MORETIANA ¹

A SOURCE FOR El caballero ²

El caballero, first attributed to Moreto in an Escogidas of 1652 that is now lost to us,³ has, for its source, a play of Lope de Vega,

¹ A fellowship granted by the American Association of University Women (1937-'38) made possible this article.
² The relationship between El caballero and El hombre de bien was suggested by a manuscript note which I have seen at Freiburg in Adolf Schaeffer's Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas, Leipzig, 1890.
³ This volume, Parte segunda de varios, is mentioned by Fajardo (Indice de todas las comedias en verso español y portugués que se han impreso hasta el año de 1716, Ms. VV—10—14706, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid). La Barrera (Catálogo del teatro antiguo español, Madrid, 1860, p. 704) has cited Fajardo as to the makeup of this collection, quoting among other things the statement of the latter: "Además, hay otra Parte segunda de varios, aunque no la buena, impresa en Madrid, 1652." I am at a loss as to the significance of this statement inasmuch as this Segunda parte which Fajardo rejects, is, so far as I can see, a perfectly normal volume. See in this connection Cotarelo y Mori's Catálogo descriptivo de la gran colección de "Comedias escogidas," Madrid, 1932, pp. 12–16.

It was published a second time in this same series: Parte XIX, Pablo de Val, Madrid, 1663. There is nothing suspicious about the format of this volume. On the other hand, the Parte XLI of this same collection, in which the play appeared for a third time, shows various irregularities. It has a Pamplona title-page which is false (See Cotarelo, op. cit., p. 205); there is no date; the pagination would indicate either that parts of two different volumes had been combined to form one, or that two different printers divided up the work, each taking six plays, for with El caballero, the seventh play in the volume, pagination starts anew. Cotarelo is of the opinion that this volume should be dated 1675. The play was to appear again in the Segunda parte of Moreto, Imprenta de Benito Macé, Valencia, 1676. All of the above mentioned editions are virtually identical. For other prints of El caballero, see Cotarelo y Mori's, La bibliografia de Moreto, Madrid, 1927, p. 21. The sueltas listed there are taken either from the Escogidas editions or that of the Parte II. All references in this study are to the BAE edition, which is taken from the Escogidas of 1663.

There is nothing that definitely dates this play except for a reference (III, ii, p. 304) to Mira de Amescua's Galán, valiente y discreto, first published in 1636 (Parte XXIX de comedias de diferentes autores, Valencia). It is similar in type and general spirit to Trampa adelante and El parecido en la corte—the only plays of intrigue in Moreto's theatre that are unquestionably his—and these are known to have been written respectively in the years 1651 and 1652. The versification of El caballero, by comparison with that of these plays, shows that: (1) the percentage of redondillas is smaller in the play under discussion and that of silvas decidedly higher than in either of the other two plays; (2) there are both décimas and quintillas in El caballero whereas in Trampa adelante and El parecido en la
El hombre de bien. The debt is not an immense one, but it is undeniable. Both center around a protagonist who, until the curtain falls on the final scene, feels himself unable to reveal his name. Questions as to his identity ever meet with the same unfailling answer, in the one play "un hombre de bien," in the other "un caballero." From the context it is evident that, in the minds of the authors at least, these two terms were synonomous. Both mean "a man of noble blood who is valiant and courteous."

The situation and the motivation of events, as well as the general spirit of the play, have been altered. In Lope's play, Jacinto has for some time been the accepted lover of Lucinda, but such complete secrecy has been guarded that their relations are unknown even to the protagonists' servants, Belarda or Gavin—let alone to the heroine's father Felicio or her brother Cloridano. While Rugero, the young monarch of Dalmatia, is out hunting, he catches a glimpse of the beautiful Lucinda, falls madly in love with her,

corte, there are quintillas only; (3) the first two acts of El caballero end in redondillas, the last one in romances. The first two points have little significance as a comparison with the versification of other plays of Moreto will readily show. See in this connection: (1) S. G. Morley's, Studies in Spanish Dramatic Versification of the "Siglo de Oro," Alarcón and Moreto, University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1918, VII, pp. 153–162; (2) my study, The Dramatic Art of Moreto, Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Northampton, Mass., 1931–32, XIII, pp. 60–69.

