

Two Alleged Calderón-Moreto Collaborations

DON W. CRUICKSHANK

University College, Dublin

My intention here is to examine two plays in which Calderón supposedly collaborated with Moreto: *La adúltera penitente* and *La fingida Arcadia*. Most Golden-Age dramatists wrote some plays in collaboration with other writers. Calderón was apparently involved in about fourteen of these that we know about, although some are disputed or printed under varying names:

Polifemo y Circe (Mira de Amescua, Pérez de Montalbán, Calderón): Acts II and III of Ms. Res. 83 of the Biblioteca Nacional are autograph; Pérez de Montalbán signed and dated Act II 'M^d y Martes de abril de 1630'. Act I is a scribal copy, and there is no proof that Mira wrote it.

El prodigio de Alemania (Calderón, Antonio Coello): surviving in a *suelta*, attributed to Calderón; Germán Vega suggests that this text is a remnant of the Calderón/Coello play on Wallenstein which was described by the Florentine envoy in March 1634. Vega also points out that there were two Wallenstein plays, the other possibly entitled *El rey de Suecia*; while it too may be by Calderón and Coello, the Florentine envoy's letter of 29 January 1633 gives the author as Lope de Vega.¹

Yerros de naturaleza y aciertos de la fortuna (Antonio Coello, Calderón): Ms. 14.778 of the Biblioteca Nacional is partly in Calderón's hand, including a *reparto* on folio 23^r, the first folio of Act II; it also has a *remisión* of 4 May 1634. If we pursue the actors' names in DICAT (*Diccionario biográfico de actores del teatro clásico español*) we find that the company must have been that of Cristóbal de Avendaño, who died later that year.

El privilegio/Los privilegios de las mujeres (sometimes attributed to Calderón, Pérez de Montalbán, Antonio Coello): printed in *Parte treynta*,

1 Germán Vega García-Luengos, 'Calderón y la política internacional: las comedias sobre el héroe y traidor Wallenstein', in *Calderón de la Barca y la España del Barroco*, coord. José Alcalá Zamora & Ernest Belenguier, 2 vols (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales/Sociedad Estatal España Nuevo Milenio, 2001), II, 793–827 (pp. 793–94).

de comedias famosas de varios autores (Zaragoza: Hospital Real y General de Nuestra Señora de Gracia, 1636).² If this is the play performed at Christmas 1634 as *Los privilegios de las mujeres*, it may date from that year.³ In *El escondido y la tapada* (written November 1635–March 1636), the *gracioso* Mosquito apparently confirms the plural ‘privilegios’: ‘¡Bien hayan los tres poetas, | que piadosos y corteses | sacaron a luz “los Privilegios de las mujeres”!’.⁴ The authorship is considered by Germán Vega García-Luengos, who argues convincingly that Calderón wrote most or all of Act I, but could not find evidence that Pérez de Montalbán and Coello wrote Acts II and III respectively.⁵ This is not entirely surprising, given that Coenen has found evidence that a major part (at least) of Act III was written by Calderón.⁶

El jardín de Falerina (Rojas, Antonio Coello, Calderón): performed by Tomás Fernández on 13 January 1636.⁷

El mejor amigo el muerto (Belmonte, Rojas, Calderón): performed by Tomás Fernández on 2 February 1636; most of Act III of Ms. Res. 86, BNE, is in Calderón’s hand.⁸

El monstruo de la fortuna (Calderón, Pérez de Montalbán, Rojas): performed by Pedro de la Rosa on 22 November 1636.⁹ Barrera’s attribution of another version to Rojas, Coello and Vélez de Guevara may be due to a confusion caused by the attribution, in *Escogidas VII*, of Lope’s version, *La reina Juana de Nápoles*, to ‘tres ingenios’.¹⁰ There is a ‘reference’ to the Calderón/Montalbán/Rojas play in Tirso’s *Del enemigo el primer consejo*, which was approved for his *Tercera parte* on 13 September 1633.

2 For *Parte XXX*, see Victor F. Dixon, ‘A Note on *Diferentes 30*’, *BHS*, XXXIX:2 (1962), 92–96.

3 M. J. del Río, ‘Representaciones dramáticas en casa de un artesano del Madrid de principios del siglo XVII’, in *Teatros y vida teatral en el Siglo de Oro a través de las fuentes documentales*, ed. Luciano García Lorenzo & J. E. Varey (London: Tamesis, 1992), 245–58 (p. 253).

4 Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Obras completas*, ed., prólogo & notas de Ángel J. Valbuena Briones, 3 vols (Madrid: Aguilar, 1952–1959), II (1956), *Comedias*, 693a. Further references to this edition are given in the text as *Comedias*, with page number.

5 Germán Vega García-Luengos, ‘Sobre la autoría de *El privilegio de las mujeres*’, in *‘Non omnis moriar’: estudios en memoria de Jesús Sepúlveda*, coord. Álvaro Alonso Miguel & José Ignacio Díez Fernández (Málaga: Univ. de Málaga, 2007), 317–36.

6 Erik Coenen, ‘Las atribuciones de Vera Tassis’, *Castilla. Estudios de Literatura*, 0 (2009), 111–33 (pp. 129–31), <<http://www5.uva.es/castilla/index/php/castilla/article/view/9/6>> (accessed 30 January 2013).

7 N. D. Shergold & J. E. Varey, ‘Some Early Calderón Dates’, *BHS*, XXXVIII:4 (1961), 274–86 (p. 279).

8 Shergold & Varey, ‘Some Early Calderón Dates’, 281–82.

9 Shergold & Varey, ‘Some Early Calderón Dates’, 282–83; there may be a performance as early as 5 June 1636.

10 See Cayetano Alberto de la Barrera y Leirado, *Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español desde sus orígenes hasta mediados del siglo XVIII* (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1860 [ed. facsímil Madrid: Gredos, 1969]), 565.

The passage reads:

ni a Angelica el Paladin
 sus Bemoles a Iusquin,
 al hidalgo la viznaga,
 a doña Caluina el moño,
 al galan la bigotera,
 a Perez la lauandera,
 a Herizo Breua, o Modroño [*sic*]
 causan tan grandes cuidados. (fol. 5^{r-v})

La lavandera de Nápoles is an alternative title, but since Pérez (de Montalbán) wrote only Act II, this is scarcely conclusive. 'Resulta bastante difícil aceptar [says Ann Mackenzie] que Tirso se refiera aquí a la colaboración de Pérez de Montalbán en la comedia tratando de la famosa lavandera de Nápoles'.¹¹ One can only agree.

Unknown Title (Solís, Rojas, Calderón): performed on the Retiro lake on 2 July 1640: 'Ayer, día de Santa Isabel, que cumplió años la Reyna Nuestra Señora, se representó en el Estanque del Buen Retiro la comedia que estava destinada para la Noche de San Juan, compuesta por Don Antonio de Solís, Don Francisco de Rojas i Don Pedro Calderón'.¹² There is a small problem: Queen Isabel's birthday was 22 November, not 2 July, which is the Visitation of St Elizabeth (feast day 5 November). In any case, the play was planned for the Noche de San Juan (24 June), not 2 July. Frédéric Serralta reminds us of Vera Tassis' remark that another lost text, *Certamen de honor y celos*, was performed 'en los estanques del Buen Retiro' in the summer of 1640, but admits that this title appears in Calderón's Veragua list, which did not include collaboration plays.¹³

Troya abrasada (Zabaleta, Calderón): Ms. Res. 78, BNE, is in Calderón's hand from the last page of Act I onwards; the rest of Act I does not match Zabaleta's handwriting or spelling in his autograph manuscript of *La honra vive en los muertos* (BNE, Ms. Res. 62), which was written for Ascanio in 1643, and so is contemporary with *Troya abrasada*. The actors named in the *reparto* (partly in Calderón's hand) point to Ascanio's company in the acting year Easter 1643–Shrove Tuesday 1644; there are licences of 1644. It is worth remembering that Calderón's

11 Ann L. Mackenzie, 'Examen de *El monstruo de la fortuna*: comedia compuesta por Calderón (I), Pérez de Montalbán (II) y Rojas Zorrilla (III)', in *Hacia Calderón. Tercer Coloquio Anglogermánico, Londres 1973*, ed. Hans Flasche (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1976), 110–25 (p. 112).

