



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

“Truth fears nothing but concealment”:
Types of Secrets in Spanish Golden Age Comedies

Verfasserin

Mag. Alexandra Hauke

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2013

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 236 352

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Diplomstudium Romanistik Spanisch

Betreuerin / Betreuer:

Mag. Dr. Wolfram Aichinger

DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICITY

I confirm to have conceived and written this diploma thesis in English all by myself.

Quotations from other authors are all clearly marked and acknowledged in the bibliographical references, either in the form of footnotes or within the text. Any ideas borrowed and/or passages paraphrased from the works of other authors have been truthfully acknowledged and identified in the footnotes.

Alexandra Hauke

DEDICATION

To my mum, who will always be my hero;
To my dad, who has taught me how to fight for what I want;
To Marlis, who can always see straight into me;
And to Fabian, who always believes in me.

My most sincere thanks goes out to Prof. Wolfram Aichinger,
who, despite difficult circumstances,
has given me the opportunity to present this thesis
as the last hurdle of my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	TIRSO DE MOLINA.....	7
	2.1 <i>LA CELOSA DE SI MISMA</i> : THE POWER OF THE SECRET IN PSYCHOLOGICAL SELF-SPLITTING.....	10
	2.1.1 A SECRET FUTURE: MAGDALENA’S DILEMMAS BEYOND THE PLAY	25
3.	JUAN RUIZ DE ALARCÓN	30
	3.1 <i>LA VERDAD SOSPECHOSA</i> : DON GARCÍA’S NOTORIOUS GAME OF DECEPTION.....	33
	3.1.1 THE SECRET BEYOND THE PROTAGONIST: BELTRÁN, MADRID, AND THE LABYRINTH OF PARADOX	47
4.	PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA	52
	4.1 <i>GUÁRDATE DEL AGUA MANSA</i> : THE DUAL POWER OF THE SECRET	54
	4.1.1 THE STILLNESS OF THE WATER: MERGING MOLINA, ALARCÓN AND CALDERÓN.....	65
5.	CONCLUSION.....	67
6.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	71
7.	APPENDIX.....	74

1. INTRODUCTION

Silencio. Sobre este tema, uno podría creer que no hay nada que decir. El silencio sería vacío impenetrable e indescifrable, y por definición algo de lo que no se podría hablar. (Béziat 11)

[E]sta noción no es fácil de definir en el absolute, puesto que el silencio es la ausencia de ruido. [E]l silencio parece invadir el teatro [...]. Ya no es “un condimento” del texto, sino el elemento central de la composición. (Pavis, Diccionario 420)

Communication is a concept often too complex for people to grasp or for researchers to define in its entirety. Ever since the beginning of time, human beings have had the active need to communicate with each other, be it via physical gestures, mimic art or concrete verbal exchange. However, as much as the art of communication has evolved up until the 21st century, with its endless means of voice-on-voice action and messaging taking over, whenever people live in a community that shares certain traditions, principles and systems, they are still drawn to what is concealed or obscured, to what allows them to unveil or expose something or someone: the secret. It exists in a multitude of forms and the way in which it is treated by whoever has conjured it up depends on the following parameters:¹ what is concealed? Who is trustworthy enough to share the secret with? How can the secret be transmitted? Is it possible to discover someone else's secret, and, if yes, through which strategies? When

¹ cf. Aichinger 10.

should the secret be unveiled? Which consequences does the process of uncovering entail? How much power do secret-bearers exert over others?

Since the idea of the secret has existed as long as communication itself has, and in every public and private community imaginable, it is only natural that it is tightly linked with lying and deception. Georg Simmel, a very prominent German philosopher and sociologist, discussed in his study on secrets and the significance of the secret in society how essential this topic is for anthropologists and social sciences. He explained that

alles das, was wir einem Andern mit Worten oder etwa auf sonstige Weise mitteilen, auch das Subjektivste, Impulsivste, Vertrauteste, [ist] eine Auswahl aus [unserem] seelisch-wirklichen Ganzen. [...] Von dieser selbstverständlichen, apriorischen, sozusagen absoluten Voraussetzung werden die relativen Unterschiede umfaßt, die wir als das aufrichtige Uns-Offenbaren und das lügenhafte Uns-Verbergen kennen. Jede Lüge, wie sachlicher Natur auch ihr Gegenstand sei, ist ihrem inneren Wesen nach eine Irrtumserregung über das lügende Subjekt: denn sie besteht darin, daß der Lügner die wahre Vorstellung, die er besitzt, dem Andern verbirgt.

Nicht, daß der Belogene über die Sache eine falsche Vorstellung hat, erschöpft das spezifische Wesen der Lüge - das teilt sie mit dem einfachen Irrtum; sondern daß er über die innere Meinung der lügenden Person in Täuschung erhalten wird. Wahrhaftigkeit und Lüge nun sind für die Verhältnisse der Menschen untereinander von der weittragendsten Bedeutung. (259-60)

Therefore, depending on the relationship an individual has with his/her conversational partner, it seems only natural that certain (social) aspects of one's past and present life will remain hidden from others. Based on Simmel's study, the notion of the secret can hence be established as a "triad of interaction", where the acts of secrecy, concealment and exposure come into play as the three main plot threads of communication. Analogous to this, three agents revolve around this game of hide and seek, (at least) two of which function as the secret-bearers, and another as the excluded outside observer the secret is kept from.² Social proximity (between agents one and two) and distance (from agent three) are essentially affected by this structure of secrecy which automatically gives rise to a whole new world of mystery.³

For centuries, the aforementioned questions concerning the content, agents, exposure, consequences and power of the secret have been treated not only by anthropologists

² cf. Nedelmann 1-3. The third triadic element is either a person – or maybe even several – or society itself, unaware of the secret that is being dealt with.