The third point is, however, important—so important that it makes me doubtful that this play, at least in the form we now have it, should be attributed to Moreto alone. All acts of this dramatist's plays normally end in romances. There are thirteen plays attributed to him, aside from El caballero, which show deviation from this rule: of this number six are certainly not his; two others are very doubtful; the other five are known to have been written in collaboration. (See The Dramatic Art of Moreto, pp. 67–68.) Around the years 1651–1652, Cánzer and Matos were the usual collaborators of Moreto. Cánzer, at least in La muerte de Valdovinos, closed two of his acts with redondillas. Matos' usual custom is to end all acts in romances, but in the following plays he has ended an act in redondillas: Los indicios sin culpa, El amor hace valientes, and El galán de su mujer. The first two are included in his Primera Parte.

The earliest known edition of this play is in Lope's Sexta parte, Madrid, Juan de la Cuesta, 1616. This volume, which carries an aprobación of Espinel, dated Dec. 11, 1614, and a tasa of Apr. 3, 1615, must be a second edition as La Barrera (op. cit., p. 440) has pointed out. References in this study are to the BAE edition.

The presence of a Lucinda and a Belarda among the characters gives an autobiographical note to this play which makes certain that it was penned before the concluding chapters of Lope's relations with Micaela Luján had been written—in other words before the close of 1608. C. Brereton (Lope's Belardo-Lucinda Plays, Hispanic Review, 1937, V, p. 310) places it between 1599 and 1606.
and straightway asks Jacinto to help him in wooing her. In the rivalry that follows, the king's repeated efforts to find out the identity of his opponent and to conquer the aversion of Lucinda are equally unsuccessful, though the lovers find little peace in their own relations because of their jealousy. Jacinto fears the king, naturally; Lucinda, on her part, is led to believe that Jacinto is in love with Clavela, mistress to the king. When Rugero hears that his promised queen is arriving, he marries Clavela to Tansilo and, in order to avenge himself on Lucinda, orders that she forget her hombre de bien and marry Jacinto. Confessions follow and the king gives the young couple his blessing. The servants are likewise paired off.

In the later play, the scene has been shifted from Dalmatia to Madrid and the atmosphere has become one of complete respectability. The lovers have never transgressed the laws of Madrid's polite society. There is neither king nor courtesan. In their place, we have the entirely upright, if rather colorless, Don Diego and Doña Luisa de Ribera, in love respectively with the heroine Doña Ana and her brother, Don Lope Enríquez. The last mentioned is made to serve the double functions of Cloridano and Tansilo. Don Felix de Toledo is the protagonist, and it is he who, returning from Flanders where he had fled after a duel, breaks into this family criss-cross and carries off Doña Ana as his bride.

There are in this comedy the same duels from which the hero always emerges victorious, the same scenes of jealousy and complaints which must inevitably end in happy reconciliation. It is in this case the avarice of the maid Inés which leads to so much misunderstanding and unhappiness on the part of the lovers, and it is her confession which makes possible the happy ending for all—even for Don Diego who with an alacrity that is hardly flattering to the bride, comes to the conclusion that the loss of the lady is no reason for vain repining against fate (III, xx, p. 309):

—yo mi queja dejo,
y quedo mejor que todos,  
pues que me quedo soltero.

The actual verbal debt is a small one, though there are vague

---

* This episode sounds very much as if it were a reflection of the trip which Lope made to Valencia in 1599 when he accompanied the Marques de Sarria (later Conde de Lemos) on the occasion of the double wedding of Felipe III and his sister with the Hapsburgs of Austria. If I am right in this assumption, then the date of this play was probably soon after 1599 when memory of these events was still fresh—say 1600 or 1601.
echoes throughout El caballero that indicate that the author had Lope’s comedy before him. Moreto’s maximum indebtedness in this play, in matters of dialogue, may be seen by comparing this passage taken from Act I of El caballero (ix, p. 292) with one from the third act of El hombre de bien (xiii, p. 205):

EL CABALLERO

DON FELIX

Manzano, ¿no ves aquello?
Un hombre a la misma reja
en que yo hablaba ha llamado.

MANZANO

Calla, señor; que es quimera.

DON FELIX

¿Cómo quimera? ¿Qué dices?
¿No le ves parado en ella?

