Notes on Some Comedias of Lope de Vega

Author(s): H. A. Rennert

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Jan., 1906), pp. 96-110

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713755>

Accessed: 24/06/2014 23:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

NOTES ON SOME COMEDIAS OF LOPE DE VEGA.

THE following notes are written with the view to amending and amplifying the bibliographical portion of my *Life of Lope de Vega* (Glasgow and Philadelphia, 1904).

LA AMISTAD Y OBLIGACION.

On page 494 of the above work is the following statement: '*Amistad (La) y Obligacion*.:—xxii. Zaragoza, 1630; *Suelta* (J. R. C[horley] and Gayangos); MS. copy Cat. Bibl. Nacional, No. 140. Duran and Mesonero Romanos assert that this is (with some slight variations) the same play as Montalvan's *Lucha de Amor y Amistad*, but Chorley notes that Montalvan's is an *obra divina*. I have the latter work, and find that the first line agrees with the MS. though the closing line does not. The characters are the same.' There is a slight error here. The first two lines of the play ascribed to Montalvan are:

Don Martin. No sé como sin morir.
Lope, te puedo escuchar.

Lucha de Amor y Amistad is identical with *La Amistad y Obligacion*, except that the first twenty-nine lines of the latter play are omitted in the former, together with the character of Belardo, and the few lines assigned to that character. When I wrote the above in my *Life of Lope de Vega* I had never seen the very rare Parte xxii., published at Zaragoza in 1630, by Pedro Verges, 'a costa de Iusepe Ginobart, Mercader de Libros,' which has since come into my possession, and I am thus able to confirm the assertion of Duran and Gayangos. The comedia is undoubtedly Lope's, and is wrongly ascribed to Montalvan. Towards the close of Act III. the following passage occurs:

Seuero. Soy Musico, soy Poeta.
.....
Lope. Soys Vulgar o Culterano?
Seuero. Culto soy.
Lope. Quedaos en casa
y escriuiureys mis secretos.
Seuero. Tus secretos, porque causa?
Lope. Porque nadie los entienda.;

Chorley is mistaken in calling the play ascribed to Montalvan an 'obra divina.' Concerning the other plays in this Parte XXII., the first one: *Nunca mucho costó poco*, ascribed to Lope (and undoubtedly his), is entirely different from Alarcon's *Los Pechos privilegiados*, which latter, according to Hartzenbusch, also exists as a 'suelta' with the title *Nunca mucho costó poco*, and appears under this title in Alarcon's *Comedias Escogidas*, Vol. II. Madrid, 1829.

Di Mentira, sacarás Verdad is by Matias de los Reyes. The concluding lines are:

Aqueste es el fin que dió
a su fabula *Batillo*,
y que os pida, me pidió
perdon de su humilde estilo
y así os lo suplico yo.

Batillo is a shepherd,—one of the subordinate characters in the play, and is very probably the *nom de guerre* of Reyes, just as Lope used the name Belardo¹.

Of the remaining plays in Parte XXII., *La Verdad sospechosa* is by Alarcon; *Quien bien ama tarde olvida* is a poor play and unworthy of Lope, to whom it is ascribed.

EL NEGRO DEL MEJOR AMO.

Prof. Restori has printed a comedia bearing this title, and ascribed to Lope de Vega, from a MS. copy in the Bibliotheca Palatina, at Parma (*Degli 'Autos' di Lope de Vega Carpio*, Parma, 1898, pp. 17—42). To me the authorship of this play seems doubtful, despite the fact that the MS. belonged to Francisco de Roxas, who made some corrections in it, and the further fact that the last two sheets are in the handwriting of Martinez de Mora. It is perhaps true, as Prof. Restori says, that Lope has written worse plays, but any third-rate *ingenio* could have written *El Negro del mejor Amo*, and I should be unwilling, except on better evidence, to make Lope responsible for it. Mira de Mescua's comedia of the same title, which I have, is wholly different. 'Rosambuco, Turco,' is the principal character in the latter play, while in Lope's *Antióbo* it is the 'Príncipe negro.' In the 1618 edition of Lope's *Peregrino en su Patria* there is a list of additional plays by Lope² (repeating twelve from the first list of 1604); among these is one

¹ Batillo is also one of the characters in the Comedia *Del que Diran* of Matias de los Reyes. See also Barrera, *Catálogo*, pp. 326, 327.