³ cf. Simmel 272.

and sociologists, but also by authors in their works of fiction. Mysterious phenomena are of particular interest to readers and writers alike, as, when the real world becomes troubling, both groups exile themselves to the world of imagination. Modern society would be incomplete without systematic concealment, be it on a personal (agent-to-agent) or more official (agent-to-society, or vice versa)⁴ level, just as much as literature would be unimaginable without tales of crime or conundrums in which secrets must be uncovered and liars must be exposed in order to achieve a unified (happy or unhappy) ending. An exemplary genre of this type of narrative, in which the notion of the secret is interwoven as a somewhat second main plot, is the Spanish Golden Age comedy of the 17th century.

As a “comic” version of the drama, the comedy encompasses in “the fictional mode [...] the expression of a single psyche [the author’s] through a multiple world of characters and their actions” (Rozik 1). Authors of this genre have thereby established the tradition of critiquing the society they lived in through caricaturing stock characters as well as their weaknesses and failures while entertaining the audience with humorous dialogues and characters the audience can easily identify with or laugh at. Lope de Vega has proven himself as the pioneer writer of the Spanish *comedia*; it is due to his *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (1609) that the comedy has become a typical three-act play with *galanes* (noblemen, inamoratos), *damas* (ladies), *graciosos* (jokers, servants) and *criadas* (maids) as its stock characters.⁵ A second stage of Golden Age Theater was then initiated by Pedro Calderón de la Barca, Spain’s other legendary 17th-century dramatist and Lope’s successor in this art. Calderon’s strength lay with the morally and philosophically complex *autos sacramentales* of which he created more than 80; his comedic masterpieces include, for example, *El secreto a voces* (1642)⁶, which deals with the subject of the secret on the Spanish court and, as will be made clear during the course of this analysis, obviously had a bearing on his contemporaries with regard to this theme. With a compound variety of literary masterpieces, the authors mentioned in this study have made a major contribution to

⁴ Agent-to-agent: family, friendship, or marriage; agent-to-society: state/government secrets.

⁵ Lope de Vega’s most famous comedies are *La viuda valenciana* (1600), *La dama boba* (1613), *La hermosa fea* (1630/32) and *La discreta enamorada* (1606), among others.

⁶ *El secreto a voces* is by far not Calderón’s most popular work; he is most commonly known for *La vida es sueño* (1636), *La dama duende* (1629) and *El médico de su honra* (1637).

the *comedias de capada y espada* (cloak-and-dagger play/comedy of cape and sword), which, together with the *comedia de enredo* (comedy of situation/intrigue), the *comedia de carácter* (comedy of character) and the *comedia de figurón* (satire/comedy of social caricature), make up the four main sub-genres of the Spanish *comedia*.⁷

All four of these categories serve not only to analyze the genre of the Spanish comedy in detail, but especially the notion of secret-bearing on a more global scale. Three prominent dramatists of the Spanish Golden Age, Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón and the aforementioned comedy-champion Pedro Calderón de la Barca, deserve closer attention and, thus, by casting a detailed look at one play by each of these authors, different types of concealment and revelation will be identified in order to offer a multidimensional picture of the comedy.

In Tirso de Molina's *La celosa de si misma*, the protagonist unlocks a world of mystery through physical and verbal disguise that lead to her own identity crisis. Through Magdalena's intrinsic self-splitting into several personalities, the reader becomes witness to her discontent and struggle with herself, a "victim of disguise, [...] her own competitor for the love of Don Melchor [and] a phantom self, an idealized version that she can neither control nor surpass" (Turner 55-56). Stimulated by Magdalena's scheming actions, the plot seems to spin out of control as more and more characters enter the world of verbal and physical concealment. Through the semantic field of (non-)vision, Molina demonstrates how his *dramatis personae* overcome their secret-keeping and unveil Magdalena's, as well as the others', true identity. This analysis will consider *La celosa de si misma*, one of Molina's major comedies of intrigue, in terms of the secrets inherent in physical and verbal disguise that lead to the protagonist's multiplicity of identity.

Further, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón's *La verdad sospechosa* offers, as the title suggests, a much more verbal display of secrets in which physical disguise is mainly replaced with misunderstandings, ambiguities and mistaken identities. Yet again, a love story triggers confusion between several characters, leading the protagonist Don García to

⁷ cf. Pavis, *Dictionary* 63. The *comedia de carácter* is often also referred to as the *comedia de caracteres*.

marry the wrong woman without any chance to redeem his mistakes. Through consistent lying and an unhappy ending for the protagonist, Alarcón demonstrates that secret-keeping is “a thematic concern which runs through the body of [his] work and plays an important if not predominant part in it” and “that [he] deals with it in a way that is more intellectually complex and morally serious” (Castells 34) than many plays of the same era. The author analyzes a type of deception “of greater human and social significance than ‘honesty is the best policy’, [...] rooted in moral consciousness and responsibility” (DiLillo 254), and thereby casts a light on and inherently criticizes baroque society without extenuating any of the mendacity and superciliousness he personally experienced. Thus, *La verdad sospechosa*, Alarcón’s most famous comedy of character,⁸ offers a genuine picture of how secret-keeping can lead to an individual’s ultimate downfall, not only in the play itself, but on a more universal scale, allowing for an analysis of a deeply devious protagonist and his verbal tactics.