MANZANO

¿Hombre a reja de tu dama?
Calla, que será alma en pena.

DON FELIX

¿Estás ciego? ¿No lo ves?

MANZANO

No lo creo, aunque lo vea;
alma en pena es, vive Dios.

DON FELIX

Me apurrarás la paciencia.

MANZANO

Pues si la quiere y tiene alma,
¿no andará en pena por ella?

EL HOMBRE DE BIEN

TANSILO

Gente suena.

REY

¿Quién va allá?

JACINTO

¿Qué sé yo quién?

TANSILO

El talle y voz le condena.

REY

¿Eres el hombre de bien?

JACINTO

Soy un alma que anda en pena.

Or by comparing the lines which close Act I in both plays:

DON DIEGO
Pues quien sos saber espero.

TANSILO

¿Quién es?

JACINTO

Un caballero.

TANSILO

Un hombre de bien.

DON DIEGO
Y ¿el nombre?

JACINTO

Diga el nombre.

DON FELIX
Este basta para un hombre;
no soy más que un caballero.

DON DIEGO

Rey

Este es mi nombre.

DON DIEGO
Basta; apuranos no quiero,
pues lo callas; guardeos Dios.

... si me cuesta mi estado

sabré quién la goza y quiere.

Such are the two references to La pelota (II, xix, p. 303 and III, v, p. 306) which clearly have their origin in Lope’s scene (II, xiv, p. 199).
DON FELIX
No os de cuidado; que a vos os buscará el caballero.

(Vase.)

REY
Eso yo te diré quién.

DON DIEGO
(Ap. a Martín.)
Martín, siguele.

MARTÍN
Eso quiero. (Vase.)

REY
Sábeslo?

TANSILO
Si, señor.

Dilo;

TANSILO
¿Quién es?

¿Quiere usted saber quién es?

¿Quién es este?

MANZANO
Oiga pues...

MANZANO
Un caballero.

Lope’s play can hardly be classed as more than dutzendware, and Moreto has done nothing to improve it. Fernández-Guerra 8 praises El caballero for its urbanity, its light style, its witticisms, but objects to its improbabilities of plot. “Houses have no doors nor human voices any distinctive characteristics,” he complains. It certainly lacks that verisimilitude of motivation, that reasonableness of situation, and that clearness of character portrayal which ordinarily characterize Moreto’s theatre. If it is his (in its entirety), it falls far below the level of Trampa adelante and El parecido en la corte.

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON LA FINGIDA ARCADIA

Fajardo 9 gives three plays of the name, La fingida Arcadia, attributing one to Tirso, one to Moreto, 10 and one to Calderón. In the case of the last-mentioned, he adds “sólo una jornada y es la tercera.” In making this statement he was but following Vera Tassis, 11 who ascribed the play as a whole to Calderón, Moreto, and

8 BAE, XXXIX, Catálogo razonado, p. xxx.
9 Indice, p. 23r.
10 Tirso’s play (Parte III, Francisco Martorell, Tortosa, 1634) has little if any connection with the comedy under consideration. Whereas his work has drawn inspiration from Lope’s pastoral novel, La Arcadia (See BAE, XXXVIII), Moreto and his collaborators used the comedy of the same name by Lope (Parte XIII, Barcelona, 1620). See The Dramatic Art of Moreto, pp. 131, 170–72.
11 Quoted from Hartzenbusch, BAE, XIV, note to p. 537.
“Don N. N.” and specifically stated that it is the third act which is Calderón’s.

Medel lists the three plays mentioned by Fajardo but in addition gives an Arcadia fingida attributed to Coello. In 1907 Stiefel pointed out the existence of a suelta of this name in the Munich library ascribed to Antonio Coello—one which he declares “identical throughout” to the play in question. With this clue, he suggests that Coello is probably “Don. N. N.”

Hartzenbusch, citing Vera Tassis for his authority, included La fingida Arcadia (as a work of collaboration) in his edition of Calderón. He willingly accepts the third act as this dramatist’s work, but he rejects the second for Moreto, declaring (p. 545): “En la jornada primera y en la tercera no se nombra a Carlos con don [al contrario de lo que pasa en el acto II]: esta particularidad y la diferencia general del estilo prueban que este acto no es de Moreto ni de Calderón. No sabemos quién le escribió; pero no puede dudarse que la comedia es de tres autores.”

