

## A COURT ENTERTAINMENT OF 1638

THEATRICALS at the court of Philip IV were not exclusively a spectator sport. Amateur performances put on by the courtiers themselves now and then were included in the diversions marking special occasions. In most cases, our knowledge of these entertainments is limited to accounts by the official chroniclers or stray comments in newsletters. Very few actual texts have been preserved.<sup>1</sup> For one such event which combines elements of masque, tournament, ballet and dialogue we have, however, not only a rather lengthy contemporary description, but also a documentary record of some of the expenditures involved and, in manuscript, the full text of the piece, complete with marginal annotations explaining some of the "in" jokes.

It should be stated from the outset that, considered from the literary point of view, the work richly deserves the oblivion in which it has remained for over three centuries. The plot line is weak, the versification undistinguished, and the witticisms often labored. Even the best of the latter are so topical that considerable research is required to discover the humor. As a document for social history, nevertheless, it is not entirely without interest, for it gives a lively picture of life at court in the middle years of Philip's reign. Even though in our democratic age the doings of the great lords and ladies so meticulously recorded in the play are apt to pro-

<sup>1</sup> In 1622 the court ladies gave Villamediana's *La gloria de Niquea* (*Obras* [Zaragoza: Juan de Lanaja y Quartanet, 1629]); see the description by Antonio de Mendoza, "Fiesta que se hizo en Aranjuez a los años del rey nuestro señor D. Felipe IV" (*Obras poéticas*, ed. R. Benítez Claros [Madrid, 1947], I, 5-26). Mendoza's own *Querer por solo querer*, done by substantially the same group for the queen's birthday, has survived in a *suelta* ([Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1623], now preserved at the Instituto del Teatro in Barcelona) and a manuscript (MS. 3661, B.N.M., without cast). Another amateur performance marked the queen's birthday in 1625 (described in *Noticias de Madrid 1621-1627*, ed. A. González Palencia [Madrid, 1942], p. 122). For a fuller discussion of court entertainments see N. D. Shergold, *A History of the Spanish Stage* (Oxford, 1967), chs. ix-xii. That in writing for amateurs poets had to make some concessions is suggested by the editor of Antonio de Solís's posthumous *Varias poesías sagradas y profanas* (Madrid, 1692), in a note to one of the *loas* (p. 231): "El deseo de proporcionarse a los sugetos que representaron la Loa que se sigue (que todos eran criados de los Excelentísimos Señores Condes de Oropesa) en el Nacimiento dichoso del que lo es al presente, obligò a nuestro Autor a deprimir no poco su Numen; mas sin querer, mostrò sus primores, y aun entre nubes, se ostentò Sol."

voke only a yawn, we have not lost our sensitivity to the aristocracy of genius: the fact that "Velázquez el pintor" played a role arouses more historical emotion than the participation of several dozen counts and dukes. Curiously, none of the court poets is included in the cast of characters, but their activities are reviewed in some detail in a passage of over 50 lines.

The anonymous *Mojiganga de la Boda* forms part of a manuscript devoted largely (perhaps entirely) to the Carnival festivities of 1638.<sup>2</sup> It is a lengthy text, consisting of 837 lines of verse, a two-page prose passage, and almost ten pages listing the participants (which, due to the nature of the piece, must be considered an integral, not accessory, part of the whole). There is no clue to the identity of the author, but the circumstances of its creation are succinctly given in the heading: "La Mojiganga de la Boda, que se traçó en Buen Retiro este año de 1638: dispússose el viernes 12 de hebrero, escriuióse el sáuado y domingo, y representóse el martes de Carnestolendas en la noche a 16 del dicho mes."<sup>3</sup> The author does, however, make the conventionally modest allusion to himself in the closing lines:

gracias den a vn mal dormido  
que en poco tiempo ha podido  
hacer tantas neçedades.

The subject matter of the *mojiganga* is ostensibly the wedding of "El Caballero de la Ardiente Legumbre, don Suspiro de la Chanza, Marqués de la Cauliflor," and doña Grimaldina Alfonso, "hija...

<sup>2</sup> Professor Ruth Lee Kennedy first called attention to this MS, which she discovered in the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, in "*Escarramán* and Glimpses of the Spanish Court in 1637-38," *HR*, 9 (1941), 124 n. I wish here to express publicly my gratitude to Professor Kennedy for generously sharing with me her photographic copy of the piece. Professor Kennedy and I have in preparation a more extensive study dealing with other compositions included in this MS. In quotations from the MS here the original spelling is kept but capitalization, accentuation, and punctuation are modernized.