12 José Pellicer de Tovar, *Avisos: 17 de mayo de 1639–29 de noviembre de 1644*, ed. Jean-Claude Chevalier & Lucien Clare, 3 vols (Paris: Éditions Hispaniques, 2002–10), I (2002), 122 (3 July 1640).

13 Frédéric Serralta, 'Nueva biografía de Antonio de Solís y Rivadeneyra', *Criticón*, 34 (1986), 51–157 (pp. 71–72).

autograph manuscript of *La humildad coronada de las plantas* was completed in ‘Toledo a 17 de março de 1644 años’, and that Don Pedro had been living in that city for some time prior to this.

Enfermar con el remedio (Calderón, Vélez de Guevara, Cáncer): Vélez died on 10 November 1644. Printed in *Escogidas IV* (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1653).

La más hidalga hermosura (Rojas, Zabaleta, Calderón): the last leaf of Calderón’s act of the autograph manuscript (Institut del Teatre, Barcelona) has a licence of December 1645. It is worth remembering that Calderón joined the service of the Duke of Alba in late 1645, spending most of his time, until 1650, in Alba de Tormes.

El pastor Fido (Solís, Antonio Coello, Calderón): printed in *Escogidas VIII* (Madrid: Andrés García de la Iglesia, 1657); Coello died on 20 October 1652.

La Margarita preciosa (Zabaleta, Cáncer, Calderón): printed in *Escogidas XXI* (Madrid: José Fernández de Buendía, 1663). Cáncer died on 2 October 1655.¹⁴ In Calderón’s act, one direction reads ‘*Descubrese el estanque*’ (= the Retiro lake); i.e., he was writing for a royal performance.¹⁵ The subject is St Margaret of Antioch (feast day 20 July). If this is a compliment to the Infanta Margarita (born 12 July 1651), it could date from August/September 1651, or mark a slightly later birthday.

La fingida Arcadia: first dated edition in *Escogidas XXV* (Madrid: Domingo García Morrás, 1666), attributed to Moreto; reprinted in his *Segunda parte* (Valencia: Benito Macé, 1676: copy of genuine edition in Institut del Teatre, Barcelona, 59211).¹⁶ Cotarelo tells us that ‘el 6 de julio de 1663 no representó Escamilla en su corral, por “estar ensayando una fiesta titulada *La Arcadia*”’. He assumed that this play, which was performed in the Retiro on 12 July, was *La fingida Arcadia*, although the document names no authors; and he accepted Hartzenbusch’s view that the play was a collaboration between Moreto, ‘N. N.’ and Calderón.¹⁷ We shall see that there is another, stronger, candidate.

Eleven of these plays are no later than December 1645; only three may postdate Calderón’s ordination in the autumn of 1651. Once ordained, he

14 Elena Martínez Carro & Alejandro Rubio San Román, ‘Documentos sobre Jerónimo de Cáncer y Velasco’, *Lectura y Signo*, 2 (2007), 15–32 (p. 26).

15 *Escogidas XXI*, p. 442, col. 2, l. 22: when Egeo (Satan) pushes Margarita into the water, Hartzenbusch adds ‘*Cae y mantiénesse sobre las aguas del estanque*’, an addition which the wording of the text supports: Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Comedias*, ed. Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch, BAE VII, IX, XII, XIV, 4 vols (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1848–50); IV [XIV], 543b.

16 See *Diccionario filológico de literatura española, siglo XVII*, dir. Pablo Jauralde Pou, 2 vols (Madrid: Castalia, 2010), I, 1053–54.

17 Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, *Ensayo sobre la vida y obras de D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (Madrid: Tipografía de la *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 1924), 315; Calderón, *Comedias*, ed. Hartzenbusch, IV, 537.

wrote plays only for royal performances; *La Margarita preciosa* was evidently one such, but there is no proof that *El pastor Fido* was another, although this lack of proof is inconclusive. If *La fingida Arcadia* was written in part by Calderón for performance on 12 July 1663, it would be his last collaboration play, by at least eight years, which may make us suspicious. What we can say is that the venue and the date betoken a royal performance, since 12 July was the Infanta Margarita's birthday: she would have been twelve in 1663, an age which is more likely to have merited a new play than a revived one, although this likelihood proves nothing about the authorship of *La Arcadia*.

Excluding plays shared between only two writers (the Wallenstein play(s) and *Yerros de naturaleza*, by Coello and Calderón, and *Troya abrasada*, by Zabaleta—allegedly—and Calderón), as well as *La fingida Arcadia*, leaves us with ten. Of these, although certainty varies, Calderón supposedly wrote the first act on three occasions and the last act on seven. Since the play attributed to Solís, Rojas and Calderón is lost, we cannot be sure that they composed the acts in that order. In fact, the only plays for which we have indisputable evidence are *Polifemo y Circe*, *El mejor amigo el muerto* and *La más hidalga hermosura*: all have autograph Calderón manuscripts of the final act.

Calderón's collaborators included both older men like Vélez de Guevara (1579–1644) and Mira de Amescua (?1574–1644) and younger ones: Pérez de Montalbán (1601–1638), Rojas Zorrilla (1607–1648), Antonio de Solís (1610–1686), Juan de Zabaleta (1610–?1670) and Antonio Coello (1611–1652). He collaborated with Rojas Zorrilla on five occasions, Coello on four, Pérez de Montalbán and Zabaleta on three, Cáncer and Solís on two, and once each with Belmonte Bermúdez, Mira de Amescua and Vélez de Guevara. With the possible exception of the two plays discussed here, he never collaborated with Moreto (1618–1669), although Moreto collaborated with several of Calderón's collaborators. Another dramatist who should be considered is Matos Frago (1609–1689), who, although he never collaborated with Calderón, did so with both Moreto and Zabaleta. By 1656, however, only four of these men were still alive: Moreto, Zabaleta, Solís and Matos.

While there is no evidence that Calderón ever wrote the second act of any three-way collaboration, he wrote the second acts of both *Yerros de naturaleza* and *Troya abrasada*; moreover, the manuscript of the first shows someone altering lines written by Calderón (37^r), while that of the second shows Calderón intervening in passages written by his collaborator (2^f, 4^v, 9^r). It is easy to imagine a situation in which the authors revised the play together, with one writer's lines being read aloud to him by the other, who altered them when asked to do so: not unlike Samuel Beckett reading drafts of *Finnegans Wake* back to Joyce. We cannot know if this is what happened, but it seems reasonable to suppose that the writers realized the usefulness of reading aloud texts which were to be performed.

