the characters. However, the event is private and, at least initially, mysterious in *El caballero*, *La ninfa*, and *Quien no cae* as the

angels gradually reveal their true identities. *La Santa Juana* includes a mixture of public and private appearances depending on the circumstances of each event.

Another distinctive of the hagiographic works is the personal relationship and interaction that certain characters enjoy with their Guardian Angels. *La ninfa* portrays the Angel as a friend who not only hinders the sinner from committing suicide, but also miraculously delivers her from the Demon that attempts to drown her. In *Quien no cae,* the Angel makes himself visibly attractive to Margarita and even produces a physical response within her. The conversation between the two supplies a major component of the play's action and allows the Angel to persuade the sinner to place her full faith in God for salvation. Additionally, the relationship between the protagonist and her Guardian Angel in *La Santa Juana* illustrates the extent of God's favor on the saint as she enjoys a close, personal friendship with the spiritual being that ministers to her. Not only do they have frequent discussions on various topics, but they also sit together and weep together. Juana confides in her Angel and expresses her joy at the unique relationship the two possess.

The spectacular nature of the angels' roles in the hagiographic works, along with the special relationship they share with the human characters intensify the devotional nature of the plays. The lives of the saints that the dramatist represents not only serve as examples of piety for the audience but as reminders of the divine assistance that God supplies for those He has chosen for specific tasks.

The incorporation of the Angel in the biblical play supplies the most basic use of the spiritual beings in the works. This play merely reproduces the biblical account and the spiritual being's role in ministering to the prophet's physical needs. The fact that the

dramatist chose not to embellish or expand this aspect of the story contrasts starkly with his treatment of other aspects of the biblical story of Jezabel. The entire relationship between the wicked Queen and Naboth is fictional, and yet it provides imaginitive speculation as to the struggles that the man may have faced. The inclusion of the episodes in which the prophet Elijah appears, while an important aspect of the biblical narrative, adds little to the main focus of the drama. Consequently, the basic representation of the Angel functions more as a way to reconnect the play to its biblical source rather than to further enhance the dramatic appeal of the work.

Although the primary purpose of this thesis has been to study the representation of spiritual beings, a secondary aspect has been to explore possible connections to several other general trends in Tirsian studies. The first area relates to questions regarding the authorship of the first five plays. When considering this topic, one problem that these plays present is the fact that they represent four different subgenres. Due to the variety of ways that the dramatist chose to portray the spiritual beings according to their respective subgenres, any additional evidence for or against Tirso's authorship based on similar or dissimilar characteristics becomes problematic.

If one considers only the seven hagiographic plays, the problems presented by genre classification lessen considerably. Dassbach's study and taxonomy of the plays include only the works critics agree that Tirso undoubtedly composed. When comparing these works to the plays of doubtful authorship, the representation of angels and demons remains relatively consistent. They perform similar functions; they employ similar vocabulary to refer to spiritual beings; and they utilize similar staging techniques. Nevertheless, these factors do not constitute conclusive evidence for Tirsian authorship

without also comparing the way in which the other Golden Age dramatists represent angels and demons in their hagiographic plays. Thus, while a certain consistency exists in the portrayal of these beings, it does not effectively clarify the authorship debates apart from generally affirming the possibility that he wrote the plays.

The second critical trend explores the issue of characterization. If one accepts the premise that Tirso excelled in the development of well-rounded, humanized characters, as described in chapter one, then the interaction between spiritual beings and the characters could provide additional support for that theory. In *El condenado*, *Quien no cae*, and *La Santa Juana*, the angels and demons fulfill important roles in the decisions made by the main characters. In *El condenado*, the Demon's deceit works together with Paulo's doubt to bring about his ultimate condemnation. Not only does the Demon's interaction with Paulo influence the development of his thoughts, but the debate between the Demon and the Musicians also causes confusion in Enrico's mind. The fact that he does not initially understand why he chooses to follow the Musicians provides additional opportunity for the extreme emotional changes he experiences as he learns of the execution that awaits him. He becomes angry that he has believed the Musicians' message and followed their advice. However, in the end, he comes to realize that they were in fact the voices of the angels seeking to lead him toward life. In *Quien no cae*, the Angel reasons with Margarita so as to bring her to the place where she understands that salvation can be hers and that her desires, which up until that point had been sinful, can be legitimately satisfied through the relationship with the Angel. *La Santa Juana* contains large passages in which the saint and the Angel converse. While

the Angel does not affect the protagonist's thought,[191] their interaction does illustrate the growing understanding that Juana has about her Guardian Angel. As she learns more about him, their relationship deepens, and they are able to discuss events and difficult situations through which she must pass. Her friendship with the Angel gives evidence to the special grace she has received and provides the peace and constancy she experiences through her life. Thus, the influence that the spiritual beings have on the characters' thought processes lends support to the idea that characterization, especially as it relates to thought development in extreme circumstances, is an important aspect of Tirso's dramas.[192]

The third area of criticism returns to the theme of the moral or religious nature of the dramatist's works. The way in which the dramatist represents the angels and demons in these ten plays enhances the overall religious themes in the works. Each play details the ongoing spiritual struggles that human beings face. They also contain strong Christian imagery, sermon-like passages, and exhortations to pious living. The demons consistently seek to destroy the soul and often state quite openly that such is their goal. The angels remain subordinate to God in their roles as messengers and helpers for the characters in their spiritual journey, whether the emphasis be their salvation or the special task that God has given them to perform on earth. Furthermore, many of the speeches given by the angels and demons allude to their various functions as described in Scripture. In works such as *La Santa Juana*, the Angel even makes occasional

[191] The main exception is the scene in which the Angel and Juana discuss her task of writing a book of her deeds. The Angel does reason with Juana. However, rather than fully convincing her to proceed with the task, they arrive at a compromise.
[192] It does not necessarily prove that Tirso creates better characters than his contemporaries; it merely underscores the importance of the trait in his works.

references to aspects of his being, reflecting the theological framework presented by St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae*. Consequently, morality and religion, at least on the surface level, comprise key aspects of the dramas.