<sup>3</sup> This heading, with its emphasis on the speed with which the play was thrown together, invites us to admire it as a production "de repente," or at least to excuse its shortcomings on the same grounds. There was, however, some advance planning: one of the Jesuit newsletters reports (January 19, 1638) that from Candlemas until Carnival the royal household expects to be at the Retiro, "donde hay prevenidas grandes fiestas y la famosa *mojiganga*" (*Cartas de algunos PP. de la compañía de Jesús, Mem. Hist. Esp.*, xiv, 293). Again, on February 9: "Los poetas, tocadores, bailarines, cómicos y *mogigangueros* andan muy solícitos para ostentar los primores de sus profesiones, y el Proto-notario que es superintendente de ellos, asiste a todo con el cuidado de tan gran ministro" (p. 320).

cassi heredera del buen conde de la Berdolaga.”<sup>4</sup> Whatever may have been the original intention of the vegetable names given the protagonists, they are almost entirely submerged in the plethora of real names of participants and spectators used for the remainder of the numerous cast of characters. The action of the skit breaks down into ten segments, as follows: 1) exposition, in the form of a conversation among four courtiers describing the bride and groom (vv. 1-64); 2) banter among the titled noblemen who accompany the groom as he approaches the palace (vv. 69-145); 3) lightly satirical conversation between the gentlemen of the groom’s train and the maids who serve the palace ladies, with many details concerning individual foibles, courtships, etc. (vv. 151-344); 4) entrance of the royal entourage, in whose presence the groom formally requests the hand of the bride, after which the ceremony is performed by the Patriarch, to the counterpoint of small talk by the ladies-in-waiting (vv. 358-457); 5) while the gentlemen go off to prepare for the *máscara* and *torneo*, the ladies discuss the poetic *certamen* held a few days earlier (vv. 497-552); 6) a herald presents the groom’s challenge for the tourney, with its novel contention that it is better to fight for one’s wife than for one’s lady (prose); 7) the ladies, showing none of their usual severity, praise the horsemanship of the gentlemen (vv. 601-639); 8) the participants in the tourney parade as their mottoes are given (vv. 661-689); 9) after the prizes have been announced (vv. 690-717), the gentlemen are paired off with the ladies (with due regard for the relationships hinted at earlier) and sustain the gallant conversation the play has been building up to almost from the start (vv. 718-805). The brief closing segment (10 verses), referring once more to the distribution of prizes, recapitulates the qualities deemed worthy of esteem in this late and diluted version of the courtly ideal.

<sup>4</sup> The bride owes her name to Alonso Gutiérrez Grimaldo, who played the role. The groom’s name may reflect a pre-existing court witticism; among the “Motes para los barcos en la noche de San Pedro, en el Retiro, que las damas de palacio y los galanes se dan” (Antonio de Mendoza, *Obras*, II, 257) number 18, *damas*, reads: “Don Suspiro de la Chanza / Marqués de la Coliflor / prestó el mote a vuestro amor.” The composition is not dated, but there was an aquatic entertainment on St. Peter’s Day in 1636 for which Mendoza wrote a charming ballad (*Obras*, II, 364); of course, the mottoes may be survivors of a similar feast in a later year, in which case the mock title would have originated with our *mojiganga*. I can find no direct connection between the *mojiganga* and the *romance* variously attributed to Mendoza (*Obras*, II, 300) and to Quevedo: “Don Repollo y doña Berza . . . casáronse, y a la boda / de personas tan honradas . . . vino la nobleza y gala,” etc.

The burlesque elements one would expect in a Carnival play are certainly present in the *Mojiganga de la Boda*, but they are confined almost entirely to the physical presentation of the piece, as we shall see below. The text itself maintains a tone of light banter, ranging from gentle satire to trivial gossip. The humorous possibilities suggested by the mating of two vegetables are exhausted in Segment 1; after that the author gets down to his main business, which is simply a more or less realistic portrayal of the ladies and gentlemen who enlivened the vast halls of Philip's palaces with their quarrels and flirtations. In a subtle but distinct fashion the play flatters the male at the expense of the female. Its longest passage is Segment 3, in which the gallantries of the gentlemen are decidedly overshadowed by the remarks of the maids poking fun at the frivolous occupations and preoccupations of their mistresses: one writes endless letters, another promises gifts which she forgets to send, another is downcast because her new dress has been criticized. The Condesa de Paredes chafes at her mother's orders that she be in bed by midnight; doña Isabel Manrique concentrates on finding ways to keep doña Inés Guzmán from riding in the coach of doña Ana María de Velasco, the aftermath of a quarrel about prizes at a recent tournament.<sup>5</sup> Not all the ladies are idle:

AYTONA	La sra. doña Catalina de Moncada, ¿qué hace?
1 <sup>a</sup> CRIADA	¿Qué? Cansarse que el mundo esté tan festiuo, que en diuina costumbre está su atención, mil laoures empeçando, y entrellas está uordando los <i>Anales de Aragón</i> .