Fernández-Guerra, on the other hand, found in the second act “algunos rasgos característicos” of Moreto’s style. This opinion was challenged by Mr. S. G. Morley, primarily on the strength of the sixty-eight-eight-syllable couplets that close the second act and the six-syllable assonants it contains. The fact that there are no redondillas in Act III made Mr. Morley reluctant likewise to accept this portion as Moreto’s. Observing that in the first edition, as well as in all sueltas of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it is attributed to Moreto without collaborators, Cotarelo reasons that its attribution to Calderón is without foundation.

I myself in making a general study of Moreto, wrote: “I cannot believe that the second act is Moreto’s. Mr. Morley’s observations concerning its versification seem quite valid to me and I find nothing

14 First published in the Escogidas, Parte XXV, Domingo García Morrás, Madrid, 1666. It is here attributed to Moreto alone. There are two other plays ascribed to Moreto in this same volume, La condesa de Belflor (Lope’s El perro del hortelano) and Sin honra no hay valentía which are not his. I have recently sent to press a study of the latter comedia.
15 BAE, XIV.
16 BAE, XXXIX, p. xxxiv.
18 La bibli. de Moreto, p. 28.
in the style that is particularly like Moreto’s. As for the third act, one must grant that La vida de San Alejo is the only play ascribed to Moreto alone which contains an act entirely without redondillas. Yet the Academia (16, pp. 553–554) in the third act is certainly characteristic of him, as is the story of the mad hidalgo (16, p. 554). Moreover, in changing the dénouement of Lope’s play in order to reward the faithful hero, the author of this act is certainly following the usual policy of Moreto. There is nothing in the first act that can be adduced as positive evidence in favor of its attribution to Moreto. One finds in it a fragment of dialogue (quoted on p. 54 of this study) which is thoroughly Calderonian. The gracioso throughout the comedy is a very pale figure for one of Moreto’s; on the other hand there is not in any portion the lyrical wealth that one usually associates with plays of Calderón. Such conflicting evidence makes it impossible to say with any degree of surety that such and such an act belongs to Moreto. I am inclined to think the third is his.”

I have, since making these comments, seen the suelta in Munich which is attributed to Coello. It is entitled La Arcadia fingida19 and its closing lines are:

Y a la Arcadia fingida
aquí da fin la comedia.

The edition of the Escogidas on the other hand, in spite of its attribution to Moreto alone and of its title, La fingida Arcadia, has for its final lines:

Es verdad porque se vea
en el Arcadia fingida
el primor de las finezas.

... y así sea
mi escoger pedir humilde
perdon de las faltas nuestras.

The earlier name, then, was probably El Arcadia fingida and not La fingida Arcadia.

19 La Arcadia fingida / Comedia famosa / de Don Antonio Coello / Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Porcia</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
<th>Cascabel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casandra</td>
<td>Federico</td>
<td>Chilindrón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Enrique</td>
<td>Fabricio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>Filiberto, barba</td>
<td>Músicos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suelta is without place or pagination; it numbers 32 pages. There is no ornamentation of any kind. I should judge it, both by its print and its paper, to be eighteenth century—later than either Medel’s or Fajardo’s Indice.
Stiefel was, in fact, mistaken in thinking the suelta at Munich "identical throughout" to the edition that is usually associated with Moreto's name. On the contrary, there are in each play additions and subtractions of such importance as to make it evident that both look back to a version now lost—one which was probably much longer than either of the editions which we have today. The Coello edition is nearer the original. In general one may summarize the changes by saying that the comic element of the Coello suelta has made way in the Escogidas play for an increase in the musical. The eight-syllable couplets are found in both and so are the six-syllable assonants.

What is the date of this work? It is, I think, fairly certain that it was written after January, 1643 and, if Coello had anything to do with it, before October 20, 1652 (the date of Coello's death). The plot of this play turns on a poisonous letter which causes death to any one who looks upon it. It is used here by one Fliberto who with it hopes to encompass the destruction of his niece Porcia and thus to usurp the throne of Cypress which is hers. He is, however, in the end destroyed by the same letter. This sounds very much as if it were an echo of the Borgia-like method, which the Conde-Duque de Olivares was supposed to have employed in 1622 to get rid of his uncle Don Baltasar de Zúñiga—a story which is almost certainly false and which still more certainly would not have been employed by court poets until after the favorite's fall in January, 1643.