The fact that religious elements abound in the works does not necessarily indicate that the dramatist held this goal as his primary objective. While much of the drama from the Spanish Golden Age contains references to God, moral living, and theology, the presence of these elements does not necessarily indicate that those values were equally important to all. At the very least, they do provide evidence in support of the notion that Christianity, its vocabulary, and its values did significantly influence seventeenth-century Spanish society.

What is impossible to prove is to what extent the dramatist was truly motivated by his religion. One could make a strong case that, due to the prevalence of the religious imagery and spiritual themes, he was concerned with encouraging his audience toward piety. However, in the absence of documents or statements by the dramatist as to his true purposes for writing, such a position is not defendable since it requires discerning authorial intent. Thus, studying Tirso's angels and demons in the light of moral drama requires a conscious decision to interpret them within the context of Catholic Spain and its theology, just as choosing to ignore the religious nature of the works reflects an interpretative strategy that ignores the most fundamental moral message of the author's work.

The final area of criticism returns to the didactic nature of Tirso's works. Due to the popularity and prevalence of drama during the Spanish Golden Age, many times the works would impress the audience as a natural result of the verisimilitude of their

representation of nature. Consequently, the drama had the potential to influence collective belief about different aspects of life the audience observed in the plays. The same holds true for Tirso's representation of spiritual beings. Since angels and demons comprise an important part of these plays, relating the daily spiritual struggles of human beings, the audience could very naturally begin to form opinions about the role of spiritual beings in their own lives. The fact that Tirso presents angels and demons in their theological and biblical functions reinforces an orthodox view of the most basic aspects of Catholic theology, and, consequently, could serve to encourage the audience to have faith and to seek to live pious lives. However, the liberties that the dramatist takes in his representation also raises the possibility that the audience could indulge in imaginitive speculation about exciting, supernatural encounters in their personal lives. Even though this study has not explored whether or not any such evidence does indeed exist, the fact that Tirso chose to incorporate angels and demons into this popular genre from the Spanish Golden Age increases the likelihood that his plays would influence, at least to some degree, popular belief about the existence and activity of spiritual beings.

Table 1. The Plays of Doubtful Authorship	
La madrina del cielo (*auto*): The story of Dionisio's ultimate salvation and Doroteo's condemnation.	
Angel	• He debates with the Demon for the soul of human beings. • He possesses greater authority than the Demon. • He possesses knowledge superior to that of the Demon. • He intercedes on behalf of human beings.
Demon	• He is a deceiver and a seducer who seeks to lead human beings into perdition. • He knows that Divine Providence ultimately cannot be hindered. • He hates God and His human creation. • He is a wolf seeking to devour his prey. • He offers poison disguised as sweets. • He encourages spiritual sleep in human beings when they ought to be vigilant. • He accuses human beings and demands that God judge them for sin. • He will be eternally condemned. • He twists Scripture in order to achieve his goals. • His power to tempt is limited.
El condenado por desconfiado (Theological Drama): The story of Enrico and Paulo's eternal destinies of Heaven and Hell, respectivly.	
Demon	• He tempts human beings to despair and, ultimately leading to their condemnation. • He brings to mind memories of sinful deeds. • He possesses some knowledge of the thoughts of human beings. • He possesses a knowledge of grace and the way of salvation. • He cannot force human beings to sin, but rather, he must work through deception. • His authority to tempt is only possible because God permits it. • He can change his appearance and portray himself as an angel. • His knowledge of future events enables him to deceive more effectively. • He succeeds in deceiving Paulo but fails in his attempt to secure Enrico's damnation.
El caballero de gracia (Hagiographic Drama of a Mendicant): The story of the generosity of Jacobo, the Caballero, and his endeavors to promote holiness despite the obstacles he faces.	
Angel	• He initially appears in a disguised form. • He delivers a message and a monetary gift. • He finally reveals that he is an angel sent by God. • He confirms God's favor on the saint.
La joya de las montañas (Hagiographic Drama of a Martyr): The story of St. Orosia's dedication to God, her escape from an unwanted marriage, and her eventual martyrdom at the hands of the Moors.	
Angel	• He appears personally and privately to the saint the first time. • He confirms God's will to the martyr. • His appearance and message give her confidence. • His appearance and message provoke an internal, physical trembling in the saint. • He appears the second time as an answer to her prayer. • His presence fills all characters present with awe and renders them powerless. • He carries on a conversation with the saint. • He instructs her about the miracle she is to perform.
La ninfa del cielo (Hagiographic Drama of a Convert): The story of Ninfa's seduction, abandonment, vengeance, and journey to ultimate salvation.	
Angel	• He admonishes and exhorts her. • He gives her reason for hope. • He presents himself to her both as a friend and as a spiritual husband. • He defeats the Devil's attempt to kill Ninfa with the power of his words.
Devil (Boatman)	• He hides his true identity by appearing as a boatman. • He deceives her into entering the boat. • He attempts to drown her.