<sup>5</sup> The reference is to the *juego de la sortija* held earlier that month and duly reported in the Jesuit correspondence (*Cartas*, pp. 318–19, 322–24). The king had set the example by offering the prizes he won to the queen and to his two distinguished visitors, the Princess of Carignano and the Duchess of Chevreuse. The other winners (several of whom appear as characters in the play) likewise offered their prizes to various ladies; hence the female interest in tournament prizes shown in the *mojiganga*. Another recent event alluded to in the segment is the bullfight at which D. Juan Pacheco entered attired in mourning and attended by Negro lackeys dressed in black, a gesture motivated by his lady's disfavor (*Cartas*, p. 329). This bullfight was held on February 10, and the *certamen* on February 11, so the actual writing of the play may well have been as hasty as claimed.

The marginal note to this speech informs us: "Porque gusta de que en su posada se haga lauor y dice que tiene mui presente la historia de Çurita." Altogether, the author finds something to say about nineteen different ladies-in-waiting, almost invariably supplementing the dialogue with an explanatory note. The scene is handled in such a way that no blame whatsoever attaches to the gentlemen; all the little barbs are put into the mouths of the servant girls, while the gentlemen are limited to mentioning a name and praising the beauty and/or discretion of its owner. Later on, when the ladies are shown in private conversation, the author refrains from introducing similar satire directed against the men. Instead, he manages to illustrate some of the traits pointed out in the earlier scene, and further on, in Segment 7, he deliberately calls attention to the fact that the ladies are actually praising the courtiers:

[LA] VELASCO      ¡Qué leues y qué apaçibles  
estamos las damas! ¡Fuego,  
si la verdad se soltara!

The court ladies are almost as kind to the poets who competed in the *certamen* held on February 11. Singled out for praise are Coello, Rojas, Solís, and Mendoza, the last for his sonnet to the prince.<sup>6</sup> The only one discussed in detail is Vélez de Guevara ("grande yngenio es; nadie llega / a su donaire natiuo," although on this occasion, it is said, he was not at his best). What marred this particular *certamen* was not, however, the quality of the poetry but an incident of a different sort, whose ultimate consequences were yet unknown at the time the *mojiganga* was written:

CONDESA DE  
PAREDES      Diz que hubo después vislumbre  
de reto.

<sup>6</sup> It is printed in Mendoza's *Obras poéticas* (III, 248): "Al tiro que el príncipe nuestro señor (Dios le guarde) siendo de 8 años, hizo en el Pardo a 80 pasos, matando un jabali y después un toro en el Retiro; en el certamen poético que allí se hizo en las Carnestolendas. Fue el primero asunto. Febrero 11, 1638." The MS which includes the *mojiganga* gives entries on this topic by Luis de Belmonte and Gaspar Dávila; an additional entry by Mendoza, in *décimas* (*Obras*, III, 167), fixes the date of the boar hunt and little Baltasar Carlos's feat on January 17, 1638. Encouraged by his success with the boar, at the bullfight he suddenly got up from his place in the royal box, picked up a gun and shot a bull. Francisco Manuel de Melo wrote three poems on the subject: a sonnet to the Prince, another sonnet to Don Antonio de Mendoza, and a *décima* praising Mendoza's verses on the topic (*Obras métricas* [León de Francia, 1665], pp. 2, 239).

[LA] MONCADA

El que quiere ser  
gracioso en otro a de hacer  
lisonxa la pessadumbre;  
¡que son cañas mui de moros  
que salgan choques más fieros  
del caso de los copleros  
que del casso de los toros!

[LA] VELASCO

Y en efeto, en la burlona  
trisca (aunque en gracexo passa)  
"Justicia, y no por mi cassa,"  
"graçia, y no por mi perssona."  
Piense el mundo que es un otro  
de berdad tan importuno,  
que en el mundo cada vno  
es ya la risa del otro.  
Mas correrse es gran frialdad,  
que lo ñ en el sayo topa  
no hiere, que está la ropa  
lexos de la authoridad.