Some of the more important passages found in the Escogidas which are omitted in the suelta are:

I, 45r: the 13-line song except for 4 verses.
II, 51v.-52r: the 40 lines beginning "Julia, yo he buscado un tema."
III, 58v: the 29-line passage beginning, "¿Qué estrella, cielos divinos."
III, 59r: the 24 lines beginning, "Ha, señor, qué suspensión."
III, 60r: some 100 lines beginning, "En tanto que Olimpo acude."

Some passages found in the Coello suelta that are lacking in the Escogidas are:
I, 3-4: a 12-line passage beginning "No de otra suerte en el soto."
I, 4: a 6-line passage starting "Bien sé yo que a Federico."
I, 10-11: the 29-verse passage beginning "No quite el dolor su oficio."
II, opening scene: 102-line quarrel between the two lackies Chilindrón and Cascabel.
II, 18-19: the 46 lines beginning "Turbada hermosura mía -."
III, 27: the 18 lines starting "Para que incapaz quedando -."

The number of smaller variants would run into the hundreds.

This story, which was one of the many that were invented after the fall of the Conde-Duque, appeared in Delitos y hechecierías. See G. Marañón's El conde-duque de Olivares, Madrid, 1936, pp. 327 and 487.
The play apparently floated about in manuscript until 1666. One asks why. There are two possible answers, if Coello had any part in its composition. This dramatist can hardly have been other than persona non grata to the ecclesiastical authorities after he abandoned his clerical robes. And with the harsh censorship of the theatre that they initiated in 1644 and which lasted (in spirit at least) until around 1651, it is not surprising that many of the plays of this author are today either in manuscript or else lost completely. Moreover, Coello made an exceedingly good marriage from the wordly point of view in January of 1645, and there was no financial pressure from this time until his death in 1652.

The play was apparently revived by Sebastián de Prado in 1664 for it is on record that he played an Arcadia before the King in that year. It was at that time, no doubt, that the changes were made in the version which two years later was to appear in the Escogidas series.

The matter of authorship must remain an unsolved problem until such a time as more is known of the dramatists of the day and in particular until the versification of their plays has been studied. I know of only one dramatist of this period who used 8-syllable couplets: Belmonte Bermúdez in his El cerco de Sevilla; and Bermúdez collaborated with Calderón in at least one instance. But this dramatist "eschewed almost entirely the use of the décima," according to Mr. Kincaid, having used it only in the collaboration, El mejor amigo el muerto; and he was particularly given to silvas.

24 See Cotarelo, Don Antonio Coello y Ochoa, in Bol. de la Real Acad. Esp., 1918, V, 563.
26 They are used only to the extent of 8 lines. See W. A. Kincaid, Life and Works of Luis de Belmonte Bermúdez, in Revue Hisp., 1928, LXXIV, 211, 236. Mr. Kincaid states: "There is no question of Belmonte's authorship of El cerco de Sevilla as several of the lines of the play and the poem [his La Hispálica] are identical. The details of the plot are very similar also."
Yet there are in *La fingida Arcadia* 100 lines of décimas in Act II and there are no silvas. He did employ 6-syllable assonants, and there is at least one play of his, *Las siete estrellas de Francia*, which has an act without redondillas.

Coello likewise was one of Calderón's collaborators—and on more than one occasion. There is in this act a detail that would point to Don Antonio: the first scene of this is the quarrel of two lackies over a certain "mondonga", Celia. This slang form is evidently used to apply to the maids of the palace, and it brings to mind Coello's satirical poem on *Las mondongas*, given in the *Academia burlesca* of 1637. The term would seem to have come into popular usage about that time. In the few plays of his that I have seen, none had eight-syllable couplets.

The one certain thing is that when the problem of attribution is solved, its author or authors will be found to be of the court circle that took part in the academies of the day. The atmosphere of the whole is completely palaciego. I am not at all certain that Moreto composed any portion of it, nor that he ever collaborated with Calderón. I suspect that if the latter lent a hand, it was in the first act not the third, but I can feel no degree of certainty on this matter until a study of Calderón's metrical habits has been made. I have no suggestions as to the identity of "Don N. N."  