Ultimately, Pedro Calderón de la Barca’s involvement in the development of the Spanish comedy shall be honored by an in-depth look at *Guárdate del agua mansa*. Despite this play’s low degree of familiarity among contemporary readers, the author proves his reputation as the father of the second generation of 17th-century Spanish dramatists by offering multifaceted characters whose games of charade demonstrate how elaborately a secret can alter one’s perspective and, essentially, identity. Clara, the silent-turned-blattant female protagonist referred to in the title, finds herself forced to act against her disregarded position in her family as well as society as she is mistaken for her flagrant-turned-decent sister Eugenia, who becomes a victim of her own atrociousness as well as the exposure of Clara’s long-kept personal secret that is the “agua mansa.” The “stage action is constructed on [...] dualism”, inherent mainly in the personalities of the two sisters, and “so is the theme constructed on a constant duality, swaying between secrecy and deception, truth and falsehood, loyalty and betrayal, wooing and duelling, comedy and tragedy” (Parker, *Mind and Art* 143). Through the exposure of Clara’s true self and the discovery of her voice, this

⁸ “Con la comedia de caracteres, el aliento dramático se atiene a un sentido común más cotidiano que poético; la trama se simplifica, lo que impide repetir situaciones o crear paralelismos entre escenas y actos, pues lo [...] que importa en este tipo de comedia es que los galanes (fundamentalmente) demuestren quiénes son, qué carácter se esconde tras su nobelza, su riqueza, su pobreza, su belleza o su fealdad. [Eso] permita que la palabra, y no tanto el movimiento, defina los caracteres” (Josa 98).

eventually leads to her victory over her younger sister; in the end, Clara is no longer a still water. Calderón's comedy of intrigue opts for a versatile view of secret-keeping, combining its aspects with the other two plays investigated herein.

The following analysis will survey Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón, and Pedro Calderón de la Barca in connection with the presented comedies and the different types of secrets presented therein. In its particular sub-genre, each play offers dilemmas of concealment the protagonists have to deal with, and, thereby, the formerly proposed questions concerning the form, the accomplices, the transmission and the exposure of the particular secrets shall be answered. Whether the secret is based on self-centered lying and deception or physical disguise, and whether the story eventually ends positively or not, it remains clear that in the three plays presented in this study the loss and (re)discovery of the main characters' multifaceted identities through secret-keeping and -exposing are at the center of attention. Therefore, what is essentially analyzed is what is either falsely said or not said at all, for, sometimes, silence speaks louder than words.

2. TIRSO DE MOLINA

Tirso certainly did take heed of the warning to maintain close ties to the visual world. Indeed, he seems to owe an obvious debt to the emblem's marriage of the verbal and the visual. Tirso's most creative use of the emblem is clearly the invention of emblematic discovery scenes and apariencias, thus demonstrating that emblematic representation fulfilled drama's unique potential to show, tell, please, and teach, all at the same time. (Cull 634)

Gabriel Téllez, better known to the (literary) world as Tirso de Molina, is considered one of the major authors of the Spanish Golden Age for his more than 400 written plays (*autos sacramentales* and *comedias*), out of which approximately 80 remain extant. As a monk of the Order of Mercedarians, Molina contributed to the worldwide emergence and development of literary myths and theories and established most of his theatric work in the genre of the comedy, more specifically the comedy of intrigue. Thereby,

he used the dramatic form that he had inherited and added to it his wit, his command of dramatic and theatrical construction, his subtlety, and, above all, his ability to create characters and situations of mythic proportions. The result was an enormous body of work within which some dozen plays are equal to the finest of Lope. (Hochman 419)

His most famous works feature one of the best-known stock characters of all time: the legend of Don Juan. *El burlador de Sevilla* (1619) and *El condenado por desconfiado* (1635) revolve around this phenomenon and have gained Molina the reputation as the father of the Don Juan myth, despite the fact that many later versions are far more

popular today.⁹ These two plays also express Tirso's belief that "saintliness can easily be converted to evil and the worst sinners to saints" (Hochman 420), a notion that most definitely contributed to his censure by the Junta de Reformatión de las Costumbres in 1625. He was prone to depict temporal issues like societal and religious immorality too explicitly and was banned from further dramatic contributions, urging him to dedicate himself to chronicle work until his death in 1648.¹⁰

In his dramas, Molina was able to create a world in which the characters are as exuberant as the stories themselves, the plots as daring as the protagonists' actions and in which the comedy itself excels on a level so deep the reader can never doubt the masterpiece before him. Molina "subscribed to Lope de Vega's ideas on the theater: he disregarded the unities, mixed the tragic with the comic, and emphasized, above all, a theatrical theater – entertaining and dynamic" (Flores 82). His Don Juan exalts virile power and so both *El burlador de Sevilla* and *El condenado por desconfiado* play with this strong, worldly character in connection with religion and society as people perceived it in 17th-century Spain. Furthermore, Molina presents in most of his works, though interestingly not the two aforementioned masterpieces, a notion typical for Spanish Golden Age drama and thus for the comedy of intrigue: secret-keeping, lying and disguising oneself are presented as daily agendas, so the author portrays *secretos a voces*, open secrets similar to those of Calderón in his magnificent play of the same title.