Thursday's academy had ended, as was customary, with *vejámenes*, those stinging prose satires that spared no one who had participated in the proceedings.<sup>7</sup> Don Francisco de Rojas, a last-minute addition to the line-up of *fiscales*, had evidently overstepped the nebulous bounds of taste governing such affairs.<sup>8</sup> Someone disregarded the sensible advice given in our *mojiganga* and took offense. We do not know whether there was a challenge or not, but towards the end of April Rojas became the victim of an assassination attempt that was very nearly successful:

[22 mayo 1638] Ha corrido voz por la Corte que la muerte sucedida en días pasados del poeta don Francisco de Rojas trujo origen del Vejamen

<sup>7</sup> See M. S. Carrasco Urgoiti, "Notas sobre el vejamen de academia en la segunda mitad del siglo xvii," *RHM*, 31 (1965), 97-111.

<sup>8</sup> The Rojas *vejamen* of 1638 was published by A. Bonilla as an appendix to his edition of *El diablo cojuelo* (Vigo, 1902), pp. 262-71. Rojas experienced another problem in this *certamen*: his entry on the topic "Ay vn indicio, que las mugeres de Palacio (las mugeres digo) alteran vna clausula al Padre nuestro, que por dezir, Panem nostrum, dicen, Maridum nostrum. Quien ha de conocer este delito? la Inquisicion, o la Camarera Mayor?" was not read: "No se leyó en la academia este asumpto porque parecio a los jueces mal sonante, no obstante que se me premio em primer lugar" (MS cit.). An entry by Antonio de Solís on this topic is printed in his *Varias poesías*, from which I take also the wording of the heading (p. 130). *Mugeres* is emphasized because the 1637 academy had outlawed the custom of calling the palace maids *mondongas*.

que se hizo en el Palacio del Retiro las Carnestolendas pasadas, de donde quedaron algunos caballeros enfadados con el dicho.<sup>9</sup>

Although the chronicler errs in reporting that the dramatist died as a result of the attack, his assertion that the incident was motivated by resentment at the *vejamen* is certainly well supported by the *mojiganga's* account.

What may well have struck the court of Philip IV as the most hilarious feature of the *mojiganga* (aside from its actual performance) is the tournament. It is very difficult to assess what degree of absurdity that audience perceived in the groom's peculiar proposal:

NOBIO	Déme buestra Magestad licencia para un cartel de un torneo.
[REY]	Es mui nobel, Marqués, esa nobedad. Remitirase al bureo. Sin dama, no ay mantener torneo, sino muger.
NOBIO	Antes mantendré vn torneo. La muger siempre tendrá [será?] dama para vn buen marido.
[REY]	¿Quién como bos lo a sauido? ¿Quién como uos lo sabrá? Todo lo más peregrino os ffo.

Several gentlemen immediately announce their intention to ride in the tourney. Shortly thereafter a herald appears with the formal challenge:

Aviendo experimentado que el servir a las damas no es más que una pessadumbre ayrosa, pues la mayor razón que hallar [*hallan?*] para matar el [*es?*] sólo el ser queridas, y que entre la neçedad de no hamarlas y la perdición de querellas no ay otro medio que ponerse en cobro el galán con la última desesperación de casarse y ser mui bonico marido: Yo el Ca-

<sup>9</sup> MS. 2339, B.N.M.; cit. E. Cotarelo, *Don Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla. Noticias biográficas y bibliográficas* (Madrid, 1911), p. 61. La Barrera also relates the incident; both he and Bonilla (op. cit.), familiar only with the better-known Retiro academy of 1637, try to associate the *vejamen* and its consequences with the preceding year. The Retiro academy or *certamen* we are dealing with was a second one, amply documented as having been held on Thursday, February 11, 1638.

uallero de la Ardiente Legumbre, don Suspiro de la Chanza, sustento en un torneo en el segundo palacio del sol  $\tilde{q}$  si los ereges del amor más fino niegan la buena ley a las cortes, mantengo que la velleza de doña Grimaldina Alfonso, mi esposa, es la mayor  $\tilde{q}$  bieron jamás los gritos de los gritos,<sup>10</sup> y que en las mugeres propias estuvieran más lucidos los primores, si como las podemos tener por lindas las pudiéramos llamar yngratas.