**EL MEJOR ESPOSO**

A. L. Stiefel has pointed out that there is in the Staatsbibliothek at Munich a suelta entitled *El mejor esposo* which is ascribed in its final lines to Moreto:

> Y don Agustín Moreto  
> pide perdón, si es que el logro  
> de su esperanza merece  
> tener el perdón de todos.


[29] I am sufficiently acquainted with Rojas' versification to assert that it is not his.


[31] *El mejor esposo* / Comedia / famosa / de don Agustín Moreto. / Hablan en ella las personas siguientes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Virgen María</th>
<th>El niño Jesús</th>
<th>El Angel san Gabriel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joseph</td>
<td>Santa Isabel</td>
<td>Efraín y Isaacar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Zacarías</td>
<td>Ismael y Abner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Señora Santa Ana</td>
<td>Un sacerdote</td>
<td>Enaín, criado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without pagination, place, or publisher. It is, I should judge, an eighteenth-century suelta.
This play is not Moreto’s; it is Guillén de Castro’s *El mejor esposo, San José*,\(^\text{22}\) published in his *Segunda parte* in the year 1625. There have been a number of cuts throughout the play but particularly in the first and second acts;\(^\text{33}\) and in the second and third there have been added 120 lines—among them the four verses quoted above in which the play is attributed to Moreto.\(^\text{34}\)

One may be sure that Moreto never effected these changes. Aside from the fact that his plagiarism never extended to such wholesale proportions as this, and that the percentages of versification are in no way characteristic of him,\(^\text{35}\) the pen which altered this play of Guillén de Castro was so unskilled at verse-making as not to be able to find the necessary rhymes. In twelve lines of *redondillas* added in Act III,\(^\text{36}\) one finds *fuera* rhymed with *destreza*, *carga* with *alma*, *Ensín* with *sí*. Moreover, the very presence of Moreto’s name in the last lines makes it suspect. No play included in the *Primera parte*, the only volume put out under this dramatist’s own aegis, is so signed.


This play was most probably written after 1617, the date when the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was formally recognized by Rome. At this time Paulo V decreed “that no one should dare to teach publicly that the Holy Virgin was born in original sin”; and in 1622 Gregory V supplemented this order by another which forbade any one to question this doctrine “either in writings or private conversations.” Señor Juliá thinks it probable that it was written for some celebration of the Valencian carpenters’ guild. It is a reasonable surmise. See *Observaciones preliminares*, p. xxxv.

\(^\text{23}\) From each of the first two acts, nearly four hundred lines have been deleted; from the third, some fifty. A host of minor characters has been eliminated in the second act: Augustus Caesar, his captain, some senators, a sybil, etc.

\(^\text{34}\) There are 66 new lines in the second act and 54 in the third. Those in Act II are purely transitional in character; they were made necessary by the cuts in that act. Those in III have to do with the weight of the Cross which Jesus is to take on his shoulders. This addition but strengthens a scene of Castro’s which looks forward to the Crucifixion. Both plays end with the death of Joseph, “the best husband.”

\(^\text{35}\) There are in Castro’s play 3277 lines which are distributed as follows: *redondillas*, 1142; *romances*, 1064; *quintillas*, 275; *décimas*, 160; *tercetos*, 145; *silvas*, 94; *octavas*, 112; *liras*, 258; *songs*, 25; Latin, 2.

In the play attributed to Moreto, there are 2609 verses: *redondillas*, 968; *romances* 970; *quintillas*, 130; *liras* (mostly of the aBaBcC type), 222; *décimas*, 160; *tercetos*, 72; *silvas*, 60; *songs*, 25; Latin, 2.

\(^\text{36}\) These, together with 36 *romance* lines, have been inserted just preceding the entrance of Ismael, Efraín, etc., p. 597.
I suspect that some autor de comedias, or some actor in his company, made the cuts and additions. There is (in Act III) in the newly-added redondillas, to which I have alluded above, a reference to the play Caer para levantar, first published in the Escogidas of 1662 as a collaboration of Matos, Cáner, and Moreto. The methods of alteration employed in cutting this play of El mejor esposo are reminiscent of those which characterized the last three decades of the seventeenth century.
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