The earliest document to link Moreto's name with Calderón's is apparently an account of a *comedia de repente*, *La creación del mundo*, performed at court during Carnival, probably in 1637, just possibly in 1638: the roles of Padre Eterno, Adán and Abel were taken by Vélez de Guevara, Calderón and Moreto respectively.¹⁸ Shrove Tuesday fell on 24 February in 1637, 16 February in 1638; Moreto, baptised in April 1618, was therefore only eighteen or nineteen when he was involved, but he was collaborating with the two greatest dramatists of this period. The participation in such 'plays' of courtiers or court officials, from Olivares down, was typical of Carnival entertainments. *Comedias de repente* were not completely improvised: the writers would be given the title a short time previously. This *comedia de repente* should not be confused with Vélez's 'serious' play of the same title, the date of which is unknown; in the critical edition of the part-autograph manuscript, the editors tentatively suggest the second decade of the seventeenth century. It is most unlikely that Vélez, Calderón and Moreto would have taken the roles in a performance of this play twenty years or more after it was written.¹⁹ In any case, the lines quoted by Suppico de Moraes from the burlesque version do not appear in the Ziomek/Linker edition. It seems quite probable that Vélez was invited to take part in creating the burlesque because he had already written a play on the subject.

Moreto has come to be universally accepted as a member of the 'school of Calderón', and the two have much in common: both were *madrileños*, both studied at Alcalá, both were ordained relatively late as priests, and both spent part of their ministry in Toledo; both were members of Toledo's Hermandad del Refugio, a group dedicated to ministering to the destitute. The brotherhood's work included patrolling the streets in search of homeless people, who were brought into the refuge to be given both spiritual and material aid. These activities, and the expenses incurred, were recorded in the *Libro de rondas y entradas de pobres*. One volume preserves accounts written and signed (or merely signed) by Calderón between 21 October 1653 and 27 August 1656; this was before Moreto arrived in Toledo (he apparently lived there from 1660 to 1668), but a volume covering the 1660s contains similar accounts written or signed by him.²⁰ The patrols normally involved two members of the Hermandad, although there is no evidence that Moreto and Calderón ever made up such a team. We might suppose that they met there, but the date of Calderón's return to Madrid is uncertain. On 7 May 1655 he signed a document in Madrid. By 9 September 1656 he was back in

18 Pedro Joseph Suppico de Moraes, *Collecçam politica de apophthegmas memoraveis*, 3 vols in 1 (Lisboa: Officina Augustiniana, 1733), III, 95–96.

19 Luis Vélez de Guevara, *La creación del mundo*, ed. & intro. by Henryk Ziomek & Robert White Linker (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1974), 1.

20 Bartolomé José Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos*, 4 vols (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1863–89 [ed. facsímil: Madrid: Gredos, 1968]), III, cols 901–02. The Moreto dates run from 26 December 1660 to 11 November 1667.

Toledo, as indicated by his nephew's widow. On 19 May 1657 he signed a document in Madrid, in which he is described as 'residente en esta corte': this suggests permanence.²¹ In Madrid, on 13 May and 12 July 1658 respectively, he signed *aprobaciones* for Matos Fragoso's *Primera parte de comedias* and a book by Gaspar Lozano.²² And while most of his *memorias de apariencias* carry no date or place, we know that he habitually attended rehearsals, both of plays and *autos* (and that he was paid for travelling from Toledo to Madrid for these).²³ There were *autos* every year, while *En la vida todo es verdad y todo mentira* was rehearsed in February 1659; three more of his plays were rehearsed in February 1660, one of them *Mujer, llora, y vencerás*.²⁴ All this suggests a move to Madrid between 9 September 1656 and 19 May 1657, yet the royal document releasing him from the need to live in Toledo (as a chaplain of the Reyes Nuevos de Toledo) was issued only on 19 April 1660; recognition, perhaps, of a *fait accompli*.²⁵ Sure enough, he was present at rehearsals in Madrid of *Celos aun del aire matan* in November and December of that year.²⁶ He signed the *memorias de apariencias* for the 1663 *autos* 'En Madrid a 27 de febrero de 1663 años'.²⁷ If the July 1663 performance of *Arcadia* were of *La fingida Arcadia*, it would seem almost certain that Don Pedro was in Madrid while it was being written; Moreto was then in Toledo.

Despite the efforts of scholars, much work remains to be done on Moreto's plays.²⁸ As yet, there is no complete edition, although the PROTEO group, under the direction of María Luisa Lobato from the Universidad de Burgos, is producing one: so far they have published eight volumes with three plays each, twenty-four in all.²⁹ Great uncertainty exists about his canon, especially the collaboration plays: for example, Urzáiz Tortajada's *Catálogo*

21 Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, *Documentos para la biografía de D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (Madrid: Fortanet, 1905), 237, 241–42, 246–47.

22 Kurt & Roswitha Reichenberger, *Bibliographisches Handbuch der Calderón-Forschung/Manual bibliográfico calderoniano*, 4 vols (Kassel: Thiele & Schwarz/Reichenberger, 1979–2003), I, 705.

23 Cotarelo, *Ensayo sobre la vida y obras de D. Pedro Calderón*, 299. This was in 1654, however.

24 Pérez Pastor, *Documentos para la biografía de D. Pedro Calderón*, 259–60, 267–68.

25 Eduardo Juliá Martínez, 'Calderón de la Barca en Toledo', *Revista de Filología Española*, 25 (1941), 198–99.

26 Pérez Pastor, *Documentos para la biografía de D. Pedro Calderón*, 277–79 (the original document refers only to a 'comedia toda cantada' which must be *Celos*).

27 Pérez Pastor, *Documentos para la biografía de D. Pedro Calderón*, 301.

28 See particularly Ruth Lee Kennedy, *The Dramatic Art of Moreto* (Philadelphia: Smith College, 1932); Frank P. Casa, *The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Moreto*, Harvard Studies in Romance Languages 29 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. P., 1966); and Ann L. Mackenzie, *Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla y Agustín Moreto: análisis*, Hispanic Studies TRAC (Textual Research and Criticism) 8 (Liverpool: Liverpool U. P., 1994).

29 Thirty-three plays were published in Volume XXXIX of BAE: *Comedias escogidas de Don Agustín Moreto y Cabaña*, ed. Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe (Madrid: M. Rivadneyra, 1856).

lists eighty-eight play titles which have been associated with him, including collaborations (which number twenty, according to a statement by the PROTEO group, on the website moretianos.com).³⁰ Among these last are *La adúltera penitente* and *La fingida Arcadia*.

The earliest known edition of *La adúltera penitente* is in *Escogidas IX* (Madrid: Gregorio Rodríguez, 1657), where it is attributed to Cáncer, Moreto and Matos. In 1881, however, Adolfo de Castro suggested that Calderón wrote Act I of this play, and much of the other acts.³¹ In *Calderón. Revue critique des travaux d'érudition publiés en Espagne à l'occasion de la mort du poète*, Alfred Morel-Fatio disagreed.³² Castro's suggestion has not found universal support, although on the Moretianos website, the play is listed as by Calderón, Moreto and Matos. This attribution implicitly rejects Castro's claim that Calderón also wrote parts of Acts II and III.

No recorded print of *La adúltera penitente* is attributed to Calderón, wholly or partly; nor did he list it in his *Quarta parte* (1672) among the forty-one titles which had been falsely attributed to him. At the end of his *Octava parte* of Calderón, Vera Tassis printed a list (115 titles) of 'Comedias supuestas, que andan debaxo de su nombre'. *La adúltera penitente* is not among them, except that a manuscript he calls *Santa Theodora* might be of the play, although this title has been linked to Lope, Claramonte, Enríquez Gómez and Diego de Figueroa y Córdoba. The likeliest candidate for this manuscript text may be *Púsoseme el sol, saliome la luna, Santa Teodora*. This was allegedly printed as Lope's in the lost *Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio. Parte veinte y seis* (Zaragoza, 1645), while the Biblioteca Nacional has a manuscript (Ms. 16.986) with the same attribution.³³ The play is usually reckoned to be by Claramonte. Several of the saints called Theodora have a link with sexual misconduct; most famous is Justinian's wife, Saint Theodora of Byzantium (6th century), who was an actress and a prostitute before becoming empress. Saint Theodora of Alexandria (d. 490) was a married woman who committed adultery and then entered religion in search of penance, while another Saint Theodora (d. 304, also of Alexandria), was condemned as a Christian under Diocletian to be sent to a

30 Héctor Urzáiz Tortajada, *Catálogo de autores teatrales del siglo XVII*, Investigaciones Bibliográficas sobre Autores Españoles, 2 vols (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 2002), II, 467–77.