Las condiciones y leyes: las antiguas, y las damas duran en el sarao.<sup>11</sup> Los precios: de más galán, mejor ynbención y letra, pica y espada de la folla; y de los jueces del torneo (que no se dicen) abrá tantos caualleros quexosos como poetas de los del Certamen. Dixi.

The comments on this unusual challenge are placed in the mouths of the Conde de Humanes and one of the *meninos*:

HUMANES            ¡Nueua fineça!

MENINO                            Forçosa,  
que a la muger se a de amar  
sólo.

HUMANES                        Siempre e visto estar  
esa raçón mui ociosa,  
y pues gran raçón la ayuda,  
mugeres proprias, señor,  
no es duda que es lo mejor,  
si estar pudieran en duda.

MENINO                        ¡Qué plática tan cortés,  
quando entre damas estamos!

HUMANES                        ¿No ues que representamos  
al pobre mundo al reués?

The key to the contemporaneous reaction to this total reversal of the ancient courtly tradition probably lies in the last line quoted. In its cast, costumes, and accessories this Carnival play certainly portrays a topsy-turvy world, and although the groom wins the prize ("porque a inbentado / el primor de buen cassado"), he is, after all, a cauliflower, hardly to be taken seriously as a model of courtly deportment!

<sup>10</sup> Grimaldo, who played the bride, had been repeatedly satirized in the 1637 academy for his shouting (*gritos*).

<sup>11</sup> I presume this means that in the *sarao* one is not required to dance with one's own wife.



What was ordinarily expected of a proper gentlemen does show through, however, in the behavior of the courtiers who attend the groom, and in the traits which provoke admiring comment from the ladies (or directly from the author in his marginal notes). He is interested in good horses and enjoys equestrian sports. This theme, a major motif in Segment 7, is treated repeatedly in the play, and several of its characters who in real life were distinguished horsemen are singled out for praise: D. Juan Pacheco, D. Bernardino de Ayala, the Duque de Híjar—the first two as bullfighters, the third as a particularly skillful rider. Excessively affected speech (*conceptos*) is criticized, but ordinary puns are tolerated, and it is just as important for the gentleman to be elaborate in his compliments as for the lady to be disdainful in her replies. One elegant motto arouses the author's enthusiasm:

La [letra] de D. Valtas<sup>r</sup> Cúñiga que galantea a la s. Marq<sup>sa</sup> de Vayona  
q̄ es lisonja de las peregrinas.

Pelinegra es la Verdad;  
pelinegra es la Hermosura;  
pelinegra es la Ventura.<sup>12</sup>

Gallantry is required; no matter how silly a lady may be, she is always right, and of course a gentleman never indulges in gossip at her expense. In addition to being gallant, the gentleman should be *galán*, well-dressed. The prize in this category is awarded in the *mojiganga* to D. Gaspar de Tebes, of whom we have this description in the *vejamen* written a few days earlier by D. Antonio Coello: "un mozo mediano de estatura, algo entrado en regordete, pero no cosa que le estorbase a la agilidad ni a la hermosura. Tenía una llave dorada en la cinta, y unas guedejas doradas en la cara. [Traía] un guardadamas atravesado en el corazón y toda la pretina llena de billetes, y en esto conocí que era un hombre que galanteaba en Palacio, y era verdad."<sup>13</sup> Tebes is so successful with the ladies that when he is paired off with the superdisdainful doña Ana María de Velasco (Segment 9), he even manages to steal an embrace. Except for this last item, which is clearly meant in fun, the ideals of courtly

<sup>12</sup> This motto, and perhaps others, may actually have been used on a previous occasion. Earlier in the play the Marquesa de Vayona says: "Yo e bisto a la confianza / pelinegra, y verla espero / lucida."

<sup>13</sup> The Coello *vejamen* of 1638 is in *Sales españolas*, ed. A. Paz y Meliá, BAE, Vol. 176, 317–18.

behavior reflected in the *mojiganga* can be taken quite seriously. The circumstances of the play's performance, however, insured that nothing about it would be taken seriously at all.