² Query: who is the author of this list in the edition of 1618? Certainly Lope de Vega had no part in drawing it up.

entitled *El santo Negro*, which is perhaps the play published in 1612 (or 1611?) in the so-called *Tercera Parte* of Lope, under the title: *Vida y Muerte del santo Negro llamado san Benito de Palermo*, and republished by Menéndez y Pelayo in Vol. iv. of the Academy's edition of Lope. Mescua's play is upon the same subject.

THE PARTES EXTRAVAGANTES OF LOPE.

It is well known that the published collection of Lope de Vega's *Comedias* consists of twenty-five *Partes*, which were issued between 1604 and 1647. It is equally well known that *Partes* III. and v. do not belong to this collection at all, but to the series of *Diferentes Autores*. In the 'tassa' to *Parte* III. the volume is distinctly described as: 'un libro de doze comedias, compuestas por diferentes Autores' (ed. of 1613, Madrid, En casa de Miguel Serrano de Vargas); while the title-page of *Parte* v. is: *Flor de comedias de España de diferentes autores*.

Now, in addition to this collection of twenty-five 'Partes,' there are three volumes which are supposed to have existed, numbered *Partes* xxvi., xxvii. and xxviii., of the comedias of Lope de Vega, and which are called *Partes extravagantes*, i.e. irregular or odd Parts, and sometimes called 'las de afuera,' i.e. not published in Madrid.

The supposed contents of these Parts are given in Barrera, *Catálogo*, pp. 682—683, from whom I have taken them in the bibliography of my *Life of Lope de Vega*, pp. 400—401. The titles of these parts, as given by Barrera, are as follows:

Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio...(y otros Autores). Parte veynte y seis. Zaragoza, 1645¹.

Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio...(y otros Autores). Parte veynte y siete. Barcelona, 1633.

Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio...(y otros Autores). Parte veynte y ocho. Zaragoza, 1639.

¹ Here Barrera adds a note, in which he says that, as the date 1645 indicates, this must be either a re-impression of the volume or of the title-page, and that the volume must have been printed for the first time in 1632 or 1633, as is proved by a passage in Lope's *El Desprecio agradecido*, printed in 1637, in the *Vega del Parnaso*:

Ines.	Pues un libro, y esta vela
	Os será de gran prouecho.
Don Bernardo.	Quien es?
Ines.	Parte ventiseis
	De Lope.
Don Bernardo.	Libros supuestos,
	Que con su nombre se imprimen.

(Ed. of 1637, fol. 153.)

It will be observed that the titles are alike, except as regards dates: no details are given. There is a good reason for this, as we shall see.

These three volumes, Partes XXVI., XXVII. and XXVIII., are known as the *Partes extravagantes* of Lope, though Parte XXIX. (En Huesca, por Pedro Bluson, 1634), of which there is a copy in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, has an equal right to be so entitled. So far as I have been able to learn, nobody who has written about these *Partes extravagantes*, or who has quoted them, has ever seen them, except Fajardo. Nobody else even pretends that he has seen *any* of them.

In any discussion of these *extravagantes* it seems to me that the testimony of Barrera may fairly be disregarded, for, as it will be shown, he has simply copied Fajardo. 'All that we can do therefore,' as Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly says (in a letter to the writer), 'is to form an estimate of Fajardo's credibility, and base tentative conclusions thereon. Speaking generally Fajardo is accurate; apart from occasional slips, he survives the trial of being tested at various points.' Now, in addition to the statements of Fajardo, the only other evidence we have of the existence of these *extravagantes* (except the passage from Lope's comedia, given above) is to be found in three made-up volumes (*tomos colecticios*), formerly in the Osuna Library, numbered respectively 131, 132 and 133, and described by Schack, *Nachträge*, pp. 41—42. Their contents are to be found in my *Life of Lope de Vega*, pp. 437—438, together with the statement of John Rutter Chorley, that the references to the *Partes extravagantes* are introduced by Barrera on the sole authority of Fajardo's *Index*, and that Barrera omits to give the reader the very necessary information that, so far as can be ascertained at present, these volumes [the *extravagantes*] do not exist, save in the fragments in the Osuna Library above mentioned.