31 Adolfo de Castro y Rossi, *Una joya desconocida de Calderón. Estudio acerca de ella* (Cádiz: Gautier, 1881), 6. The play has also been attributed to Lope, but '[n]o sabemos por qué se atribuyó esta comedia a Lope' (S. Griswold Morley & Courtney Bruerton, *Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega* [Madrid: Gredos, 1968], 409 [first published in English in 1940: see n. 55 below]).

32 See Alfred Morel-Fatio, *Calderón. Revue critique des travaux d'érudition publiés en Espagne à l'occasion de la mort du poète* (Paris: Denné, 1881).

33 For *Parte XXVI*, see Maria Grazia Profeti, *La collezione 'Diferentes autores'* (Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 1988), 59–60.

brothel; she was rescued by her first would-be customer, thus preserving her virginity. The unidentified play Vera Tassis refers to could have been about any of these three, or even one of the others. *La adúltera penitente* deals with the adulteress St Theodora of Alexandria; the source may be the *Legenda aurea*, which tells her story.

Act I of *La adúltera penitente* has a number of Calderón-sounding adjective-noun phrases: 'liquiditas centellas' (244a), 'esperança verde' (244a), 'lirio quaxado' (245a), 'bellissima emulacion' (246b), 'purpura nieve/purpura nevada' (247a), 'ricos maridajes' (247b), 'primorosos encajes' (247b), 'bruto coral' (249a), 'pardas guijas' (249a), 'rayada concha' (249a), 'liquidos arpones' (249a), 'tregua sucinta' (249b), 'verde amenidad' (249b).³⁴ Of these, however, only the last is used by Calderón, in *Psiquis y Cupido (para Madrid)*. I have not found them in Cáncer, Moreto or Matos either. Two other phrases, however, 'gran çurra de cuchilladas' (245b) and 'municiones cristalinas' (249b), are used only by Matos, in *La devoción del ángel de la guardia* and *El traidor contra su sangre* respectively. Another feature of this act is the number of stage directions which use subjunctives: '*Salgan delante los Musicos*' (246b), '[...] *y el vno saque vna escala de cuerda*' (252), '*Encaminese àzia ellos*' (253), '*Anden algunos passos*' (253), '*Retirese Morondo*' (254), '*Llegue a la escala*' (255). Although subjunctives predominate in the authentic Calderón play *Argenis y Poliarco*, that play's editor could find only isolated examples in his other plays; the usage in Act I of *La adúltera* is definitely uncharacteristic (Calderón never uses 'retírese' or 'retírense' in a stage direction, for example).³⁵ The number of subjunctives in Act I is all the more striking because there are no such examples in Acts II and III. However, a brief search in Matos reveals '*Retirese al paño*' (*Callar siempre es lo mejor*), '*Retirese Enrique*' (*El yerro del entendido*), '*Salgan hombres*' (*Amor, lealtad y ventura*), '*Salgan los que pudieren*' (*El hijo de la piedra*). Not only do these details give us good reason to believe that Calderón did not write Act I of this play; they provide evidence that it was the work of Matos Fragoso, the supposed author of Act III.³⁶ It is perhaps worth noting that in his *Catálogo razonado* of Moreto's plays, Fernández-Guerra does not consider the authorship of Acts I and III, but concedes that '[e]fectivamente parece escrita por él [= Moreto] la segunda jornada'.³⁷

The authorship of *La fingida Arcadia* has been disputed for well over three centuries, with a particular quickening of interest in recent years. The play

34 Page references are to the text printed in *Escogidas IX*.

35 See Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Argenis y Poliarco*, ed. crítica & anotada de Alicia Varo López (Madrid: Iberoamericana/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2015), 94.

36 Some word-searches were made using the CD *Teatro español del Siglo de Oro* (TESO), co-ord. C. Simón Palmer (Chadwyck-Healey España, 1997–98). Variant spellings (e.g., 'quaxado', 'cuajado') were checked.

37 Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, 'Catálogo razonado', in *Comedias escogidas de Don Agustín Moreto y Cabaña*, ed. Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, xxix–xlvi (p. xxix).

has most often been attributed uniquely to Moreto, but it has also been claimed—and published—as a Calderón collaboration. An edition of the version attributed to Moreto is available on the PROTEO website; since it has line-numbers, I refer to it here.³⁸ As the editor of this edition, Marcella Trambaioli is well equipped to examine questions of authorship; her study includes very useful references to evidence gathered by earlier scholars, and to the opinions they based on their gatherings; I owe a number of my references to her.³⁹

In Calderón's *Octava* (1684) and *Novena* (1691) *partes*, Vera Tassis listed *La fingida Arcadia* among those 'en las que tiene [Calderón] vna Iornada'; in this case, the third. By this time, the play had appeared as Moreto's in *Escogidas XXV* (Madrid, 1666) and his posthumous *Segunda parte* (Valencia, 1676). Indeed, all pre-1800 editions attribute it to Moreto, apart from an imprintless *suelta* in Munich's Staatsbibliothek (4 P.o.hisp. 51 p#Beibd.4), which attributes it to Antonio Coello. This *suelta* has sixteen leaves (A–D⁴), a variant title, *La Arcadia fingida*, lacks some lines found in the *parte*, and has a variant ending: in the 'Moreto' version (*Escogidas XXV*), the maid Julia rejects her *gracioso* suitors Chilindrón and Cascabel, and asks pardon for the actors' faults. In the 'Coello' *suelta* these servants' lines are omitted, and Carlos, another unsuccessful suitor (of the heroine), reiterates the variant title: 'Y de la Arcadia fingida | aqui da fin la Comedia'. The 'Moreto' version, in which Julia parallels her mistress Porcia's rejection of two suitors, is arguably superior. Medel listed the Coello *suelta* under 'Arcadia fingida'; it is not clear whether he realized that it was essentially the same text as the 'Fingida Arcadia' he listed under both Calderón and Moreto; the listing under Calderón's name could mean that a *suelta* attributed to him may once have existed.⁴⁰

As noted above, Hartzenbusch's edition of Calderón printed the play as a collaboration, by Moreto, 'N. N.' and Calderón (that is, he agreed with Vera Tassis about Act III). On this point Trambaioli tells us that 'Vera Tassis asentó que se trataba del producto de tres plumas: a saber, de Moreto la primera jornada, de un dramaturgo sin identificar la segunda y de Calderón la tercera' (185). This is not strictly correct: while it would be useful to know what Vera thought about the authorship of Act I, he said nothing about the matter: the first editor to make this claim was Hartzenbusch, who gives no evidence to support his assertion. We are left to suspect that

38 <<http://www3.ubu.es/proteo/docs/Comedias/ClbFingidaArcadia.pdf>> (accessed 22 August 2013).

39 Marcella Trambaioli, 'La fingida Arcadia de 1666. Autoría y escritura de consuno', in *Moretiana. Adversa y próspera fortuna de Agustín Moreto*, ed. María Luisa Lobato & Juan Martínez Berbel (Madrid: Iberoamericana/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2008), 185–206.

40 Francisco Medel del Castillo, *Indice general alfabético de todos los títulos de comedias, que se han escrito por varios autores, antiguos y modernos* (Madrid: Alfonso de Mora, 1735), 12, 44.