The Jesuit correspondence refers to the *mojiganga* in letters by two different writers. What particularly drew the attention of both reporters was not the subject-matter of this entertainment but its cast. The letter of February 16 addressed to P. Francisco Sánchez by an unnamed friend was evidently set down before the performance had taken place: "... y hoy tienen mojiganga de todos los señores, y entre otros sale el Almirante vestido de mujer. Esta fiesta se hace en el salón, y es sólo para los de Palacio, y aunque quisieran, no podría ser para otros porque está lloviendo desesperadamente."<sup>14</sup> A more complete description, in a distinctly disapproving tone, is offered by Sebastián González in his letter of February 23, to P. Rafael Pereyra:

El martes se hizo una boda<sup>15</sup> de una dama, por vía de entremés, concurriendo a la representación casi los más de los caballeros. Fue portero aquel día el señor Conde-Duque; salieron vestidos de alabarderos a lo tudesco el conde de Oropesa, el conde de Aguilar, el marqués de la Guardia, D. Francisco de Luzón y otros; de gentiles-hombres el conde de Puño en rostro, el duque de Híjar, etc., de dueñas D. Jaime de Cárdenas, D. Francisco de Cisneros, etc., de damas el Almirante, el conde de Grajal, el conde de Villalba, el marqués de Aytona, etc. [A] la Reina hizo el obrero mayor, que se llama Carbonel; al Rey un ayuda de cámara viejo; al príncipe el duque de Pastrana; la novia fue otro ayuda de cámara viejo de muy mala cara, y el novio Zapatilla.<sup>16</sup> Llevaban 12 pajes hijos de se-

<sup>14</sup> *Cartas*, pp. 335-36.

<sup>15</sup> From Shergold's account (*History*, p. 291), based on these letters, one might conclude that the *mojiganga* and the "wedding" were two separate events. The surviving MS dispels this confusion. The *mojiganga* of 1637, also sponsored by the Protonotario, was said to be the first example of this Aragonese type of entertainment ever seen in Madrid, but the descriptions indicate that it was not similar to the 1638 *mojiganga* and, as Shergold remarks, "in reality [it] does not seem to have differed greatly from the ordinary fancy-dress masquerade with dances" (p. 288). A closer ancestor of the *Mojiganga de la Boda* may have been a short piece (now lost) written for the 1637 Carnival: "vna loa de tres personages, figurados por el Licenciado Benauente en Manuel Cortiços . . . , Veedor, y vn Alabardero Tudesco, con chistes muy del caso, como de su raro y singular ingenio" (A. Sánchez de Espejo, *Relacion aivstada en lo possible a la verdad* [Madrid, 1637], fol 19<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>16</sup> D. Francisco Zapata, nicknamed Zapatilla, is often mentioned in gazettes and *vejámenes*; the *mojiganga* alludes to his passion for cards and puns repeatedly on his name.

ñores. Los gentiles-hombres entraron en caballos de caña.<sup>17</sup> Hizo oficio de patriarca el conde de la Monclova, que era el que había de casar los novios. Hubo su modo de sarao y dichos, que cada uno llevaba estudiados, y a algunos no les ayudaba la memoria y sacaban su papel y iban diciendo lo que les tocaba por él, ayudados para leer de una candelilla. Los trajes fueron ridículos y de grande entretenimiento.<sup>18</sup> Lo demás no fue de tanta consideración como se pensó. A algunos no ha parecido tan ajustado a la decencia el traje, aun para burlas, a las personas que le llevaban; mas como fue fiesta otros lo excusan, y esto entre solos los de Palacio y criados de SS. MM. que estuvieron, y así no hizo tanta disonancia a algunos.<sup>19</sup>

Since this description is in all likelihood a second-hand account, its accuracy is surprising. There are only a few minor discrepancies between the cast list it gives and that provided by the MS. What scandalized serious minds ("a algunos") was evidently not so much that titled noblemen took part in such a frivolous pastime, but that they were seen in undignified costumes, and particularly that some of them appeared as women. While the woman-disguised-as-man motif was a standard feature of light comedies (and aroused frequent objection), the man-disguised-as-woman motif is rare, except in *entremeses*. Ridiculous disguises are, of course, a stock-in-trade of the *entremés*, and this particular one is a great favorite, but since the *entremés* regularly observes the classical precepts for comedy, all its characters are strictly plebeian and, needless to say, the actors who performed such scenes had no social position either. That even amid the traditional liberties of the Carnival season such disguises were deemed inappropriate for aristocrats is worth noting.

An intriguing feature of this critical comment on the *mojiganga* (as I read the passage, the writer is among those who frowned on

<sup>17</sup> Juan Laurencio was paid 150 reales "por vnos caballitos y cascaveles para la mojiganga" (Shergold, *History*, p. 291, n. 1). Since the text nowhere explains that hobby-horses were to be used, this information is vital for understanding the humor of the passages about horses and riding skill.