Molina distinguishes himself from his contemporaries not only through the emergence and presentation of his ideas, but mostly through the creation and development of his female characters. He does submerge to the typical 17th-century notion of (female) disguise and cross-dressing in connection with the secrets he depicts, but attributes more depth to the women he depicts by exploring their personalities and identities.¹¹ Despite the fact that Molina never received the same literary popularity as Lope de

⁹ Molière (*Don Juan*, 1665/1682) and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (*Don Giovanni*, 1787) are among those authors mostly accredited with the first creations of Don Juan as the seducer, corrupter and taunter he is known to be. Therefore, "[i]t is ironic that although Tirso himself is comparatively unknown among great dramatists, his creation is one of the best known of all literary characters" (Hochman 419).

¹⁰ Among his last publications as chronicler is the *Historia General de la Orden de la Merced* (1637) in which he portrays the history and development of his Order.

¹¹ cf. Halkhoree 39.

Vega or Pedro Calderón de la Barca, it appears that his many female protagonists offer so much insight into the human psyche that he more than makes up for this lack of stage dominance. Also, his deep involvement with these women and their detailed characteristic outlines counteract the many complex plots he has often been criticized for. It appears that Molina's focus lies so determinedly on his personae that story development only ranks second: "difficulties appear in his plots [due to] lack of verisimilitude, awkward endings, and a tendency to place too much trust in the audience to understand his plot structure" (Turner 8). Nevertheless, he remains the undisputed hero in character development. It has been said that "[s]us mujeres no son enternecedoras como las de Lope, no orgullosas como las de Calderón, sino mucho más naturales, atrevidas, apasionadas, y resueltas" (Hernández García 97), they are clever, quizzical and crafty, and understand to tamper with the truth to reach their goals without viciously manipulating their fellows.

La celosa de si misma, Molina's play most relevant to this analysis, demonstrates a female protagonist who can only be described as truly *tirsiana*. Despite the fact that this drama is definitely not among his most popular ones, it excels in character presentation, plot intertwining and secret-keeping on the Spanish Golden Age court and should not remain disregarded.

2.1 *LA CELOSA DE SI MISMA*: THE POWER OF THE SECRET IN PSYCHOLOGICAL SELF-SPLITTING

*Un secreto
me guardad, si sois discreto. (2.1856-57)*

*Pues si aquí con vos se casa,
todo en fin se cae en casa.
De lo parlado me pesa;
mas este anillo me quita
el frenillo del secreto;
que es como salvia en efeto,
que la lengua facilita. (2.1944-50)*¹²

La celosa de si misma introduces a female protagonist in its title, but it is Don Melchor the reader encounters as the first character of the play. In a street in Madrid, where he has just arrived with his servant Ventura, Melchor informs the reader of the reason for his onset:

Vamos, que es tarde y deseo
ya conocer a mi esposa;
que dicen que es muy hermosa.
[...]
Cuidados
diferentes han de darme
motivo de ser su esposo;
que aunque el dinero es hermoso,
yo no tengo de casarme,
si no fuere con belleza
y virtud. Esto es notorio. (1.93-95, 100-06)

¹² All references to Tirso de Molina's *La celosa de si misma* in section 2 of this study will be given in parentheses as "act.line-line."

He is already spoken for to a beautiful woman unknown to him, and it remains clear that Melchor would settle for no less in a wife than an astonishing beauty. After the reader meets Don Jerónimo, the female protagonist Doña Magdalena's brother, and Don Sebastián, who will be Melchor's competitor for the love of the lady, Melchor and Ventura lay eyes on a mysterious beauty near a church, and the galán is immediately smitten with her:

¡Ay, qué bella
imagen vi, si es imagen
quien a sí se representa!
¡Ay si de la Soledad
esta hermosa imagen fuera,
y no de la compañía,
porque ninguna tuviera! (1.290-96)

At this point Melchor already foreshadows the message of the story: he does not see his mysterious beloved, but an image of her representing herself, just as Magdalena will later produce an actual mirror image of herself. Who she is must remain the essential secret to Don Melchor. Ventura mocks his master as he realizes that Melchor is infatuated with her after only catching sight of her hand:

¡Al primer tapón zurrapas!
[...]
¿De una mano te enamoras,
por el sebo portuguesa,
dulce por la virgen miel, 355
y amarga por las almendras,
sin un adarme de cara,
sin ver un ojo, una ceja,
un asomo de nariz,
una pestaña siquiera? (1.297, 353-60)

Thereby, Molina introduces the opposing view between Melchor and Ventura. The gracioso understands how ridiculous Melchor's obsession with the unknown woman is while the galán presents himself as a vain guy who, even though he is already planning to marry someone else, wants to pursue the one the pretty hand belongs to. He cannot know that his former betrothed and the mystery woman are one and the same; the key secret of the plot has thus been established.

As the sceptical Ventura tries to talk sense into his master, Melchor can only confirm his superficial self yet again:

[Y] yo, de la suerte mesma,

conjeturo por la mano
qué tal será la belleza. (1.387-90)

He infers from the hand that the woman herself must be beautiful in her entirety – Magdalena herself remains *tapada* to him. This proves that what Melchor is really looking for is love itself, not the one woman he will truly fall in love with and will want to marry. “It is within this context, that of the conflict between reality and image, that disguise and identity come into play. [...] Melchor is rejecting Magdalena’s reality for a mental construct” (Turner 57-58). He ignores that all she essentially is to him is a secret, but instead of uncovering her identity, he establishes his own version of her in his head and thereby creates a new but technically inexistent identity that completes Magdalena’s psychological split. He is drawn to the unknown, to the masked, to a representation of something he cannot grasp.