Hartzenbusch was influenced by the early attributions of the whole play to Moreto. Fernández-Guerra admits to considering these attributions as evidence for Moreto's involvement, and concludes that 'en la jornada segunda se hallan algunos rasgos característicos de su estilo'. As for Act I, he tentatively ('tal vez') suggests Cáncer.⁴¹

Fernández-Guerra's conclusions received a sharp rebuff from S. G. Morley, one of the great experts on the verse-forms of Golden-Age drama: 'If the distinguished authors of the play divided their labor up by acts, Moreto certainly did not write the second'. He adduced a passage of six-syllable assonants (*romancillo*), and another (68 lines) of 8-syllable couplets (i.e., *pareados*), which he had not seen used in dialogue anywhere else.⁴²

When Ruth Lee Kennedy turned to the play in *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, she concluded that it was hard to assign the first act to Moreto, although 'one finds in it a fragment of dialogue which is thoroughly Calderonian'; as for Act II, 'I cannot believe that the second act is Moreto's', although 'I am inclined to think the third is his'.⁴³ By 1939, however, she had reached the conclusion that 'I am not at all certain that Moreto composed any portion of it, nor that he ever collaborated with Calderón'.⁴⁴ Kennedy went on to consider the 'Coello' *suelta*, concluding that 'I should judge it, both by its print and its paper, to be eighteenth century — later than either Medel's or Fajardo's *Índice*'.⁴⁵ While I have not examined the paper, the suggestion that the typography is post-Medel (1735) is simply incorrect, and incorrect by quite a long way. As noted earlier, the *suelta* is an unexceptional quarto in fours (A–D⁴); unexceptional, that is, apart from the fact that the third leaves of gatherings B, C and D are signed (B3, C3, D3). This practice was common in the period prior to 1660, but I have not seen it in reliably datable *sueeltas* after this. There are no examples of J and U (e.g., in IORNADA SEGVNDA), which suggests a date prior to 1700, probably earlier, while the many examples of the mixing of swash and standard italic capitals (especially C and P) suggest a date in keeping with that indicated by the signatures. While the scan I have examined has no scale, it is possible to calculate from the Granjon two-line pica titling capitals of COMEDIA FAMOSA (the originals of which are 7 mm) that the body-size of the text type is about 83 mm/20 lines: a pica, i.e., not one of the smaller sizes commonly used in later *sueeltas*. The *suelta* almost certainly belongs to the third quarter of the seventeenth century; it may well be the earliest surviving version of the text.

41 Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, 'Catálogo razonado', in *Comedias escogidas de Don Agustín Moreto y Cabaña*, ed. Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, xxxiv.

42 S. G. Morley, 'Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the Siglo de Oro. Alarcón and Moreto', *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, VIII (1918), 131–73 (p. 168).

43 Kennedy, *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, 131.

44 Ruth Lee Kennedy, 'Moretiana', *Hispanic Review*, 7:3 (1939), 225–36 (p. 234).

45 Kennedy, 'Moretiana', 231.

Kennedy goes on to argue that the wording of the *suelta*'s endings ('Y de la Arcadia fingida / aqui da fin la Comedia'; 'porque se vea / en el Arcadia fingida / el premio de las finezas') points to *La Arcadia fingida* being the original title; the version which preserved the original title was the earlier. I do not quite accept this conclusion, but for the argument to be sustained, it had also to be argued that the 'post-1735' *suelta* had been printed from a much older text, now lost. The argument is unnecessary, however, given the likely date of the *suelta*. I share Kennedy's view that the oldest surviving version of the text of the play is likely to be the *suelta*, with its attribution to Antonio Coello, who died in October 1652. It is just possible that the *suelta* may pre-date his death, and possible that it derives, as Kennedy argued, from an earlier edition with, presumably, the same attribution. The fact that the *suelta* omits lines present in the *parte* of 1666 does not prove the existence of an earlier edition (a manuscript may be more likely), although it suggests a complex *stemma*. We cannot conclude, of course, that the attribution in an imprintless *suelta* set in an unusually battered pica font is the only one we can trust; but the *suelta* does effectively bring Coello's name into contention among the possible authors.

Four much more recent studies have examined the play: that of Canonica, examining literary aspects, accepts that Act I is Moreto's and Act III, Calderón's.⁴⁶ The year 2008 produced those of Enrique Rull and Alessandro Cassol.⁴⁷ The former examines the opening of Act III:

PORCIA	¡Dejadme todos!	
CELIA		Mira ...
ENRIQUE		Considera ...
JULIA	Advierte ...	
CARLOS		Escucha ...
CASANDRA		Aguarda ...
FEDERICO		Tente ...
FILIBERTO		Espera ...
PORCIA	¿Qué he de advertir, si muero?	
	¿Qué he de esperar, si bien ninguno espero?	
	¿Qué he de ver, si estoy ciega?	
	¿Qué he de oír, si sorda a mis voces llega	
	aquesta vida poca? (1860–66)	

46 Elvezio Canonica, 'La *fingida Arcadia*: desde su fuente lopesca hasta su desembocadura calderoniana', in *El ingenio cómico de Tirso de Molina. Actas del II Congreso Internacional sobre Tirso de Molina (Pamplona, 27–29 de abril de 1998)*, ed. Ignacio Arellano, Blanca Oteiza & Miguel Zugasti (Madrid/Pamplona: GRISO/Univ. de Navarra/Instituto de Estudios Tirsonianos, 1998), 33–46.

47 Enrique Rull, 'Procedimientos de construcción triautorial en *La fingida Arcadia*', in *De Moretiana Fortuna: estudios sobre el teatro de Agustín Moreto*, ed. María Luisa Lobato & Ann L. Mackenzie, BSS, LXXXV:7–8 (2008), 139–52; and Alessandro Cassol, 'El ingenio compartido: panorama de las comedias colaboradas de Moreto', in *Moretiana*, ed. Lobato & Martínez Berbel, 165–84.

He describes this passage as ‘silvas [...] muy calderonianas y unas enumeraciones partidas muy características del dramaturgo’. He is surely right. Rull concludes that ‘Moreto es el autor fundamental de las dos primeras jornadas, y Calderón de la última’.⁴⁸ By ‘fundamental’ he wishes to suggest that the three authors did not simply write one complete act each, but collaborated in a much more complex way; the third author may have been Cáncer (‘descartamos a Coello’), and he may have been involved in Act II. It is worth remembering that Cáncer frequently collaborated with Moreto (Cassol lists eight occasions), and with Calderón twice.⁴⁹

Cassol examines some alleged Moreto collaborations at length, but not *La adúltera penitente* or *La fingida Arcadia*. In the latter case, he refers us to Rull and Trambaioli.

In the most recent study, Erik Coenen examines the claim of Vera Tassis that Act III is Calderón’s, and finds considerable evidence that it is; in particular, he notes the use of the word ‘parante’ (discussed below).⁵⁰ Since his concern is to examine the claims of Vera Tassis, he does not investigate the authorship of the other acts.

The need to consider Coello as one of the possible authors involved in the *Arcadia* play involves us in consideration of the date. The real problem with the play’s date is the evidence that the *La Arcadia* performed by Escamilla on 12 July 1663 was a different play entirely: DICAT’s entry for Escamilla’s activities indicates that the play he performed on that day was *Hacer fineza el desaire*, which was printed in *Parte veinte y tres de comedias nuevas*, i.e., *Escogidas XXIII* (Madrid: José Fernández de Buendía, 1665). The play’s author is given in this edition as Diego Calleja; the volume was approved for printing by Calderón. We might suppose that some error could have been made in the theatre documents, but *Hacer fineza el desaire* is set in *Arcadia*, with suitably Arcadian characters: Cardenio, Olimpio, Salicio, Rústico, Sátiro and Venus. It would not be inappropriate to refer to it as *La Arcadia*.