Now let us take the case of Parte XXVI. Zaragoza, 1645, noted by Barrera on p. 682. The contents of this volume are simply copied from Fajardo; a thing which nobody would guess, but it is so. Among the plays included in this volume, Fajardo gives *El Nacimiento de Alba* and *El Prodigio de Etiopia*. They exist respectively in vols. 131 and 132 of the Osuna Library (a fact which Barrera mentions in a note), but in the list of contents of these three volumes, as we have it, both these plays are marked as 'sueatas' (whether without pagination, or paged separately, is not indicated). Unfortunately we are now unable to verify such accounts as we have of these three Osuna volumes, as they are not available at the Biblioteca Nacional. I happen to know, however, that there is now in the Gayangos collection in the Biblioteca

Nacional a copy of *Amar como se ha de Amar*, for example, which is given in Vol. 131 as a 'suelta,' but which is paged 214—233. Chorley had a copy of this play so paged, as had likewise Salvá (*Catálogo*, I., p. 548), showing that, in all probability, the details of the Osuna volumes are not entirely accurate. Of *El Prodigio de Etiopía*, the only 'suelta'—also from the Gayangos collection—is unpagged. But even if *El Nacimiento de Alba* and *El Prodigio de Etiopía* were paged as 'sueltas' (though it would weaken the case), still it would not be positive evidence that they may not have been contained in Parte xxvi. *extravagante*, inasmuch as Parte xxix. (Huesca, 1634) is made up almost entirely of plays separately paged, as are likewise all the copies of Lope's Parte vi. that I have seen. Hence we may, perhaps, fairly infer the existence of an otherwise unknown volume, containing these two plays, and we may assume that this volume was the Parte xxvi. *extravagante*, mentioned by Fajardo as containing the said two plays. So far this corroborates Fajardo's statement. But it must be observed that the corroboration is only partial; it is limited to the two plays above named. Fajardo may be right as regards the remaining ten plays. The presumption is even in his favour. Nevertheless it is nothing more than a presumption. We know nothing that would justify us in speaking decisively on this point.

Again, take the case of Parte xxvii., Barcelona, 1633, noted by Barrera on p. 682, col. 2. The contents of this volume are also simply copied by Barrera from Fajardo, and again Barrera says not a word as to the origin of his information. He merely mentions that one of the plays in this Parte xxvii., *Lanza por Lanza*, is in Vol. 133 of the Osuna Library, and he goes on to say that this Vol. 133 is in the main made up of fragments of this very rare Parte xxvii. *extravagante*. Observe that Barrera says this Vol. xxvii. is very rare, but he carefully avoids saying that he has seen it, and skilfully conveys a wrong impression. Yet the case for xxvii. *extravagante* is very strong. The Osuna volume No. 133 contains seven plays, with, apparently, a continuous pagination, from fol. 1 to fol. 146, and six of these plays are said by Fajardo to be in xxvii. *extravagante*. Now we have some knowledge of this pagination elsewhere, and it partly confirms the contents of the volume, though not in the order in which Barrera has given the plays. Salvá (*Catálogo*, Vol. I., p. 548) tells us that he possessed some fragments of an unknown volume, and combining his data (he gives the pagination of his fragments) with what we have in Osuna 133, we get the following, for the contents of Vol. xxvii. *extravagante*:

<i>Lanza por Lanza, la de Luis de Almanza,</i>	fols. 21—38.
<i>El Sastre de Campillo</i>	„ 39—62.
<i>Allá darás, Rayo</i>	„ 63—80.
<i>La Selva confusa</i>	„ 81—100.
<i>Julian Romero</i>	„ 101—122.
<i>Los Vargas de Castilla</i>	„ 123—146.

We have, therefore, very strong indications of the existence of a volume which has left no other trace behind. This is a decided corroboration of Fajardo. It will be seen (*Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 438) that Chorley's and Salvá's fragments point to the conclusion that *Julian Romero* ought to be included in XXVII. *extravagante*; its omission warns us to check Fajardo's statements as we should those of any other bibliographer¹.