<sup>18</sup> The costumes were provided by Andrés de la Vega, formerly a leading *autor de comedias*, who at least since 1634 had specialized in the renting of theatrical costumes (Bergman, *Luis Quiñones de Benavente* [Madrid, 1965], p. 561; Shergold, *History*, p. 291, n. 1). In addition to the 4,500 reales paid Vega "por los vestidos que hizo para la mojiganga y las medias," 500 reales were given Juan de Barahona "por el alquiler de diez arneses dorados i plateados que dio para la mojiganga" (Shergold, *History*, p. 291, n. 1).

<sup>19</sup> *Cartas*, pp. 336-37.

the whole business) is that it leaves so much unsaid. Was no one disturbed by the fact that the part of the king was played by D. Diego de Covarrubias y Leiva, so frequently satirized in the 1637 *Academia burlesca* for his overwhelming girth?<sup>20</sup> Or that the beloved queen was portrayed by the grotesquely ugly architect Alonso Carbonel?<sup>21</sup> In fact, a year previously one of the palace wits had visualized how funny Carbonel would look in female dress, for he directs these burlesque praises to an ugly woman:

Diréte (aunque amor me riña),  
con lo que a risa probocas,  
que eres (perdónelo, niña)  
Manuel González con tocas,  
y Carbonel con basquiña.<sup>22</sup>

Evidently their majesties took these unflattering characterizations of themselves in good part, so the court followed suit. The many gentlemen and ladies who appear as characters could hardly be less gracious about seeing themselves portrayed more or less humorously

<sup>20</sup> One of the topics of the 1637 *Academia burlesca* was: "Siete canciones de a seis versos, que digan, con qué defenderá mejor la entrada en Buen Retiro Don Diego de Cobarrubias y Leiba, con la pança o con el cuydado?" (ed. A. Pérez Gómez [Valencia, 1952], pp. 75-77; see also pp. 37, 38, 72). His girth is repeatedly mentioned in the 1637 Batres *vejamen* (pp. 114-15, 118) and is the subject of an extended passage in the 1638 Coello *vejamen* (*Sales españolas*, pp. 319-20). This Cobarrubias, *guarda mayor* of the Retiro, was himself a writer of sorts; he contributed to the 1637 academy (pp. 28-31) and edited *Elogios al Palacio real del Buen Retiro, escritos por algunos ingenios de España* (Madrid, 1633).

<sup>21</sup> He also was the subject of verses in the 1637 competition: "Qvatro otabas en arte mayor pintando la hermosura y garbo de Carbonel" (to be understood ironically, as the replies make clear. Rosete Niño describes him as fat and hairy, more like a bear than a man [*Academia*, pp. 73-75]). Still another poem of that year refers to his ugliness: "Tu cara y talle espantoso / no tienen par, si te enrubias, / pues si a compararlos oso / es çençeño Cobarrubias / y Carbonel es hermoso" (p. 38). All the *vejámenes* of 1637-1638 mention him, that of Batres (1637) stressing the darkness of his face and that of Coello (1638) comparing his ugliness to the pictorial representations of the temptations of St. Anthony. Although a topic of the 1638 *certamen* was: "Dando la norabuena a Cobarrubias y a Grimaldo y a Calero y a Caruonel de que no se a de gracejar con ellos porque se ofendieron el año passado" (MS. cit.; there are entries by Cáncer and by D. Román Montero), this mandate was obviously ignored. The *guardadamas* Francisco Calero, constantly satirized in the *vejámenes* for his miserliness, appears in the *majiganga* not as actor but as character: as one of the judges, he tries to keep for himself the prize he is supposed to award.

<sup>22</sup> *Academia*, p. 36.

than the royal couple—and, indeed, few would have had cause for complaint as to the rank of the persons chosen to play them, although disproportions of age<sup>22</sup> and sex undoubtedly added to the amusement in many instances. On the other hand, the MS indicates only a few cases of titled noblemen playing such roles as halberdiers and ladies' maids; it assigns most of these parts to the court secretaries, pages, and palace officials. Of course it is possible that the Jesuit's informant added individuals appearing in non-speaking roles; the MS states that "el número de los de la Moxiganga fueron ciento," but its actual listing of names falls slightly short of that figure.