Basta que el avaro manto
sirva de nube sagrada
a esa gloria idolatrada.
Descubríos, blanca aurora,
que dirán que sois traidora,
pues dais muerte, disfrazada. (1.453-58)

As Melchor first speaks with his unknown beloved he mentions the coat she is covered with, an actual way of disguise already thousands of years old.

Women originally were covered up to control or distance their untrustworthy nature, but when early Christianity adopted the custom it was interpreted as an indication of modesty and desire to avoid arousing male passion. [...] The *tapada* [...] used a veil or shawl of varying material, style, and quality, wrapping it around her head and shoulders but leaving one eye, and sometimes a shoulder [or] hand, revealed. By this time, the practice began to be equated with false modesty, coquetry, and deceit. [...] Poets and writers throughout the Golden Age depicted *tapadas* or referred to the practice, [and all represented the *tapada* as a deceptive, flirtatious, brazen woman who never fails to charm the men, then swindle and/or betray them. (Pérez and Ihrie 159)

In the previous quote from the play, “manto”, “nube” and “disfrazada” are three words Melchor uses to refer to Magdalena, all of which characterize her as the secret *tapada*. She remains disguised, covered by her veil like a cloud would the sky; “que al sol quitéis el nublado. / Vea yo el cielo estrellado / que en ese manto se esconde” (1.522-24). The dichotomy of seeing but not really seeing her introduces the semantic field of vision and sight that the author refers to frequently during the play: Melchor refers to his eyes and to what he sees in Magdalena, a semantic oxymoron, for he can see as

little of Magdalena as he could of a star in a cloud-covered sky.¹³ When he realizes the woman's disinterest in him, he fabricates a lie to keep her close. He intends to return her purse which was allegedly stolen by an unknown third party; in truth, he presents her with his own purse and convinces her to return the next day to affirm the rightful owner has come to claim it. As a promise to return, Magdalena offers all but her hand.

MAGDALENA: A las dos
volveré, sólo por vos,
que sois galán cortesano.
MELCHOR: Dadme una seña.
MAGDALENA: Esta mano.
Quítase de una mano el guante (1.594-99)

While in the beginning Magdalena's disguise served only as a symbol of female tradition in Spanish society, Melchor ascribes meaning to her physical dress and thus turns her into the secret she will remain to him until the end of the story. Due to this infatuation with the mental image he has created, he contemplates but cannot understand the common proverb "love is blind":

No sé lo que os diga en eso;
lo que sobra por oídas
y lo que basta hasta verlo.
No sé yo por qué al Amor
le llaman y pintan ciego,
pues lo que no ve no estima. (1.802-07)

He states that he cannot appreciate what he cannot see, wherein Molina presents another duality within the semantics of vision, for Melchor does the exact opposite of what he says: his unjustified emotional mania stems from his inability to see Magdalena. Therefore, it is not that he can only love what he *can* see, but that he tries to force himself to love what he *cannot* see, the mystery woman. He is just as blind as the cupid he condemns.

In the following scene, together with Don Jerónimo, Melchor meets his cousin, Don Luis, and realizes that the man is in love with Doña Magdalena, the woman originally promised to himself. At this moment the reader realizes that the many secrets of the

¹³ "[P]orque hay ojos / que cuidadosos nos ven, / y no sé que os esté bien, / si dais motivos a enojos" (1.559-62).

play do not only occur on the physical level of disguise, and not only between the two protagonists, but also on a more verbal sphere.

MELCHOR: Don Luís, si sois discreto,
¿por qué me habláis con preñeces?
[...]
Primo, puesto que a casarme
de León a Madrid vengo,
no es de suerte enamorado
al interés que pretendo
que no sea lince mi honor,
con que velando penetro
dificultades que esconden
vuestros confusos misterios. (1.817-18, 837-44)

Unwilling to disclose his secret love for Magdalena at first, Luis speaks in riddles. Molina uses words such as “preñeces” and “misterios” to draw the reader’s attention directly to the fact that certain things are hidden; thus, the language (of secrets) that is used plays an essential role in the story. Luis then pledges his friendship with Melchor to be more important than the love for a woman, while Melchor tries to use this opportunity to talk himself out of his commitment with the unknown Magdalena, for his heart belongs to the *tapada* alone. Yet again, Molina stresses the notion of sight and proves how deep-seated the allure of the woman-secret already is in Melchor:

Ni yo a quien amáis he visto,
ni en viéndola me prometo
tanto, que pueda mudar
las memorias que conservo.
¿Qué sé yo si agradaré
a esa dama, que habrá hecho
ausente retratos míos
allá en el entendimiento,
y por no corresponder
el original con ellos,
me aborrezca, pues no iguala
la verdad a los deseos? (881-92)

He justifies that the image he has created of his fiancée will never correspond to reality, which is why he is willing to step aside for Don Luis.

At the same time, Doña Magdalena finds herself contemplating an idea about Melchor in a conversation with her servant Quiñones that corresponds to his musings about her. Unable to forget the stranger she met at the church, Magdalena is befallen by sadness, because she is obliged to honor society’s rules and marry her promised one. However,

she is reluctant to accept defeat as she makes further plans to break this promise and marry the mystery man. As has become apparent by now, Molina “presents disguise as one way in which to circumscribe the restrictions of society” (Turner 66).