Table 2. The Plays of Undisputed Authorship	
Santo y sastre (Hagiographic Drama of a Miracle Worker): The story of Homobono's marriage, acts of charity, and miracles despite the opposition he faces from his friends and family.	
Angel	• He protects the saint from harm. • He carries a flaming sword. • His presence causes Lelio to become dumb. • He affirms Homobono's virtue. • (The angels assist Homobono in his earthly activity so that he can attend to his spiritual profession.)
Quien no cae, no se levanta (Hagiographic Drama of a Convert): The story of Margarita's repeated failure to repent of her illicit sexual desires and her ultimate salvation.	
Angel	• He appears as a handsome young man. • He preaches, exhorts, and encourages the protagonist to repent. • He appeals first to her passion and then to her thinking to convince her to repent and have faith in God's grace. • He offers her his hand as a sign that she will not fall again. • He gradually reveals his identity as her Guardian Angel.
La Santa Juana, trilogy (Hagiographic Drama of a Mendicant and Miracle Worker): The story of Juana's avoidance of an unwanted marriage and escape in order to enter the Franciscan Order, the miracles she performs, the obstacles he faces, her death, and her spiritual unification with her heavenly Husband.	
Angel	• He hinders her from returning to her home and encourages her to enter the monastery. • He comforts her as she contemplates whether or not she is guilty of the sins of pride and arrogance. • He delivers messages to her from God about the tasks He has for her to do. • He speaks to her as a friend and comes when she calls. • He holds a position of authority over other angels. • He delivers petitions to Juana from souls in Purgatory. • He presents Juana's rosaries to God on His throne. • He discusses with her the dangers of Lutheranism and the role of Spain in combatting heresy and maintaining doctrinal purity. • He cries when he informs her of the suffering she will face. • He comments on his nature in order to explain why he cries and why he asks her to sit down and talk. • He reasons with Juana in order to convince her that she can do the task God has appointed her to do. • He delivers to her a crown of flowers as a symbol of her victory in the time of testing. • He acts as an attendant whenever deity appears to Juana. • He reminds Juana of his position as a servant of God. • He guards the relics that she entrusts to him. • He explains the significance of the doctrine of the Eucharist.
Demon (possessing the girl)	• Juana calls him the " padre de mentiras." • He is arrogant and obscene. • He speaks with Latin phrases.
El mayor desengaño (Hagiographic Drama of a Mendicant and Convert): The story of Bruno's search for happiness in love, military service, academics, and finally, in service to God.	
Angel	• He appears miraculously at the end and delivers a divine message to Bruno. • He speaks allegorically. • He confirms Bruno's assessment of the situation and instructs him to found a religious Order.
La mujer que manda en casa (Biblical Drama) The story of Jezabel, Ahab, Naboth, and the prophet Elías.	
Angel	• He delivers food and drink to the prophet. • He instructs him to rest.

References

"Abonar." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 1 April 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Agheana, Ion Tudor. *The Situational Drama of Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Plaza Mayor Ediciones, 1972. Print.

Albrecht, Jane W. *Irony and Theatricality in Tirso de Molina*. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1994. Print.

---. "The Statistical Analysis of Verse Form As a Tool for Assigning Authorship and the Case of Tirso de Molina." *Looking at the 'Comedia' in the Year of the Quincentennial*. Lanham: UP of America, 1993. 247-53. Print.

"Ángel custodio." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 1 April 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.2.0.0.0.>.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. *The De Malo of Thomas Aquinas*. Ed. Brian Davies. Trans. Richard Regan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

---. *Summa Theologiae: Latin Text and English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Appendices, and Glossaries*. 61 vols. Ed. Thomas Gilby. Cambridge: Blackfriars, 1964-1981. Print.

Arellano, Ignacio. "Biblia y doctrina teológica en los autos de Tirso: un caso de intertextualidad privilegiada." Dolfi and Galar. 39-56.

---. *Historia del teatro español del siglo XVII*. 4th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2008. Print.

Arellano, Ignacio, Blanca Oteiza and Miguel Zugasti, eds. *Autos sacramentales I: El colmenero divino, Los hermanos parecidos, No le arriendo la ganancia*. Pamplona: GRISO-Revista Estudios, 1998. Print.

---. *Autos sacramentales II: El laberinto de Creta, La madrina del cielo, La ninfa del cielo*. Pamplona: GRISO-Revista Estudios, 2000. Print.

Arendzen, John. "Cherubim." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03646c.htm>.

"Arrojar." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 30 March 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.6.0.0.0.>.

Assmann, Aleida. "Spirits, Ghosts, Demons In Shakespeare And Milton." *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Andreas Höfele and Wener von Koppensfels. 200-213. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.

Augustine, Saint. *The City of God: Books I-VII*. Trans. Demetrius B. Zema, and Gerald D. Walsh. Washington: Catholic UP, 1950. Print. *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 6.

---. *The City of God: Books VIII-XVI*. Trans. Gerald D. Walsh, and Grace Monahan. Washington: Catholic UP, 1952. Print. *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 7.

---. *The City of God: Books XVII-XXII*. Trans. Gerald D. Walsh, and Daniel J. Honan. Washington: Catholic UP, 1954. Print. *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 8.