Concerning Parte XXVIII. *extravagante* there is no confirmation of its contents (so far as I know), as given by Barrera, who takes them from Fajardo. The latter, for example, gives *El Labrador venturoso* as in XXVIII. *extravagante*. Chorley conjectures, and I incline to agree with him, that Fajardo perhaps meant to write XXVIII. *Diferentes*, which does contain *El Labrador venturoso*. This may be a slip of the pen, for volumes bearing the same number, but belonging to different series and issued at divers times and places, do occasionally include the same plays². But Barrera is certainly in difficulties in regard to this XXVIII. *extravagante*, which he says contains *El Palacio confuso*, ascribed to Lope. Fajardo simply notes: 'En Parte XXVIII. de Mescua.' He may have meant *Escogidas* XXVIII., and true, there it is, but ascribed to Mescua. Barrera simply substitutes Lope for Mescua, confusing the matter with Vol. XXVIII. *Diferentes* of Huesca, where the play is ascribed to Lope³.

¹ Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly reminds me, however, that Fajardo mentions *Julian Romero* as being 'en su Parte 17 de Zaragoza,' and suggests that this may be merely a slip of the copyist's for 'Parte 27.'

² Since the above passage was written, Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly has pointed out to me that, with the exception of *El trato muda costumbres* (which occurs in Vol. xxx. *Diferentes* of Huesca, 1636, under the title of *El Marido hace mujer*), all the plays mentioned by Fajardo as being in Parte XXVIII. *extravagante* are given in XXVIII. *Diferentes* of Huesca, 1634.

³ See the note in my *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 524. All the information in this article concerning Fajardo's Index (which I have never seen) has been kindly furnished by my friend, Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly. It is a great satisfaction, moreover, to know that his opinion of the *extravagantes* is in substantial agreement with mine.

I may add here that in the list of contents of Part XXIX. (En Huesca, por Pedro Bluson, 1634) given by Barrera, p. 683, he has entirely omitted the second play, *Donde no está su Dueño, está su Duelo*, ascribed to Lope. From the contents of this volume, which I subjoin, it will be seen that it is a made-up volume.

Doze Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio, Parte veynte y nueue. En Huesca, por Pedro Bluson, Año de 1634.

La Paloma de Toledo:—Lope, Representóla Avendaño, fols. 121—140.

Donde no está su Dueño, está su Duelo:—Lope, Representóla Prado, fols. 58—81.

Querer mas y sufrir menos:—Lope, fols. 1—20 v.

Los Mártires de Madrid:—Lope, fols. 1—20 v.

[*La prospera*

In the matter of these *Partes extravagantes*, therefore, the testimony of Barrera need not be considered at all. He had never seen the *extravagantes* (nor does he, in fact, say that he has seen them, though he permits us to infer as much); he has simply copied Fajardo's Index. Chorley possessed a MS. copy of this Index, and was, moreover, scrupulously careful in his statements; on the whole he was a much better guide. Fajardo, as we have stated above, was the only man who ever saw these *extravagantes*. As Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly has said, in a letter to me: 'Apart from the Osuna volumes, the solitary witness [concerning these *Partes extravagantes*] is Fajardo.'

To sum up. (1) I believe there was a Parte XXVI. *extravagante*: (a) on the strength of Fajardo's assertion, and (b) because of the corroborative evidence in the Osuna Vols. 131 and 132, and (c) because Lope de Vega in his *El Desprecio agradecido* distinctly says that there was such a Parte XXVI. (2) I believe, too, most strongly, that there was a Parte XXVII. *extravagante*: (a) on the assertion of Fajardo, which is confirmed by (b) the plays in the Osuna Vol. 133, by the fragments possessed by Salvá, and by (c) Chorley's fragment of *Los Vargas de Castilla*, corresponding to pp. 127—146 of this Osuna Vol. 133. (3) The existence of a Parte XXVIII. *extravagante*, as Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly writes to me, 'depends entirely on the amount of confidence to be placed in Fajardo.' He is not infallible, but his credibility is not seriously shaken. He says there is (or was, rather) a Parte XXVIII. *extravagante*. He makes mistakes, perhaps, in this case (see concerning *El Labrador venturoso*, p. 101, and especially for the remaining plays, note 2 on p. 101); he apparently makes a mistake also in the case of XXVII. *extravagante*, which should include *Julian Romero*. I find less corroborative evidence as to what Fajardo says about XXVIII. *extravagante*, and so its case is very much weaker than that of the two preceding volumes, yet I am inclined to believe such a volume existed, though this belief is wholly based on my faith in Fajardo's assertion.