While there is evidence that Montalbán and Rojas were Calderón’s personal friends rather than merely professional ones, evidence for the mechanics of literary collaboration is hard to come by, although Ann Mackenzie has found some. It is easy to suppose that collaboration allowed three playwrights to write three acts simultaneously, finishing in a third of the usual time, but Mackenzie concludes that ‘los colaboradores calderonianos componían uno tras otro, jornada por jornada, en estricta sucesión’; she presents evidence, for example, that writers of second and third acts had previous acts available.⁵¹

48 Rull, ‘Procedimientos de construcción triautorial en *La fingida Arcadia*’, 148, 152.

49 Cassol, ‘El ingenio compartido’, 170–71.

50 Coenen, ‘Las atribuciones de Vera Tassis’, 128.

51 See Ann L. Mackenzie, *La escuela de Calderón: estudio e investigación*, Hispanic Studies TRAC (Textual Research and Criticism) 3 (Liverpool: Liverpool U. P., 1993), especially Chapter 3, ‘La técnica de componer comedias en colaboración’, 31–67. The quotation is from p. 33, and the pages following present the evidence.

Nothing that has been said so far proves that Moreto and Calderón collaborated on *La fingida Arcadia*. It is time to examine the text of the play for clues. Early in Act I, as the heroine Porcia's maids try to persuade her to say what is bothering her, she is irritated by their badgering, and tells one of them, Celia, to stop and to sing instead: 'Canta, y calla' (l. 52). These are the opening words of Calderón's poem *Psalle et sile* (and the meaning of the title). A sceptic might call this an interesting coincidence, inconclusive. The approbation in the first edition of the poem, by Francisco de Arando y Mazuelo, a canon of Toledo Cathedral, is dated 31 December 1661, while Pedro de Villafranca's engraving of the cathedral's choir screen, showing the words which inspired the poem, is dated 1662. Given Calderón's practice of self-advertisement in his plays, we might believe that the wording is no coincidence, but even if we do, there are other possible explanations: another writer might have decided to pay him a compliment, or might have slipped in the reference subconsciously. If this is an allusion rather than a coincidence, it would suggest a composition date in 1662 or later, perhaps relatively soon afterwards.⁵²

In Act III Celia sings again:

Ruiseñor, que volando vas,
cantando finezas, cantando favores,
¡oh cuánta pena y envidia me das!
Pero no, que si hoy cantas amores,
tú tendrás celos, y tú llorarás. (2340–44)

The same song, with these words, is found twice in plays which are entirely Calderón's: *Los dos amantes del cielo* (?late 1630s; printed in the *Verdadera quinta parte* of 1682) and *Fieras afemina Amor* (planned for 22 December 1671, printed about then as a *suelta*).⁵³ Wilson and Sage found a manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional with the earliest (?) text of the lyric, with music by Juan del Vado, who was a violinist in the Capilla Real in 1635. This 'stanza' is the refrain, and the manuscript text is similar but different, although the wording used by Calderón in *Los dos amantes* and *Fieras* is as printed here. A search in Moreto's plays shows that the word 'ruiseñor' occurs once, in quite different circumstances; in fact, this song is apparently used only here and in these two Calderón plays. This is much more significant, although the possibility remains that collaboration extended to suggestions made by the collaborators

52 *Exortación panegírica al silencio (Psalle et sile)*, in Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *Obras menores (siglos XVII y XVIII)*, ed. Antonio Pérez y Gómez (Cieza: 'La fonte que mana y corre', 1969), 'El aire de la almena', XXIV, item 4.

53 E. M. Wilson & Jack Sage, *Poesías líricas en las obras dramáticas de Calderón: citas y glosas* (London: Tamesis, 1964), 112.

about their colleagues' acts; but even this would imply Calderón's involvement.

Apart from references to, or repeated borrowings from other works, authors can be identified from unusual metaphors or vocabulary. We can begin with 'adusta' (l. 9), a favourite word of Góngora's (five occurrences in the *Polifemo* and *Soledades*), and so likely to be a favourite of Calderón's. Sure enough, he uses it (masculine, feminine or plurals) on twenty-one occasions, Moreto only once. The same speech includes the word 'albedrío' (8): hardly rare, one might think; indeed, in Calderón it is common, with 337 instances, including characters in *autos*. In Moreto there are forty-five. The line containing 'adusta' is 'Fruto opimo, o mies adusta'. There are seven examples of 'opimo' in Calderón, none in Moreto. As for 'mies', Calderón has ninety-four, including an *auto* character; Moreto none at all. A little later, we find the phrase 'Parca inexorable' (120). Calderón wins on 'inexorable' by five to nil, on 'parca' by fourteen to three. Still later, we find the phrase 'los cóncavos de su pecho' (241). Calderón uses a form of 'cóncavo' on forty-one occasions; in particular, he uses the noun 'cóncavos' (as here) eleven times. The only form we find in Moreto is 'cóncavo', used twice as a singular noun. Although there is no example in either writer with the additional words 'de su pecho', Calderón three times uses the phrase 'los cóncavos senos de sus entrañas' (in *A tu prójimo como a ti*, *La nave del mercader* and *El nuevo hospicio de pobres*), as well as 'cóncavos senos' in *El purgatorio de San Patricio*. As for other writers, Calderón uses the word 'cóncavo', singular or plural, masculine or feminine, as often as all the others combined.

Four other examples in this category (i.e., in Act I, used only or much more frequently by Calderón) can be quoted. The first is 'tijera/tijeras' (127) in the stated or implied context of 'de la Parca'. Calderón has three uses, Moreto none (with nine further Calderón examples to one in Moreto of other contexts of the word). As for the phrase 'estatua de hielo' (513), Calderón has seventeen examples against one in Moreto. Most of these occur either in a simile describing a lover's vigil outside the beloved's house, or (as here) in a metaphor denoting astonishment. Calderón also has nine examples of the phrase 'estatua de nieve'; Moreto has none. (In all, TESO records 670 uses of 'estatua/s'; of these, 378 are Calderón's, or over 56% of the overall total. Moreto has seven, a fraction over 1%.) The third is 'estragos' (671), common enough in Calderón, who has thirty examples; much rarer in Moreto, who has two. The last piece of strong evidence is 'partícipe' (726), for which Calderón wins by six to nought. Less convincing, but worth quoting, is 'preámbulos' (170). Neither author uses the plural, but Calderón has 'preámbulo' in *Amigo, amante y leal*. A slightly better example is 'rebujando' (239): again, neither writer uses the present participle, although Calderón does have three other parts of the verb; the only other writer to use it is Zamora (born 1665; 'rebuja', 'rebuje').

These data would suggest very strong odds for Calderón and against Moreto in the composition of Act I. However, some of the other evidence is more complicated. At line 721, we find 'pesia'. Moreto has thirty-nine examples of this, compared with only six in Calderón (most examples are in such phrases as 'pesia mi alma', 'pesia mí'). However, if we search under the alternative spelling 'pese a', we find sixteen other Calderón examples. If the autograph manuscript of *El agua mansa* ('pese a mi') is typical, this was his preferred spelling.⁵⁴ As it stands, then, the 'pesia' evidence is inconclusive.

Other unhelpful evidence involves 'arrasar' (441), 'atleta' (631) and 'paliados' (881): neither author used these anywhere else. Another rare verb, 'rebosar' (633), is shared by Moreto and Calderón at two each. I have failed to find any version in any writer of the interesting phrases 'el vulgo no es más que un ciego, /preciado de vigilante' (187–88) or 'muy tiernos saben poco / los hombres como los panes' (370–71).