"Auto." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Auto sacramental." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Barruntar." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1726. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Berceo, Gonzalo de. *Milagros de nuestra Señora*. 12th ed. Ed. Michael Gerli. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003. Print.

Biblia sacra, iuxta vulgatam Clementinam. 9th ed. Ed. A. Colunga, and L. Turrado. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1994. Print.

Biblia sacra vulgata. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <www.biblegateway.com>.

Brown, Raymond E., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990. Print.

"Campaña." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1729. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Carreño-Rodríguez, Antonio. "Alegorías bíblicas del poder en el teatro de Tirso de Molina." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 87.4 (2010): 447-62. Web. *EBSCO*. 3 Jan. 2013.

Cervantes, Miguel de. *Segunda parte del ingenioso caballero don Quijote de la Mancha*. 5th ed. Ed. Luis Andrés Murillo. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1978. Print.

Chadwick, Henry. *Augustine of Hippo: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Chandler, Richard E., and Kessel Schwartz. *A New History of Spanish Literature*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1961. Print.

Chapman, John. "Dionysius of Alexandria." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. 31 Oct. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen /05011a.htm>.

Cilveti, Ángel L. *El demonio en el teatro de Calderón*. Valencia: Albatros ediciones, 1977. Print.

"Cizaña." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1869. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.1.0.0.0.>.

"Cizaña." *Diccionario de la lengua española*. 22nd ed. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://lema.rae.es /drae/?val=ciza%C3%B1a>.

Cline, Rangar. *Ancient Angels: Conceptualizing Angeloi in the Roman Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 2011. Print. *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World*, Vol. 172.

"Colegio." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1729. *Real academia española*. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Comendador." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1729. *Real academia española*. Web. 2 Oct. 2012. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Contrario." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1729. *Real academia española*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. *Comedias de Tirso de Molina*. 2 vols. Madrid: Bailly/Baillere, 1906-07. Print.

Damiani, Bruno M. "Tirso de Molina (Gabriel Téllez)." Mary Parker. 205-17.

Darst, David H. *The Comic Art of Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1974. Print. *Estudios de hispanófila*, 28.

---. "The Two Worlds of La ninfa del cielo." *Hispanic Review* 42.2 (1974): 209-20. Web. *JSTOR*. 1 Feb. 2013.

Dassbach, Elma. "Las artes mágicas y los sucesos milagrosos en las comedias de santos." *Hispania* 82.3 (1999): 429-35. Web. *JSTOR*. 23 Aug. 2012.

---. *La comedia hagiográfica del Siglo de Oro español: Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina y Calderón de la Barca*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997. Print. *Ibérica* 22.

Deferrari, Roy J., M. Inviolata Barry, and Ignatius McGuiness. *A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Baltimore: Catholic U of America P, 1948. Print.

"Definidor." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1732. *Real academia española*. Web. 19 July 2012. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Delgado Gómez, Ángel. “Sermón y drama en El condenado por desconfiado.” *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* [Glasgow] 64.1 (1987): 27-37. Print.

Delgado, Maria M. and David T. Gies, eds. *A History of Theatre in Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2012. Print.

Dolfi, Laura and Eva Galar, eds. *Tirso de Molina: Textos e intertextos: Actas del congreso internacional organizado por el GRISO y la Universidad de Parma (Parma, 7-8 de mayo de 2001)*. Pamplona: GRISO-Revista Estudios, 2001. Print.

Donovan, Stephen. "Franciscan Crown." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 4. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 19 Feb. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04540a.htm>.

Douay-Rheims 1899 American Edition. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <www.biblegateway.com>.

Driscoll, James F. "St. Raphael." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 12. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12640b.htm>.

Drum, Walter. "Psalms." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 12. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. Web. 28 Jan. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12533a.htm>.

“Entremés.” *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1732. *Real academia española*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.1.0.0.0.>.

Escudero Baztán, Lara, ed. *El mayor desengaño; Quien no cae no se levanta: Dos comedias hagiográficas*. Pamplona: Instituto de estudios tirisanos, 2004. Directed by Ignacio Arellano and Luis Vázquez. Print.

“Estorbar.” *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1732. *Real academia española*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Fenlon, John Francis. "Beelzebub." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907. Web. 5 Feb. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02388c.htm>.

Fernández, Xavier A., ed. *Las comedias de Tirso de Molina*. 3 vols. Pamplona: U of Navarra, 1991. Print.

Ferreyra Liendo, Miguel Ángel. “*El condenado por desconfiado* de Tirso: Análisis teológico y literario del drama.” *Revista de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba* 10 (1969): 923-46. Print.

Florit Durán, Francisco. “Comedia hagiográfica y censura: El caso de la Santa Juana I de Tirso de Molina.” *Homenaje a Henri Guerreiro: La hagiografía entre*

historia y literatura en la España de la Edad media y del Siglo de Oro. 617-36. Madrid: Vervuert, 2005. Print.

Florit, Francisco. "La reescritura de lo popular en *La Santa Juana. Primera parte*." Dolfi and Galar. 89-112.

Foster, Kenelm, ed. *Summa Theologiae: Vol. 9*. By St. Thomas Aquinas. Cambridge: Blackfriars, 1968. Print.

Fox, E. Inman. "Spain as Castile: Nationalism and National Identity." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Spanish Culture*. Ed. David T. Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 21-36. Print.

Fraguas, Rafael. "El Caballero de la Gran Vía." *El País*. 1 Nov. 1999. No pag. Web. 08 Feb. 2013. <http://elpais.com/diario/1999/11/01/madrid/941459073_850215.html>.