Unfortunately, as I have said, we must for the present be content with the description which we now possess of the Osuna volumes 131,

La prospera Fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera, Lope, fols. 1—22 v.

La adversa Fortuna de don Bernardo de Cabrera:—Lope, Representóla Morales, fols. 1—22 v.

Las Mocedades de Bernardo del Carpio:—Lope, Representóla Roque de Figueroa, fols. 1—20 v.

Pusoseme el Sol, saliome la Luna:—Lope de Vega crossed out and Claramonte written above, fols. 1—22.

El Cerco de Peñon de Velez:—Luis Velez de Guevara, fols. 1—20 v.

El Cautivo venturoso:—Francisco de Barrientos, fols. 1—16 v.

Un Gusto trae mil Disgustos:—Juan Perez de Montalban, fols. 1—20 v.

El Hombre de mayor Fama:—Doctor Mira de Mescua, fols. 1—17 v.

132 and 133, for, as already stated, these volumes are not, so far as I can gather, available at the Biblioteca Nacional.

Of some plays contained in the Osuna volumes, duplicates exist in the Biblioteca Nacional, mostly from the Gayangos collection. I subjoin the opening and closing lines:

AMAR COMO SE HA DE AMAR.

(*Suelta*; Biblioteca de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad Central.)

Comedia Famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio. Representóla Suarez.

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

Don Pedro de Cardona.	Turin.
Don Juan, su hermano.	Rugero.
Clarinda, Princesa.	Lucindo.
Ricarda, y Julia, labradora.	El Conde Roberto, padre de Ricarda.

Acto Primero.

Salen Don Pedro y Don Juan.

D. Juan. Fuese el Rey?

D. Pedro. Ya se partió
para castigar el Rey
de Napoles, al Virrey,
que con Sicilia se alzó.
Pero dicen que salió
para estoruarle el castigo
su reuelado enemigo,
con otra famosa armada.

D. Juan. Será dessa infame espada
el mar sepulchro y castigo.

D. Pedro. Yo con quedar me è quedado
corrido, aunque no le niego
a mi amor, por ser tan ciego,
el contento que me à dado;
que a su consejo de Estado
el Rey me manda acudir,
todo es servir, si es servir
al dueño de mis enojos,
sin veros, hermosos ojos,
es imposible viuir.

.....

[fol. 233 v.] *Clarinda.* Razon y amor me aconsejan,
desde oy, don Pedro y Ricarda
Reyes de Napoles sean,
que yo y don Juan lo seremos
de Cicilia.

D. Pedro. Quien pudiera,
sino tu ingenio y valor,
dar tan diuina sentencia?

D. Juan. Señora, con que palabras
quieres que yo te agradezca
tanta merced y fauor?

Clarinda. Con que solamente aprendas
a amar como se ha de amar,
que es la mayor excelencia.
Turin. Pues no dan nada a Turin?
Clarinda. Eres Turin el que sueñas?
Turin. Yo voy.
D. Pedro. Pues dile al Senado
que aquí acaba la Comedia.

NARDO ANTONIO VANDOLERO.

(*Suelta*, paged 235—254 v. Biblioteca de Filosofía y Letras &c.)

Comedia famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio.

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

El Conde de Miranda.	Otro soldado.	Pedro Talla.
Nardo Antonio.	Liseno.	Belarda.
Leonarda.	Un Capitan español.	Pascual
Ricardo, su padre.	Leonido.	Martin
Gerardo.	Valerio.	Celia.
Laura.	Lisardo.	Floro.
Leonelo	Moyon.	Rufino, mercader.
Batistela	Montilla, vandolero.	Ybañes.
Roselo	Tres vandoleros.	Liseno, pastor.
Timbrio	Julia, criada.	

Acto Primero.

Suena musica, y salen Batistela, Leonelo y Roselo, soldados.

Roselo. Brauo recibimiento. *Leonelo.* Generoso.
Batistela. De Napoles su esfuerço acreditado,
que al Conde de Miranda, valeroso,
muestra en festines general aplauso:
puede llamarse el Reyno venturoso
con tal Virrey, que a fuer de buen soldado
oy à honrado con premios la milicia,
mezclando la piedad con tal justicia.
Leonelo. A aquesta sala viene. *Batistela.* Aquí veremos
mas espacio el valor de su presencia,
a quien tan grande amor los mas deuemos,
claros indicios de su real clemencia.