Magdalena’s idea of her beloved from the church is more comprehensible to the reader, however, than Melchor’s image of her. She can base her obsession on a complete visual while projecting all her hopes onto this picture, disregarding meanwhile the fiancé she was so eager to meet before. Melchor, however, cannot get over the fact that his future with the *tapada* is literally unforeseeable:

¡Ay mano! ¡Ay cristal! ¡Ay cielo!
Con una mano en los ojos,
¿qué he de ver estando ciego? (1.893-95)

It is Don Alonso, Magdalena’s father, who eventually arranges the long-desired meeting between the two protagonists: he intends to honor his cordial commitment to his friend Don Juan, Melchor’s father, whom he has promised to unite their children in marriage. In this key scene of the play, the secrets between Magdalena and Melchor collide. They see each other for the first time, and for Magdalena it appears that her dreams have come true: her fiancé and her idealized mystery man merge into the same person. As she presents her hand to Melchor and his servant, it is Ventura who acknowledges it as the hand of the *tapada*. His master, however, is still blinded by his love for the unknown version of Magdalena and dismisses Ventura’s musings as “blasphemy”:

VENTURA: ¿Qué hermosura
se igualará a la presente?
Pero, dejando la cara,
en la candidez repara
de aquella mano esplendente,
que es la misma, vive Dios,
que melindrizó el bolsillo.
MELCHOR: Anda, borracho; aun decillo
es blasfemia.
VENTURA: No est[á]is vos,
señor, con juicio cabal. (1.1068-78; my emphasis)

Ventura intends to make Melchor aware of the equality of the two hands, whereby he weakens Magdalena’s secret and has also secretly exposed the lady, but what comes to be the incessant truth is never revealed, not even between Ventura and Magdalena.

Through Melchor's words, it becomes clear that he is incapable of seeing the truth; "seeing incorrectly is precisely Melchor's greatest problem" (Blue qtd. in Turner 68). He clings, instead, onto the secret he has come to love so much. Magdalena's hand, an objective physical indicator of the truth behind the accidental deception, remains disregarded by Melchor as he cannot see the resemblance to the *tapada's*.

MELCHOR: Ésta es asco, es un carbón.

Es en su comparación
el yeso junto al cristal.

A sus divinos despojos
no hay igualdad.

VENTURA: Yo la vi,
cuando me llevó tras sí
con el bolsillo los ojos,
y juro a Dios que es la propia.

MELCHOR: Enviaréte noramala,
si no callas, necio. Iguala
la Scitia con la Etiopia.
La mano que a mí me ha muerto,
de una vuelta se adornaba
de red...

VENTURA: (Bolsillos pescaba.) **Aparte**

MELCHOR: ...y ésta trae el puño abierto.

VENTURA: No estaba el otro cerrado
para agarrar los doscientos.
Llégala a hablar. (1.1078-96)

As the true Magdalena before him appears ugly to Melchor and can in no way compare to the beauty of his loved one, the psychological splitting of the female protagonist is complete. While it can be believed that Melchor cannot distinguish the one version of Magdalena from the other, he has in truth created a third dimension of her, for it is not the secretive identity of Magdalena he met at the church he yearns for, but a whole other person he cannot bring into relation with this woman at all. Due to the fact that Magdalena does not uncover the confusion of identities at this point, the secret that is her twofold/threefold existence is raised to yet another level. Molina could end his play with the exposure of the two lovers and a happy marriage at this point, because it is only Melchor now who is left in the dark about Magdalena's identity. Instead, the lady begins to doubt Melchor's love for her true self because of his idealized emotions for her other, secret, self in an emotional and worrying monologue.

MAGDALENA: Mas, ¿con qué seguridad
rendiré mi voluntad
a quien, con tan fácil fe,
la primer mujer que ve

triunfa de su voluntad?
Hombre que a darme la mano
viene aquí desde León
y es tan mudable y liviano
que a la primera ocasión,
liberal y cortesano,
a un manto rinde despojos
y a una mano el alma ofrece.
¿No quieres que me dé enojos
quien así se desvanece?
Y sin penetrar sus ojos
lo que, por no ver, ignora,
se suspende y enamora,
exagera, sutiliza,
y palabras autoriza,
pues con escudos las dora.
¿Qué satisfacción dará
a quien por dueño le espera?
¿O quién me asegurará
de voluntad tan ligera,
que, desposado, no hará
lo mismo con cuantas mire,
y yo con él mal casada,
quejas al alma retire,
llore mi hacienda gastada,
y sus mudanzas suspire? (2.1234-63)

In the following offside conversation between Magdalena and Quiñones, the protagonist presents the profoundness of her character. Her servant cannot understand her predicament; she reflects the point of view of the reader when asking who Magdalena could possibly be jealous of, now that she knows that it is precisely *her* Melchor has fallen in love with. Magdalena, however, doubts Melchor's true intentions as she realizes that his love was not directed at her, but only at the secret identity behind her veil and hand. She brings the title of the story into play as she formulates her concerns:

QUIÑONES: ¡Pues siendo tú quien despierta
su voluntad, y encubierta
diste causa a sus desvelos,
¿de quién puedes formar celos?
MAGDALENA: **De mí misma.** Y está cierta
que si le amé forastero,
doméstico y dueño ya,
dudo, al paso que le quiero. (2.1264-71; my emphasis)

At this point, Magdalena's actions fall in line with Melchor's. She has come to be her own competitor, jealous of herself and incapable of fully loving Melchor when he can

only appreciate one version of her, and an unknown version at that. Thus, from now on, Magdalena will knowingly split her personality to represent both the *tapada* and the lady, as she will see fit. Quiñones's words of consolation and encouragement are in vain when she promises Magdalena that Melchor "te olvidará por ti propia" (2.1283) because she does not see her mistress's worries for Melchor's intentions.