Fuentes, Ventura. "Gabriel Téllez." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 14. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. Web. 2 Oct. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14478a.htm>.

Garau. Jaime, ed. *Santo y sastre*. By Tirso de Molina. *Obras completas: Cuarta parte de comedias II*. Pamplona: Instituto de estudios tirsianos. Directed by Ignacio Arellano and Luis Vázquez. Print. 617-738.

Gascón, Christopher D. *The Woman Saint in Spanish Golden Age Drama*. Lewisburg: Bucknell U P, 2006. Print.

Gies, David T. "Modern Spanish Culture: An Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Spanish Culture*. Ed. David T. Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 1-8. Print.

Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelmorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Leiden: Brill, 1998. Print.

Gigot, Francis. "Seraphim." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 13. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13725b.htm>.

Giorgi, Rosa. *Angels and Demons in Art*. Ed. Stefano Zuffi. Trans. Rosanna M. Giammanco Frongia. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2005. Print.

Greer, Margaret R. "The Development of National Theatre." *The Cambridge History of Spanish Literature*. Ed. David T. Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 238-50. Print.

Gurméndez, Carlos. "Los misterios de Madrid." *El País*. 18 Sep. 1989. Web. 8 Feb. 2013. <http://elpais.com/diario/1989/09/ 18/madrid/622121061_850215.html>.

Halkhoree, Premraj R. K. *Social and Literary Satire in the Comedies of Tirso de Molina*. Ed. José M. Ruano de la Haza and Henry W. Sullivan. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1989. Print.

Hesse, Everret W. "¿Es La ninfa del cielo, atribuída a Tirso, una 'comedia desatinada'?." *Filología Romanza* 3 (1956): 141-61. Print.

"Higa." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1734. *Real academia española*. Web. 28 Jan 2013 <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenu Ntlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Holweck, Frederick. "St. Michael the Archangel." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 10. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen /10275b.htm>.

The Holy Bible, Translated from the Latin Vulgate: Diligently Compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and Other Editions in Divers Languages. Baltimore: John Murphy Co, 1899. Print.

Hornedo, R. M., S. J. "*El condenado por desconfiado* no es una obra molinista." *Razón y fe* 120 (1940): 18-34. Print.

Hughes, Ann Nickerson. *Religious Imagery in the Theater of Tirso de Molina*. Macon: Mercer UP, 1984. Print. *Mercer's Sesquicentennial Series*.

"Humanarse." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1734. *Real academia española*. Web. 6 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.1.0.0.0.>.

Hutton, Lewis J. "Salvation and Damnation in Tirso de Molina's Play *Condemned for Unbelief*." *Christianity & Literature* 30 (1981): 53-62. Print.

"Insolencia." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1734. *Real academia española*. Web. 28 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1997. Print.

Keck, David. *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

Kennedy, Ruth Lee. "*El condenado por desconfiado*: Various Reasons for Questioning its Authenticity in Tirso's Theatre." *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 23.2 (1976): 129-48. Print.

---. "*El condenado por desconfiado*: Yet Further Reasons for Questioning its Authenticity in Tirso's Theatre." *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 23.3 (1976): 335-56. Print.

---. "Did Tirso Send to Press a *Primera Parte* of Madrid (1626) Which Contained *El condenado por desconfiado*?" *Hispanic Review* 41.1 (1973): 261-74. *JSTOR*. Web. 4 Sept. 2012.

---. *Studies in Tirso, I: The Dramatist and His Competitors, 1620-26*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, 1974. Print.

"Latin Dictionary." Web. 20 Feb. 2013. <http://latin-dictionary.net/>.

"Latin Vulgate." Web. 20 Feb. 2013. <http://www.latinvulgate.com/>.

"Loa." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1734. *Real academia española*. Web. 24 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUI MenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Lyon, John, ed. and trans. *Tamar's Revenge*. Tirso de Molina. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1988. Print.

Mayberry, Nancy K. "On the Structure of Tirso's *Santa Juana* Trilogy." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 41.2 (1976): 13-21. Web. *JSTOR*. 23 Aug. 2012.

McClelland, Ivy L. *Tirso de Molina: Studies in Dramatic Realism*. Liverpool: Institute of Hispanic Studies, 1948. Print.

McKendrick, Melveena. *Theatre in Spain: 1490-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.

Minelli, Fiorigio. "Poesía y teología de la conversión en *Quien no cae, no se levanta*." *Revista canadiense de estudios hispánicos* 10.2 (1986): 183-204. Web. *JSTOR*. 23 Aug. 2012.

"Mitra." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1734. *Real academia española*. Web. 11 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.4.0.0.0.>.

Molina, Tirso de. "A la venerable y piadosa congregación de los mercaderes de libros desta corte, en la tutela del glorioso Doctor San Jerónimo." Palomo and Prieto. 5-6.

---. *Auto famoso de nuestra Señora del rosario, La madrina del cielo*. Arellano, Oteiza, and Zugasti. 173-212.

---. *El caballero de gracia*. Ríos. 3: 264-307.

---. *El condenado por desconfiado*. Rodríguez López-Vázquez. 139-312.

---. *La joya de las montañas*. Ríos. 1: 165-205.

---. *El mayor desengaño*. Escudero Baztán. 173-300.

---. *La mujer que manda en casa*. Smith. 383-486.