The criticism that men played the parts of women on this occasion is, in a way, rather unfair. Surely the outcry would have been even louder if the ladies had themselves participated in such a show! Although on other occasions ladies-in-waiting did perform in masques and theatricals of a more dignified sort, in this *mojiganga* all 34 females role are assigned to men; there are no women whatsoever in the cast. All the female parts, except those of the bride and the five maids, bear the undisguised names of real ladies who were beyond doubt present at the performance. The vast majority of the male roles likewise carry specific names, and no less than 22 names appear in both the actors' and the characters' columns. A great deal of the humor of the play derives from this simple circumstance. Almenara and Salinas merely play each other; the remaining actors are shuffled about. To bring this out, in Segment 2 almost every speech includes a vocative, so that the audience can chuckle at hearing D. Alonso de Zuñiga addressed as "Bernardino" or Puñoenrostro as "Pobar." This technique is carried to greater complication in the *sarao* scene (Segment 9), where we meet such pairs and threesomes as San Román (playing Ana de Silva) with Oropesa playing San Román and Puñoenrostro playing her suitor Pobar, or Ynés María (played by the Conde del Real) with her real-life suitor Híjar (playing D. Jaime Manuel) and Baños playing Híjar. One of the most successful moments in the involved conversations which arise from this casting occurs in the exchange between Luisa María (played by

<sup>22</sup> We know that the Marqués de Villazores played his own grandfather; the stock witticism at the expense of Zapatilla (the groom) was his incalculably great age. Perhaps the roles of the Prince and the Patriarch also went to persons quite obviously of the wrong age. Such details could easily be ascertained, but it hardly seems worth the trouble.

Bernardino de Ayala) and the bullfighter Bernardino de Ayala (played by Alonso de Zuñiga):

BER <sup>no</sup>	En la culpa del destino está el delito; es abono.
LUISA M <sup>a</sup>	La bernardina os perdono pero no lo Bernardino.
BER <sup>no</sup>	En la nuca de mi pena del alma el rejón rompí.
LUISA M <sup>a</sup>	Toread menos, que aquí ninguna suerte haréis buena.

At this point one might mention that the character Tebes, played by the Conde de Villa Monte, manages to get that embrace from doña Ana María de Velasco because *she* is played by none other than the real Tebes himself!<sup>24</sup>

The statement that some of the actors couldn't remember their parts and had to read them from a promptsheet, though uncorroborated, certainly rings true. It was probably equally difficult to get them to speak at the right time. The length of the roles varies considerably. The part assigned to Velázquez, as the Condesa de Santiesteuan, for example, consists of the single line: "¡Ea, despóssenlos ya!" About a dozen non-speaking parts are listed. The longest roles run between 20 and 40 lines, and most are shorter, so that no unreasonable strain was placed on the memory of any of the participants. One "memory failure" is actually written into the play, when D. Francisco de Luzón, playing the part of the Conde-Duque, is called upon to say:

Le decid—¡mas no tam presto,  
que el trauajo que ay en esto  
es que no sea berdad!—  
llegue con alta razón  
de Conde Duq̃ a la esfera  
(pero al Conde me atubiera  
si él llegara a ser Luzón) . . .

<sup>24</sup> Referred to in the play both by his name and by his title of Marqués de la Fuente, Tebes is one of the leading figures of the *mojiganga*. As actor he has the longest female part (doña Ana María) with over 40 lines of verse and the entire prose passage, while the character Tebes speaks 30 lines and is given the *despedida*, as well as being honored within the play as "el más galán."

This "slip," however, also illustrates the dual perspective which is fundamental to the entire play. There is no theatrical illusion here. Repeated joking references to the players' real names (similar to those already quoted) serve to reinforce the powerful and immediate impression created visually during the actual performance. For it is not quite accurate to say that Luzón *acted* the part of the Conde-Duque; what the court audience really saw was Luzón *masquerading* as the Conde-Duque. What brought this rather arid text to life, back in 1638, was not the skillful realization of a fiction, but the ludicrous contrast between fiction and reality.<sup>25</sup>

HANNAH E. BERGMAN

*Lehman College,  
City University of New York*

<sup>25</sup> J. E. Varey, in an article which appeared while this study was in press, analyzes in greater detail the contemporary description of one of the court entertainments (Carnival, 1623) mentioned by Shergold. It had several features in common with that of 1638: the designation *majiganga*, courtiers dressed as German soldiers and as women, a mock wedding, parody of a *juego de sortija* with challenge and prizes, hobby-horses, and roles for don Francisco Zapata and several others who were still at court fifteen years later. ("La creación deliberada de la confusión: Estudio de una diversión de Carnestolendas de 1623," *Homenaje a William L. Fichter*, [Madrid, 1971], pp. 745-54). Since there is no text preserved for the 1623 piece, a closer comparison is not possible.