Magdalena's plan to meet Melchor the next day dressed in untypical clothes confuse Quiñones even more. When she asks her mistress about her plan, Magdalena's distrust in her servant surfaces. She does not confide in her collaborator, as would be expected, but understands that the self-centered servant is not to be trusted with her secrets. Thus, it seems that Magdalena breaks with an essential notion of secret-keeping: she disregards Quiñones as her agent-accomplice and takes matters into her own hands instead. Magdalena hires a secret servant and covers herself entirely in funeral-like robes so that no one can expect it to be her. She meets Melchor and informs him that she has heard of his commitment to "[u]na Doña Magdalena, / noble cuerda, hermosa y rica" (2.1507-08). The lady speaks about herself in third person, and it is at this moment that she vigorously conjures up a new personality and lies to her wannabe-lover. Up to this point, Magdalena's second identity was only a passive image contemplated in words and idealized in Melchor's mind. As she systematically presents herself before Melchor as this other *tapada* and schemes about Magdalena, it becomes clear that the secret selves now actively rest within her. She has verbalized the core secret of the story and is now a dynamic participator in this role-play of hers. She is determined to continue impersonating this new masked woman as she is "driven, above all, by an irresistible urge to test Don Melchor, fearing that the ease with which he has fallen for another woman is a sign that he will make a flighty husband" (Smith). She must therefore speak and act as a whole new person. "This is the value of disguise. Where power and speech cannot be openly exercised, there is still the possibility to speak as the unknown, the Other" (Turner 79), i.e. the fact that Magdalena feels that she cannot verbally expose her true identity spurs on the plot of secrets, and even sets a new one in motion.

She involves her new servant, the footman Santillana, in her act as the new *tapada* to make her character more believable, which proves how committed Magdalena is to

defrauding everyone and to finding out Melchor's true intentions. In her conversation with the galán about Magdalena – her true self – the lady submits to destabilizing her secret:

Pero no,
que **vuestro deseo me pinta**
más bella de lo que soy,
y temo perder la estima
en que **estoy imaginada,**
cuando no la iguale, vista.
Aunque no quiero tampoco
desacreditar la dicha
que en vuestro amor intereso
si por no verme se entibia.
Yo os juro a fe de **quien soy,**
si es licito que se siga
la pública voz y fama
que tengo de aquesta villa,
que no es doña Magdalena
ni más bella, ni más rica,
ni más moza, ni más sabia,
ni más noble, ni más digna
de serviros y estimaros
que yo; y aunque coronista
de mis mismas alabanzas,
en competencias se admitan,
si no créis **estas verdades.** (2.1575-97; my emphasis)

Similarly to Ventura before, who tried to unveil to Melchor the singularity of Magdalena's identities, the lady exposes herself in a covert way to Melchor. She refers to his blind error of attributing perfection to an image he has never seen ("me pinta / más bella de lo que soy") and swears that his beloved is no more beautiful or rich than herself, in which she tells the obvious truth ("estas verdades"). She can rely on Melchor's blindness and disbelieving stance not to grasp that she and Magdalena are one and the same, and at the same time she does not have to lie concerning her appearance or possessions. Through her choice of words, she treats her secret in a very subtle and diplomatic way, and yet her hopes are crushed and her apprehensions verified:

MELCHOR: Por la luz pura y divina
que amante adoro y no veo,
que os juzgo por maravilla
de la belleza, y que os hace
la comparación traída
agravio en mi estimación
como la noche hace al día. (2.1508-1604)

As Melchor compares Magdalena's beauty to that of the *tapada* as he would compare day to night, he unknowingly alludes again to the duality of the lady's character. Both versions live within one person, but to him they could not resemble each other less. Magdalena then invites Melchor to her own house as the *tapada*, which he willingly accepts, and offers him as well as Ventura to expose her eyes. When he discovers these eyes, he is obviously *looking*, but is not really *seeing*: the importance of vision is undermined as Magdalena must remain hidden for the time being. It seems to the reader, however, that her plan is starting to crumble when her new servant, Santillana, ascribes a name to her as the covered unknown woman, the *Condesa de Chirinola*. Magdalena has no other option than to play along with this unexpected turn of events while fearing that her fake identity has been "hijacked," as Dawn Smith terms this process. It is now possible for Magdalena to be traced and found out through the name and address Santillana provides about the inexistent Countess.¹⁴ Yet again, Magdalena's secret has hit an unimaginable state: she must now impersonate the Countess and can no longer remain the covered woman no one knows in order not to embarrass herself through exposure. Her many identities start to spin out of control ("Y compitiendo conmigo, / de mí misma estoy celosa" [1967-68]) up to the point where she sees no other way out than to resolve part of the problem, and thereby part of the identity. As she realizes through her conversation with Melchor that his desire for the imagined beloved is stronger than his desire for Magdalena herself, she lies to her father, Don Alonso, saying that Melchor is now promised to another woman and therefore she should marry Sebastián and Ángela should marry her brother, Jerónimo. At the same time, Magdalena tells Melchor that the Countess had to leave town for she, too, is promised to marry someone else. The reader understands that Magdalena is overwhelmed with the net of secrets she is caught in and must eliminate as much of the vicious circle as she can in order to still succeed in her ultimate goal and end up with Melchor anyway. For the second time now Molina offers a potential last scene of the play. The characters have all found someone to marry, despite the fact that no one is promised to the one they truly love. Therefore, the final lines of this second act "could be read as a morality tale in which desire and Melchor's need to chase the unreal are

¹⁴ cf. Turner 81-82.

punished” (Turner 86) just as much as Magdalena’s incapability of trusting the one she loves.