---. *La ninfa del cielo, condesa, bandolera y obligaciones de honor*. Ríos. 1: 927-71.

---. *La Santa Juana: Primera parte*. Ríos. 1: 770-824.

---. *La Santa Juana: Segunda parte*. Ríos. 1: 825-65.

---. *La Santa Juana: Tercera parte*. Ríos. 1: 866-908.

---. *Quien no cae, no se levanta*. Escudero Baztán. 303-444.

---. *Santo y sastre*. Garau. 633-738.

Morón, Ciriaco, and Rolena Adorno, eds. *El condenado por desconfiado*. 6th ed. By Tirso de Molina. Madrid: Cátedra, 1984. Print.

Mougel, Ambrose. "St. Bruno." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 21 Feb. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03014b.htm>.

"Ninfa." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1780. *Real academia española*. Web. 12 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Oakley, Robert J. *Tirso de Molina: El condenado por desconfiado*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1994. Print. *Critical Guides to Spanish Texts*.

Oteiza, Blanca. "Re: Los textos de Tirso." Message to Amos Kasperek. 28 Sept. 2012. Email.

---. "Tirso en el Siglo XXI: Estado Actual de los estudios tirsianos." *Ínsula: Revista de letras y ciencias humanas* 681. (2003): 3-5. Print.

Palomo, María del Pilar, and Isabel Prieto, eds. *Obras completas*. 5 vols. Tirso de Molina. Madrid: Fundación Castro/Turner Libros, 1994-2007. Print.

"Paraninfo." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1780. *Real academia española*. Web. 6 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Parker, Alexander A. *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón: An Introduction to the Autos Sacramentales*. Oxford: Dolphin Book, 1943. Print.

Parker, Mary, ed. *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age: A Bio-graphical Sourcebook*. Westport: Greenwood P, 1998. Print.

---. "Introduction: The Golden Age of Spanish Drama." Mary Parker. 1-17.

Paterson, Alan K. G. "Tirso De Molina: Two Bibliographical Studies." *Hispanic Review* 35.1 (1967): 43-68. *JSTOR*. Web. 28 Aug. 2012.

"Peñasco." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1737. *Real academia española*. Web. 5 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Penedo Rey, Fray Manuel, ed. *Historia general de la orden de nuestra Señora de las Mercedes*. 2 vols. Fray Gabriel Téllez. Madrid: Provincia de la Merced de Castilla, 1973-74. Print. *Collección revista estudios*.

Pérez, Janet. "Prose in Franco Spain." *The Cambridge History of Spanish Literature*. Ed. David T. Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 628-42. Print.

Pilar Palomo Vázquez, María del. "La creación dramática de Tirso de Molina." *Espéculo. Revista de estudios literarios* 7 (1997): No pag. Web: 15 Jan 2013 <http://www.ucm.es/OTROS/especulo/ numero7/palomo1.htm>.

---. "La creación dramática de Tirso de Molina (II)." *Espéculo. Revista de estudios literarios* 15 (2002): No pag. Web: 15 Jan. 2013 <http://www.ucm.es/OTROS/especulo/numero8/palomo2.htm>.

Pope, Hugh. "Angels." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01476d.htm>.

---. "Angels of the Churches." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907. Web. 21 Feb. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01486a.htm>.

---. "Guardian Angel." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 7. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07049c.htm>.

---. "St. Gabriel the Archangel." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 6. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06330a.htm>.

Portalié, Eugène. "Life of St. Augustine of Hippo." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907. Web. 1 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/ cathen/02084a.htm>.

Poulain, Augustin. "Mystical Marriage." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 9. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910. Web. 26 Mar. 2013. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen /09703a.htm>.

Prat, Ferdinand. "Origen and Origenism." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 11. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. Web. 1 Nov. 2012. <http://www.newadvent.org/ cathen/11306b.htm>.

"Propiedad." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1780. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013 <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Proviso." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1737. *Real academia española*. Web. 30 March 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.4.0.0.0.>.

"Real Oratorio del Caballero de Gracia." Web. 8 Feb. 2013. <http://www.caballerodegracia.org/>.

"Regalar." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1737. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Remiso." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1780. *Real academia española*. Web. 30 March 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

Ríos, Blanca de los, ed. *Obras dramáticas completas*. 3 vols. By Tirso de Molina. Madrid: Aguilar, 1946-58. Print.

Robinson, Paschal. "Franciscan Order." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 6. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. 19 Feb. 2013. <http://www.newadvent.org/ cathen/06217a.htm>.

---. "St. Bonaventure." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 2. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907. Web. 1 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02648c.htm>.

---. "St. Francis of Assisi." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 6. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. 19 Feb. 2013 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06221a.htm>.

Robles, Isidro de, comp. *Navidad y Corpus Christi: Festejados por los mejores ingenios de España, en diez y seis autos a lo divino, diez y seis loas, y dies y seis entremeses*. Guido Mancini, ed. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1983. Print. *Textos y estudios clásicos de las literaturas hispánicas*.

Rodríguez López-Vázquez, Alfredo, ed. *El condenado por desconfiado; La ninfa del cielo*. Attributed to Tirso de Molina / By Luis Vélez. Madrid: Cátedra, 2008. Print.

Rogers, Daniel, ed. *El condenado por desconfiado: A Play Attributed to Tirso de Molina*. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1974. Print.

Rojas, Fernando de. *La Celestina*. 6th. ed. Ed. Dorothy Severin. Madrid: Cátedra, 1992. Print.