[fol. 254 v.] Leonarda quiero que tenga
fin religioso, ayudando
para su dote mi hazienda,
la Concepcion Española
será su carcel perpetua.

Nardo. Dexame besar tus pies;
solo un Español pudiera
hazirme favor tan grande:
ya Leonarda viua quedas,
dame tus braços y al cielo
a Nardo Antonio encomienda.

Leonarda. No puedo sufrir el llanto;
morir contigo quisiera.

Nardo. Lleuadlos, que me enternecen,
porque dichoso fin tenga
la vida de Nardo Antonio,
que oy agradaros dessea.

QUERER MAS Y SUFRIR MENOS.

(In *Doze Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*. Parte veynte y nueue.
En Huesca, 1634.)

Comedia famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio.

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

Don Diego de Castro.	Jacinta.
Don Juan de Ribera.	Lope, criado.
Doña Leonor.	Don Luys, padre de Doña Ana.
Doña Ana, su prima.	Cesar.

Jornada Primera.

Salen Don Diego y Don Juan.

D. Diego. Hable, don Juan, el azero,
supuesto que vos callays,
que de esse silencio infiero
que a pelear me sacays,
y satisfazeros quiero.
Ya no estamos en lugar,
don Juan, de gastar razones,
y assi podreys escusar
el pedir satisfacciones,
quando no las pienso dar.
He conocido el intento.

Don Juan. Si, don Diego a esso venis,
pero dezir lo que siento
quiero, si cortes me ois.

Don Diego. Ya os escucho. *Don Juan.* Estad atento.
Ya sabeys que en cierta calle,
no es menester que os la nonbre,
que yo sé que la podreys
conocer por mis informes.
Y es bien passarla en silencio,
por los troncos que nos oyen,
que escuchan mudos a vezes
lo que publican a voces.
Sirvo a una dama, don Diego,
claro está que quien esconde
aun el nombre de la calle,
el suyo es bien que perdone.

[fol. 20 v.] *Salen Jacinta y Lope.*

- Lope.* Vive Dios, que quando vi
el alboroto y estruendo,
y las voces, quise dar
con las puertas en el suelo,
que entendi que te mataran;
en efeto no estás muerto?
- Don Diego.* No, Lope, sino casado.
- Lope.* Pues haz quenta que es lo mesmo,
y será quenta muy cierta:
bueno es dexarme al sereno,
y entrarse a casar. *D. Diego.* Que quieres?
- Lope.* Venturoso yo que llego
tarde al casar. *Doña Leonor.* No tan tarde
que Jacinta. *Lope.* En fin no puedo
escaparme. *D. Diego.* No es possible.
- Lope.* No, pues paciencia, y apelo
para el capuz. *Jacinta.* Malos años.
- Don Lugs.* Venid, porque concertemos
estas bodas. *D. Diego.* Esto ha sido
querer mas, y sufrir menos.
Las faltas dissimulad
deste amante atrevimiento,
de aquel que desea serviros,
que esto le basta por premio.

DONDE NO ESTÁ SU DUEÑO, ESTÁ SU DUELO.

(Also in *Doze Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*. Parte veynte y nueue. En Huesca, por Pedro Bluson, año de 1634. This comedia is not mentioned in the list of plays in this volume given by Schack and Barrera.)

Comedia famosa de Lope de Vega Carpio. Representóla Prado.

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

El Conde.	Sabina.	El Duque de Terranova.
Don Diego.	Leonor.	D. Juan de Ucunca, veedor.
Un Paje.	Tres Capitanes.	El Duque de Parma.
Vanquete, gracioso.	Don Pedro.	Un Maestro de Campo.
Aurelia.	Zamudio.	Un criado.
Doña Juana.	Villalta.	Criados.

Acto Primero.

Salen el Conde, y Don Diego.

- Conde.* Estremadamente os veo,
con vuestra suerte dichosa,
contento. *D. Diego.* Tengo una esposa
a medida del desseo:
la dicha que yo he tenido
ni se escriue ni se sabe.

Conde. Plegue a Dios que no se acabe,
que ha poco que soys marido.