Among the evidence which runs counter to the apparent trend is 'cohombro' (501), of which there is one example in Moreto, none in Calderón: hardly conclusive. Perhaps more significant are parts of the verb 'fomentar': 'fomentes' (98) and 'fomento' (742). Calderón uses only 'fomenta', once, in *Luis Pérez el gallego*; Moreto has a total of eight examples of different parts of the verb. Apart from this last example, which is far outweighed by 'opimo', 'mies', 'inexorable', 'tijera/s', 'estatua de hielo' and 'partícipe', for which Moreto's combined score is two, against 141 for Calderón, the textual evidence strongly suggests that Don Agustín did not write Act I. The attribution of the entire play to him alone is almost certainly incorrect, and of course the many *sueñas* which do so may have a single source: *Escogidas XXV*. Finally, it is worth quoting again a passage noticed by Trambaioli:

Cobrole [el guante] y buscome ([Ap] ¡Ay, cielo!),
 que medrosa ([Ap] ¡Fuerte lance!),
 enojada ([Ap] ¡Raro susto!)
 me retiré ([Ap] ¡Pena grande!),
 y dándome ([Ap] ¡Acción valiente!)
 mi prenda ([Ap] ¡Atención notable!)
 desta suerte ([Ap] ¡Horror terrible!)
 sobre mis brazos se cae [...] (243–50)

This passage is so Calderonian that it could scarcely have been written by anyone else.

⁵⁴ *El agua mansa, edición facsímil del manuscrit autògraf, generalment conegut amb el títol Guárdate del agua mansa* (Barcelona: Diputació de Barcelona/Institut del Teatre, 1981), fol. 21^r, l. 6.

If it remains unproved that Calderón wrote the entire act, the evidence above indicates that he was involved. Apparently Ruth Lee Kennedy was correct and Vera Tassis was not. It is worth recalling that at different times Vera ascribed Act I (in the *Octava parte*, 1684) and Act III (in the *Novena parte*, 1691) of *El privilegio de las mujeres* to Calderón. Although this play resulted from a three-way collaboration, we have seen evidence that Calderón was involved in Acts I and III; he also re-used lines from both of these acts for *Las armas de la hermosura*. Vera's confusion had a factual basis. While we do not know what criteria he used to attribute whole plays or single acts to Calderón, it seems likely that he relied on impressions: he had no electronic technology to tell him how often, or when, Don Pedro used particular images, vocabulary or verse-forms.

Act III has a lot of non-evidence. There are phrases like 'signo tirano de mi estrella' (1936), 'violenta mi esperanza' (2064) 'azul imperio' (2067), 'fértil espacio ameno' (2173), 'comarcanos reinos' (2275), 'sobrada licencia' (2456), which none of TESO's authors uses anywhere else, unless we count Diamante's 'Reynos comarcanos' and Zamora's 'espacio ameno'. If we pursue the rare word 'tabletas' (2675), we find that, apart from Lope de Vega (twice), no dramatist seems to have used it, singular or plural. More positive, but scarcely very helpful, is 'un loco ciento hace/hace ciento' (2162; also found in Act II at 1047): both Moreto (in *El esclavo de su hijo*) and Calderón (in *El día mayor de los días*) use this once. Less helpful to Moreto's candidacy is 'salamandra' (1957): Calderón eight, Moreto four. Positively antipathetic is 'balbuciente', sometimes accompanied, as here, by 'tartamudo/a' (2623). Moreto uses the first once, but there are sixteen examples in Calderón; the 'tartamudo/a' score is four to Calderón, none to Moreto. Also significant is the phrase 'perfe(c)ta hermosura': never used by Moreto, fourteen times by Calderón. The full context is 'no hay perfeta hermosura / sin perfeta discreción' (2000–01). In *Cada uno para sí* we find 'no hay perfecta hermosura / donde no hay alma perfecta' (*Comedias*, 1677b); in *Mañana será otro día*, 'no hay perfecta hermosura / donde perfecta virtud / falta' (*Comedias*, 779a). As for single words, we find thirty-eight examples of 'contingencia' (2556) in Calderón (including six plurals), a mere seven in Moreto (never plural). The ostensibly innocent 'escrúpulo' (2194) produces an even bigger discrepancy: in Calderón, fifty-four plus twenty plurals; in Moreto, four plus two. The nonce-word 'parante' (2149, coined by analogy with 'andante') is used by Calderón to amuse in *Basta callar* (*Comedias*, 1711a), *Cada uno para sí* (l. 187) and *El escondido y la tapada* (*Comedias*, 676a); never by Moreto, or, indeed, by anyone else: this word alone is almost enough to claim the act for Calderón. If we turn to verbs, there is 'estriba' (2150). The search here included 'estribar' and 'estriban': the score was thirty-three to Calderón, five to Moreto. Finally, it may be noted that although no use of

'comarcanos reinos' (2275) is recorded, Calderón uses 'comarcanos villajes' in *Hado y divisa* (*Comedias*, 2104a).

The totals of these few examples are 188 to Calderón, twenty-four to Moreto. If we add the lyric 'Rui señor que volando vas', the evidence for the involvement in Act III of Calderón rather than Moreto is substantial. Perhaps we should not forget that evidence of this kind is skewed in Calderón's favour, because he wrote more. Also, greater uncertainty about Moreto's canon makes his evidence less reliable: some authentic plays have certainly been omitted from his database, while others, like *La fingida Arcadia*, appear as entirely his. Calderón is less affected by these problems, and, with significantly more plays and far more *autos*, his total *oeuvre* is four times as large.

Hilborn published his *Chronology of the Plays of Calderón* in 1938. Some early reviewers felt that Don Pedro's work did not lend itself to chronology based on metrical analysis. When his book appeared, however, the much-praised *Chronology* of Morley and Bruerton was two years away; he would surely have learned from them.⁵⁵ He had over 180 texts to work with (108 plays, 72 *autos*, plus acts from collaboration plays), but, as with Morley and Bruerton, who had far more, many were unreliable; some 'dated' ones had been dated incorrectly, while others were misattributed. Perhaps not surprisingly, he accepted the view of Vera Tassis and Hartzenbusch that Calderón wrote Act III of *La fingida Arcadia*, and Cotarelo's view that the play dated from 1663: he included it among the 'dated plays of this period' (1661–63).⁵⁶ In Act III he counted 68% of *romance*, 15% of *décimas*, 14% of *silva* and 2% of *redondillas*, which fitted, more or less, although the count for *décimas* and *silva* is high, while that for *redondillas* is low: this is the only play he assigns to this period in which the percentage of *silva* reaches double figures, while the figure for *redondillas* is the lowest. The count for *décimas* is the highest in this group, well above the 11% of the next highest, *Ni Amor se libra de amor*, which was premiered in January 1662.⁵⁷ But of course a single act is more likely to suffer from statistical vagaries than a whole play. He did not count the other acts, and the table below gives my figures for the entire play; Hilborn's figures for Act III differ from mine only insofar as he rounded up or down to whole numbers.

55 Harry Warren Hilborn, *A Chronology of the Plays of D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (Toronto: Toronto U. P., 1938); S. Griswold Morley & Courtney Bruerton, *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's 'Comedias'. With a Discussion of Doubtful Attributions, the Whole Based on a Study of His Strophic Variation* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1940).