Roscales, Olea G. *El Caballero De Gracia: Más de cien años de aventura*. Madrid: Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 1989. Print.

Round, Nicholas G., ed. and trans. *Damned for Despair*. By Tirso de Molina. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1986. Print.

Ruano de la Haza, José M. and Henry W. Sullivan, eds. *Social and Literary Satire in the Comedies of Tirso de Molina*. Premraj R. K. Halkhoree. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1989. Print.

Ruiz, Juan. *Libro de buen amor*. 6th ed. Ed. Alberto Blecua. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003. Print.

Ruiz Ramón, Francisco. *Historia del teatro español (Desde sus orígenes hasta 1900)*. 3rd ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 1979. Print.

Ryrie, Charles C. *Basic Theology*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999. Print.

Saglia, Diego. "Tirso y la literatura inglesa: modalidades de la apropiación del siglo XVII al XIX." Dolfi and Galar. 327-50.

"Santa Orosia." Web. 11 Feb. 2013. <http://www.jaca.es/ cultura_sorosia.php>.

Sanz y Díaz, José, ed. *Tirso de Molina: Estudio y antología*. Madrid: Compañía bibliográfica española, 1964. Print. *Un autor en un libro*.

Schets, Joseph. "Third and Fourth Books of Kings." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 8. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910. Web. 28 Feb. 2013. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen /08652a.htm>.

Smith, Dawn L. "Women and Men in a World Turned Upside-Down: an Approach to Three Plays by Tirso." *Revista canadiense de estudios hispánicos* 10.2 (1986): 247-60. Web. *JSTOR*. 23 Aug. 2012.

Smith, Dawn L., ed. *La mujer que manda en casa*. By Tirso de Molina. *Obras completas: Cuarta parte de comedias II*. Pamplona: Instituto de estudios tirsianos, 1999. Directed by Ignacio Arellano and Luiz Vázquez. Print. 357-486.

"Sobrado." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013 <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.5.0.0.0.>.

Solà-Solé, Josep M. and Luis Vázquez Fernández, eds. Tirso de Molina: Vida y obra, Actas del I simposio internacional sobre Tirso. Madrid: Revista Estudios, 1987. Print.

Souvay, Charles. "Tabernacle." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 14. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. Web. 6 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14424b.htm>.

Stoll, Anita K. "Thematic Development in the Biblical Plays of Tirso de Molina." Diss. Case Western Reserve U, 1972. Print.

Stratil, Marie, and Robert J. Oakley. "A Disputed Authorship Study of Two Plays Attributed to Tirso de Molina." *Literary and Linguistic Computing: Journal of*

the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing 2.3 (1987): 154-60. Web. <http://llc.oxfordjournals.org/> 24 Sept. 2012.

Sullivan, Henry W. *Tirso de Molina and the Drama of the Counter Reformation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1976. Print.

Sullivan, Henry W. and Raúl A. Galoppe, eds. *Tirso de Molina: His Originality Then and Now*. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1996. Print.

Thacker, Jonathan. *A Companion to Golden Age Theatre*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2007. Print.

Tomlinson, Janis A. *From El Greco to Goya: Painting in Spain 1561-1828*. New York: Calmann and King, 1997. Print.

"Tornera." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013 <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenu Ntlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.3.0.0.0.>.

"Torno." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013 <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.2.0.0.0.>.

Trubiano, Mario F. *Libertad, gracia y destino en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Ediciones Alcalá, 1985. Print.

Turner, William. "Celsus the Platonist." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 31 Oct. 2012. <http://www.newadvent.org/ cathen/03490a.htm>.

Ugarte, Michael. "The Literature of Franco Spain, 1939-1975." *The Cambridge History of Spanish Literature*. Ed. David T. Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 611-19. Print.

Valbuena Prat, Ángel. *El teatro español en su siglo de oro*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1969. Print.

Vázquez Fernández, Luis. "Apuntes para una nueva biografía de Tirso." Solà-Solé and Vázquez Fernández. 9-50. Print.

---. "Biografía de Tirso de Molina (1579-1648): Estado actual de la cuestión." *Ínsula* 681 (2003): 7-10. Print.

---. "Influencia de Tirso en *El gran teatro del mundo* de Calderón." Dolfi and Galar. 237-254.

"Velar." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 29 Jan. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.0.0.0.0.>.

"Veneno." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 30 March 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.2.0.0.0.>.

Vermeersch, Arthur. "Religious Obedience." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 11. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. Web. 2 Oct. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11182a.htm>.

Vosler, Karl. *Lecciones sobre Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Taurus Ediciones, 1965. 9-50. Print.

Ward, Bernard. "Douay Bible." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Web. 24 Apr. 2012. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05140a.htm>.

Wardropper, Bruce W. *Historia y crítica de la literatura española: vol. 3*. Barcelona: Ed. Crítica, 1983. Print.

Weber, Nicholas. "Cathari." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. Web. 3 Nov. 2012 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03435a.htm>.

Wetmore Jr., Kevin J., ed. *Catholic Theatre and Drama*. Jefferon: McFarland, 2010. Print.

Wilson, Margaret. *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age*. Oxford: Pergamon P, 1969. Print.

---. *Tirso de Molina*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977. Print.

---. "Tirso's Texts and More on *El condenado por desconfiado*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 70.1 (1993): 97-104. Print.