D. Diego. No puede ser, si segura
tengo la dicha, y el sesso,
porque tengo a un mismo peso
la discrecion y hermosura,
y hermosura y discrecion
la vez que vienen a ser
iguales en la muger,
en el hombre eternas son.
Tanto al gusto vive asida,
que pienso al consideralla,
que ay en mi para adoralla
en el alma poca vida.

Conde. El mayor bien viene a ser
de la tierra auer llegado,
a estar siempre enamorado,
un hombre de su muger.

[fol. 81.]

Quando no porque la devo
yo la vida y tu lo mandas,
lo hiziera, por verme aora
el cuchillo a la garganta:
tu esposo soy. *Doña Juana.* Yo soy tuya.

Aurelia. Quien vió cosas tan estrañas?

Vanquete. Señor, perdoname a mi.

Sabina. Si conmigo no se casa,
no lo hagas.

Vanquete. Esso dudas?
he aqui mi mano.

Sabina. Esso basta.

Aurelia. Aora dame los braços.

D. Diego. Toma los braços, y el alma,
y acabe aqui la Comedia,
pues estos exemplos bastan
para que sirva mi esposa,
para que assista en mi casa,
porque me diga siempre mi rezelo
donde no está su dueño, está su duelo.

LA NIÑA DE PLATA.

There are two comedias entitled *La Niña de Plata*, both ascribed to Lope de Vega. The first has the sub-title *El cortés Galan*, and is published in Parte IX. of Lope's *Comedias*, Barcelona, 1618, fol. 103. The other play, with the title *La Niña de Plata y Burla vengada*, exists in MS. in the British Museum (MSS. Eg. 547). Concerning it Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly informed me (see *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 210 n.) that this MS. is dated Montilla, January 29, 1613; also that it is not in Lope's handwriting, that it is not signed by him, that it differs altogether from Lope's printed comedia¹, that it is (so far as he is

¹ It may be convenient to state that Ismenio, Don Diego, Fabio, Don Pedro, Lechuga, Doña Blanca and Xarife are among the numerous characters of *La Niña de Plata* in MSS. Eg. 547.

aware) unpublished, and that it bears no resemblance to Lope's style. The comedia as printed in Lope's Parte IX. is edited by Menéndez y Pelayo and appears in Volume IX. of the Academy's edition. This volume is reviewed in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, Vol. 28 (1904), by Prof. Restori, and this, like all other reviews of the Academy's edition of Lope, written by that scholar, is of prime importance, both as regards precise knowledge of Lope's theatre and the new critical matter adduced. Menéndez y Pelayo cites a 'suelta' of *La Niña de Plata* of 1781; Restori compares a 'suelta' printed in 1739, with the play as published by Menéndez y Pelayo, and shows the many and very important variations from the original Parte IX. This is another example, if any were needed, of the importance of the 'sueltas' for the constitution of a text, although these 'sueltas,' as is well known, were generally forced into the regulation number of sheets and often mutilated in most barbarous fashion. I may add that I possess the 'suelta' of this play dated 1781, 'en Valencia, en la Imprenta de Joseph y Thomas Orga,' which seems, barring a few changes, to be identical with that of 1739. The later edition supplies the missing verses in the copy of 1739 (*e.g.* on p. 114 of Restori's review):

Maestre (not *Arias*, as in 1739 text): Es hija
de un Ventiquatro.
Arias. En el pueblo
tiene estimacion. *Rey.* *Maestre*, etc.

On p. 121 of the *Zeitschrift*, *Don Juan's* speech reads:

Calla, necio, que no estoy
para gracias: ay Leonido!

In the same review, Restori refers to a copy of a very rare and ancient edition of *La Estrella de Sevilla*, which seems to have been torn from a volume, as it is paged 99—120. This volume is not wholly unknown, as was supposed, but is mentioned by Salvá (*Catálogo*, I. p. 548), who possessed a copy of the same fragment, as well as a copy of *La Paloma de Toledo*, paged 121—140, showing that these two comedias were consecutive in the same volume, no other trace of which seems to exist.

EL BRASIL RESTITUIDO.