56 Hilborn, *A Chronology of the Plays of D. Pedro Calderón de la Barca*, 63.

57 J. E. Varey & N. D. Shergold, *Teatros y comedias en Madrid: 1651–1665* (London: Tamesis, 1973), 239.

Verse-forms	Act I (957 lines)	Act II (902 lines)	Act III (820 lines)
<i>romance</i>	63.4%	49.5%	67.9%
<i>redondillas</i>	26.7%	22.2%	2.4%
<i>décimas</i>	7.6%	11.1%	14.6%
<i>silva</i>	2.2%	—	14.4%
<i>romancillo</i>	—	7.5%	—
<i>pareados</i> (8-syll)	—	7.5%	—
song	—	2.2%	0.6%

Act I's figure for *romance* (63.4%) is typical of the early 1660s for Calderón: *Ni Amor se libra de amor* has 64%. The low single figure for *silva* (2.2%) is also typical, while that for *décimas* (7.6%) is close to the average for the early 1660s. The only wayward percentage is that for *redondillas*: 26.7% is more typical of the 1640s. In comparison with those of Act III, though, the figures are more consistent with composition by Calderón, since they present only one unusual percentage instead of three; and the argument that single acts are more likely to present inconsistencies still applies. With this in mind, it may be worth broadening the data-base by combining the figures of Acts I and III:

<i>romance</i>	<i>redondillas</i>	<i>décimas</i>	<i>silva</i>	song
65.5%	15.5%	10.9%	7.8%	0.3%

While it is still hard to find a play with percentages very close to these, the closest matches seem to be found in the 1630s, e.g., *Gustos y disgustos son no más que imaginación* (c. 1638), with 63% *romance*, 13% *redondillas*, 18% *décimas*, 4% *silva*.

As for Act II, the figures suggest that Calderón could not have written it in any period. To find him using such high figures for *redondillas* with such low ones for *romance*, we have to go to the 1620s and 1630s, but there are no zero percentages for *silva* then. Finally, although Hilborn lists the abbreviation *par.* for *pareados* on p. 4n, he records no Calderonian use of *pareados* (i.e., couplets); but since *pareados* are defined by rhyme or assonance rather than by syllable-count, some may have been recorded under *silva*. As for Morley's remarks about Moreto's non-use of six-syllable assonants (*romancillo*) and eight-syllable *pareados*, I am not in a position to contradict him; but Moreto's most famous play, *El lindo don Diego*, has forty-six lines of eleven-syllable *pareados* (ll. 1587–632).

As for the possible role of Coello, this is hard to investigate: we have no collected edition of Coello's plays, and few critical ones; the lack of a collected edition means that he is excluded from TESO, and the lack of an electronic database hinders any search for vocabulary and imagery.⁵⁸ Collecting data by traditional methods on these and on his verse-forms would be a huge task, despite his relatively small output (around thirty plays, perhaps a third in collaboration, are linked to his name). However, three of his collaborations with Calderón date from the 1630s. Kennedy suggests a link between the use of *mondonga* in Act II (970, 1663; there is another example in Act III, 2511) and Coello's satirical poem *Las mondongas* (1637). However, as Trambaioli notes,⁵⁹ TESO tells us that the word is found in Calderón (three times), Moreto (three), Tirso, Pérez de Montalbán, Matos and Diamante: there is nothing conclusive here. Kennedy also suggests that the play must post-date the fall of Olivares (January 1643), on the grounds that no playwright would have portrayed the use of a poisoned letter to get rid of an enemy for fear of antagonizing the favourite, who supposedly (i.e., according to his enemies) accomplished the death of his uncle Baltasar de Zúñiga in this way; but this was the means used by Ana Bolena to get rid of Queen Catalina in *La cisma de Ingalaterra*, which we know was performed in 1627. On the other hand, one of Kennedy's other discoveries is more helpful: that Belmonte Bermúdez used eight-syllable *pareados* in *El cerco de Sevilla* and six-syllable *romancillos* in *Las siete estrellas de Francia*. Belmonte is as difficult to investigate as Coello (no collected edition, not listed in TESO), but this is surely worth pursuing, since he collaborated with both Moreto and Calderón.

It seems clear that *La fingida Arcadia* is not a conventional three-way, one-act-each collaboration. There is evidence for Calderón's involvement, both from the text of Acts I and III and, arguably, from Medel (n. 38 above). The play could have been a collaboration like *Troya abrasada*, with two acts by Calderón, or like *Yerros de naturaleza*, in which Coello apparently wrote the first thirty lines of Act III, whereupon Calderón then wrote 242 lines, and Coello the rest.⁶⁰ Finally, the phrase 'un loco ciento hace' (1047, 2126) could join Ann Mackenzie's examples of a collaborator (in this case Calderón) reiterating what a colleague had written in a previous act.

I hope to have shown that the claim that Calderón wrote Act I of *La adúltera penitente* is mistaken, whereas the uncertainty about whether he

58 See Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, 'Dramáticos del siglo XVII: Don Antonio Coello y Ochoa', *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, V (1918), 550–600; and Ann L. Mackenzie, 'Coello como discípulo y colaborador de Calderón', in *Calderón desde el 2000. Simposio Internacional Complutense*, ed. José María Díez Borque (Madrid: Ollero & Ramos, 2001), 37–59.

59 Trambaioli, 'La fingida Arcadia de 1666', 192–93.

60 Lines 31–272 are in Calderón's hand. In an important recent article, Erik Coenen uses a Coello document preserved in the Archivo Histórico Nacional to show that the other hand is a copyist's: Erik Coenen, 'Problemas del manuscrito de *Yerros de naturaleza y aciertos de la fortuna*', *Hipogrifo*, 3:1 (2015), 118–28.

wrote Act I or Act III of *La fingida Arcadia* is resolved by the evidence that he wrote both of these acts, or at least parts of them. While there are fragments of evidence in Act II for the involvement of Moreto, we cannot attribute this act to him with any confidence, especially given the remarks of Morley almost a century ago—except that they were made with the proviso that the whole act was written by one person, which it may not have been. The discovery that a *suelta* which attributes the whole play to Antonio Coello may be as early as the 1650s raises questions about the possible involvement of Coello, whose three reliably-datable collaborations with Calderón belong to the period 1634–1636. The versification of Calderón's two acts suggests that we should at least consider the possibility that composition may date from the 1630s, which, in any case, is Calderón's most productive decade for collaborations.

Both Coenen and Trambaioli draw attention to the possibility that Calderón revised complete texts of which he had written only part: the manuscripts of *Yerros de naturaleza* and *Troya abrasada* certainly support the view that revisions of one author's lines involved one of his collaborators. (Cassol and Trambaioli remind us of a similar *modus operandi* in *El príncipe perseguido*, where the autograph manuscript shows Moreto intervening with 'enmiendas, sustituciones y adiciones' in the acts written by Belmonte and Martínez.⁶¹) It might be said that Rull takes this a step further, suggesting that authors might have shared the composition of single acts between them, something which we know happened in *Yerros de naturaleza* and, apparently, in *Troya abrasada*; he is probably right. In any event, there is more work to do on *La fingida Arcadia*, especially on Act II.

Finally, when looking for a collaborator, we should remember that in the 1630s, 1640s and 1650s Calderón was often away from Madrid, sometimes for months, even years, at a time. Even so, we cannot safely conclude that living many miles apart while they collaborated on a play would have presented authors with unsurmountable difficulties: we know that Calderón finished *El nuevo palacio del Retiro* 'En Pedrosa a 28 de mayo de 1634 años', while it was approved in Madrid 'a 1° de junio de 1634', four days later.⁶² Today's postmen could scarcely do better.*

61 Cassol, 'El ingenio compartido', 175–76; Trambaioli, '*La fingida Arcadia* de 1666', 191.

62 From Ms. 15.298, BNE. We do not know which Pedrosa this was, but the nearest is Pedrosa de Duero (Burgos), 106 miles from Madrid; the furthest, in Orense, 285 miles. Corpus in 1634 fell on 15 June, leaving the usual two weeks for rehearsals.

* Disclosure Statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.