"Xeme." *Diccionario de autoridades*. 1739. *Real academia española*. Web. 11 Feb. 2013. <http://ntlle.rae.es/ntlle/SrvltGUIMenuNtlle?cmd=Lema&sec=1.4.0.0.0.>.

Appendix A: Revisiting the Conundrum of Tirso's Date of Birth

Tirso's date of birth has for many years been one of the debates over which critics have grappled. Despite the fact that most critics seem to accept Luis Vázquez's research as the most authoritative, very few clearly cite his articles as support for their claims. Consequently, any person entering Tirsian studies may quickly become confused by the plethora of conflicting dates and theories regarding the dramatist's birth. The purpose of this appendix is to clarify the development of those theories and explore the reasons behind the continued uncertainty that clouds certain aspects of Tirsian studies.

Through the 1970s Fray Manuel Penedo's introduction to Tirso's *Historia general de la orden de nuestra Señora de las Mercedes* contained the best collection and analysis of the documentation available to the early Tirsian scholars. The first of four documents cited, which generally carried the most weight among critics, is a declaration Tirso made to the Inquisition in 1638 in which he declared himself to be fifty-eight years old. The second piece of evidence provided by Penedo follows a series of deductions based on decrees from the Council of Trent regarding minimum ages for different levels of ordination, as well as specific rules at the convent in Guadalajara, which Tirso most probably entered in 1603. Consequently, Penedo deduced that Tirso had to be at least twenty-two at the time of his entrance (1: xxv-xxvi). The third piece of evidence is the official request to the *Supremo Consejo de Indias* for permission to travel to the New World. In that document, Tirso, one of several monks participating in the mission, was listed as being thirty-three years old. Since the group sailed in January of 1616, the evidence from this document would indicate 1582 as his birth year.

However, Penedo points out that the age listed on the request would most likely have been the dramatist's age at the time of submission, rather than the time of departure (1: xxvi-xxxiv). The last document is in reality literary evidence from Tirso's *Deleitar aprovechando* in which he wrote "*Diez y nueve años contaba la florida juventud de Pedro Guillén"* (qtd. in Penedo 1: xxxiv). Penedo cites other critics who agree that this passing comment must have a deeper significance relating to Tirso's age upon entering the Mercedarian Order in 1600, consequently placing his birth in 1581 (1: xxxiv-xxxv).

Considering the evidence available at that time, Penedo and others who followed his legacy became reasonably certain that Gabriel Téllez could have been born no earlier than 1580 and no later than 1583. However, the ongoing investigations of Luis Vázquez Fernández during the second half of the twentieth century have brought to light additional information placing the dramatist's supposed birth date slightly earlier than initially expected.

A fundamental document uncovered by Vázquez is a baptismal record bearing not only Tirso's given name but also his parents' and attending god-parents' names. According to a record found in the Parish of Saint Sebastian in Madrid, Andrés López and Juana Téllez brought their infant son, Gabriel, to be baptized on March 29, 1579. Further corroborating the authenticity of the evidence are the accompanying death certificates uncovered in the same parish for both Tirso's father in 1618 and mother in 1620 ("Apuntes" 12). Based on these discoveries, Vázquez was then able to search for further evidence of the lives of Tirso's family members, supporting the notion that the baby mentioned in the baptismal record and the dramatist are indeed the same person.

Despite the apparent clarity of the aforementioned documentation, one cannot say that it completely dispels all doubt. While the appearance of a record that clearly names Gabriel Téllez does lend strong credibility to the argument, Vázquez as well has to enter the realm of theorizing to complete the missing elements and resolve any remaining contradictions. First, while the date of the baptism is March 29, one cannot say with absolute certainty the date of Téllez's birth. Vázquez makes a reasonable and logical assumption that he was born five days earlier on March 24 ("Apuntes" 12), yet one cannot be absolutely certain. Vázquez himself indicates this uncertainty by repeatedly using the word "probable" ("Biografía" 7). Second, the baptismal record reopens the problem of contradicting dates and ages indicated by the Order's permission to travel to the New World and Tirso's own declaration to the Inquisition in 1638. Therefore, some new explanation must be offered to rectify the apparent discrepancy in these documents.

The two possible solutions that Vázquez presents once again depart from tangible evidence. In the first theory, he postulates a clerical error through which Tirso was mistakenly listed as being thirty-three years old instead of thirty-six at the time of embarcation. Vázquez considers this solution to be the simplest and most likely ("Apuntes" 24-25). The second, more suspect theory he presents is based on the idea that officials more frequently granted permissions to travel to the New World to younger applicants, resulting in a purposeful misrepresentation of the friar's age since he was the eldest member of the group ("Apuntes" 25). Finally, with regard to the inconsistency between Tirso's self-declared age to the Inquisition and the evidence of the baptismal record, Vázquez states, "Dada la variable incluida en ese «poco más o

menos» de la época, esta declaración no sólo no significa una objeción posible al documento bautismal, sino que viene a ser una *corroboración* de él" ("Apuntes" 26).

While Vázquez's proposed solutions are not wholly convincing, they are based on no less plausible grounds than those of other critics before him. A chief merit of Vázquez's research is his departure from evidence extrapolated from literary passages from both Tirso and other writers of his day, as was the all-too-common tendency of previous investigators. He seems to limit his conclusions, whenever possible, to the available historical documentation of the time. Thus, Vázquez's overall contribution to the debate does lend strong support to the year 1579 as the dramatist's birth date.