The autograph of this comedia, signed by Lope at Madrid, October 23, 1625, is now in the Lenox Library, New York. Mr Lenox bought it from Mr Obadiah Rich, then U.S. Consul at Valencia, and Mr Rich purchased it from D. Fernando de la Serna. In the Lenox Library is also a transcript made by Henri Ternaux-Compans in 1833,

from Duran's copy. The latter is now in the Biblioteca Nacional, at Madrid. The play has been reprinted in the Academy's edition of Lope de Vega, Vol. XIII.

The Rich collection of Spanish mss. is now in the Lenox Library, and among them a number formerly owned by Ternaux-Compans.

The cast of *El Brasil Restituido*, which I copied from the autograph, is interesting, and is as follows:

Personas del P^o Acto.

Doña Guiomar	M ^a de Vitoria.
Don Diego	Cintor.
Bernardo	Bernardino.
Laurençio	Antonio.
Leonardo	Bobadilla.
El Coronel de Olanda	Arias, con barba Francesa.
Alberto, su hijo	El Spiñ Santo del Auto.
El Gobernador	El Autor.
Machado	Pedro.
.....	
.....	
El Brasil	Maria de Cordoba.

Personas del 2^o Acto.

La Religion Catolica	Dorotea.
El Brasil	La Autora.
Don Manuel de Meneses	musico.
Don Fadrique de Toledo	Arias.
Leonardo	Bobadilla.
El Coronel electa	Bernardino.
Don Enrique de Alagon	Cintor.
Don Diego de Espinosa	Antonio.
Don Pedro de Santisteban	Fr ^{co} de rro.
Doña Guiomar	M ^a de Vit ^a .
D. Juan de Orellada	Mar ana.
La heregia	M ^a de Vitoria.
Un soldado	El niño.

The 'autor' or manager of this company in 1625 was, in all probability, Andres de la Vega, one of the best known theatrical managers of the first half of the xviiith century. His wife (in this cast 'la Autora') Maria de Cordoba (called *Amarilis* or *La Gran*

Sultana, was one of the most famous actresses of her time. In the previous year the company of Andres de la Vega represented one of the 'autos' at the Corpus Christi festival in Seville, and also took part in the festival given by the Duke of Medina Sidonia to Philip IV. in that year. Both Andres de la Vega and Maria de Cordoba were still acting in 1643. The latter was the daughter of Antonio Martinez and Isabel de Cordoba, both of Madrid (*Nuevos Datos*, p. 223). Gabriel Cintor was a celebrated 'galan,' who must have been at the height of his fame in 1625. He was in the company of Bobadilla in 1638, receiving 20 reals per day for acting and 10 reals for maintenance besides 50 ducats for the Corpus Christi festival—then a large sum. In the following year he was one of the principal actors in the company of Juan Rodriguez de Antriago (Pérez Pastor, *Nuevos Datos*, p. 312). In 1640 he had a company of his own. He is said to have died poor in the General Hospital at Madrid. Luis Bernardo de Bobadilla, like most actors of note, afterwards became an *autor* (theatrical manager), and had his own company in 1637 and 1638. His wife was Maria de Victoria, also a celebrated actress. In 1624 and 1639 Bobadilla and Maria de Victoria were members of the company of Antonio de Prado (*Nuevos Datos*, pp. 206, 325). Damian Arias de Peñafiel, the first actor of his day, was in the company of Juan de Morales Medrano in the previous year (1624). He had a company of his own in 1639, and we find him again in the company of Vallejo in 1643, in which year he is said to have died at Arcos.

'Dorotea' is a very rare name amongst the actresses of the XVIIIth century: I find only Dorotea de Sierra, wife of Juan Mazana, 'musicco,' in the long list of Pérez Pastor (*Nuevos Datos*, pp. 247 and 328—329). She seems to have been an actress of considerable reputation in 1636. She died before May 30, 1642. Her husband may be the actor here taking the part of Don Manuel de Meneses.

Bernardino is probably Bernardino Alvarez, who was in Balbin's company in 1613, and in Prado's company in 1624. Antonio is perhaps Juan Antonio, in Prado's company in 1639 (Sanchez-Arjona, *Anales del Teatro en Sevilla*, p. 325).

Fr^{co} de rro = probably Francisco de Robles, an actor at least as early as 1609; he was in the company of Pedro de Valdez in 1623, and in that of Juan de Morales Medrano in 1624.

H. A. RENNERT.