MAGDALENA: Según esto, no te espante
que me obligue la Fortuna
a ser conmigo importuna,
y quiera ser sola amada;
pues soy dos imaginada,
aunque en la verdad soy una. (2.2013-18)

As Magdalena now aims to rid herself off of her fake identity as the Countess in order to gain back some control over her future, Melchor, at the same time, would rather remain in his haze for the unknown woman and return to León the poor man he has become than honor his commitment to the real Magdalena:

He seems the perfect negative example. His stubbornness and failure to keep his promise to Magdalena seem to have been justly punished. Such a conclusion would appear to support the traditional societal structure and warn against grasping for that which is not in reach. (Turner 87)

As the third act enrolls, Molina makes it clear that his plot of secrets has not come to its conclusion. Despite the obvious despicable traits that have surfaced in Melchor, the reader has now found hope again for the characters to be married happily. Magdalena obviously shares the same hope: even though her true self has been treated badly by Melchor this entire time, her love for him urges her to return to him as the Countess once again.

MELCHOR: **Lee**
*Por asegurarme de vuestro amor,
he fingido jornadas que no pienso hacer,
y casamientos de que estoy libre, puesto
que doña Magdalena, engañada por mí,
haya publicado lo uno y lo otro por
verdadero. Satisfaced de mis celosas
diligencias, y vedme luego en el lugar
acostumbrado; que para la costa del
camino, que os ruego no hagáis, ese
escudero os lleva dos mil escudos y un
regalo de dulces y ropa blanca.
Reservándoos el principal para cuando
sea ya tiempo, que es un alma reconocida
a lo mucho que merece vuestra firmeza y*

valor. La Condesa. (2.2400-n.l.¹⁵)

It is at this point that Molina brings Ángela in again as a competitor for the love of Melchor. He involves her in his plot of secrets when Quiñones tells her about the aforementioned letter from the Countess to the galán and advises her to step in front of Melchor as the disguised Countess of Chirinola. Once again, Quiñones counteracts to her expected role as her mistress's accomplice and intends to drive Magdalena into Sebastián's arms. To make Ángela's disguise as the Countess believable, Quiñones even provides Ángela with the purse Melchor gave Magdalena during their first encounter.

QUIÑONES: Nuestra doña Magdalena,
que para decir verdad
tiene extraña voluntad
a don Melchor, con la pena
y celos de quien adora,
en fe que por él se abrasa,
para saber lo que pasa
me ha hecho su inquisidora.
[...]
Yo, que este aviso te doy
y tengo engaños de indiana,
como tú te determines
a un hecho digno de fama,
daré a tu amorosa llama
dichosos y alegres fines.
Vístete de luto, y ve
a la Vitoria cubierta;
que él aguardará a la puerta
su condesa; y si te ve
tapada y con luto, luego
te ha de tener por su dama. (3.2521-28, 2547-58)

As he did with Melchor before, Molina verifies through this scene Magdalena's suspicions towards her servant as a selfish "inquisidora" only looking for "provecho" (3.2641).

When Ángela eventually converses with Melchor and tries to convince him of her identity as the Countess, she reveals the purse as well as one of her eyes to the galán. Unsurprisingly, it is Ventura who realizes that it is not the same eye as the one they have been revealed by the Countess before; ergo, she must be someone else.

¹⁵ „N.l.“ (no line) indicates that the abstract has been taken from the stage directions provided by Tirso de Molina. These are not numbered in the play, hence the lack of line indication. The first line has been provided as orientation for the reader of this analysis.

VENTURA: Que ha sido almendra preñada
nuestra condesa de a dos,
o erizo con dos castañas,
huevo que dos yemas tuvo,
y aunque con cáscara entrambas,
tu amor, que es gallina clueca,
hoy estas dos pollas saca. (3.2932-38)

Melchor, however, is still too blinded by his desire and lust to see the mistake. Magdalena and Ángela now fight for the love of Melchor, both disguised equally as the countess, and Ángela is more than ready to take down her opponent (“¡Qué vaya vencida mi opositora!” [3.2960-61]). When Melchor can obviously no longer see what is real and is incapable to make a decision between the two ladies, he turns to Ventura for help, who solely advises him to choose, instead of exposing the real and the impostor.

When Melchor claims to Alonso, Sebastián and Jerónimo that he was ordered by the Countess to return to her house and that now he plans to marry her, Ángela shows up once more and claims to be the “real” countess. However, Magdalena swoops in to present her eyes and hand as evidence for her “real” identity as the Countess.

MAGDALENA: Doña Ángela os ha engañado,
por más que usurpame quiera
el derecho de mi amor
porque yo soy la condesa,
si en el título fingida,
en la sustancia de veras,
a quien don Melchor adora,
y vos, quien hoy encubierta
pretendisteis engañarle,
hurtándome el nombre y señas
y para confirmación
de esto, los testigos sean
estas trenzas y bolsillo,
aqueste escudero y dueña.
[...]
Y para última certeza,
esta mano os desengaño,
pues fue, idolatrando en ella,
principio de vuestro amor. (3.3479-92, 3498-3501)

In this very last scene of the play Magdalena gives up all her secrets and exposes herself as the “real” Countess, and Ángela as having defrauded Melchor with her fake version. Molina thus ends his story with the return of his strong female protagonist: Magdalena is now capable of letting go of her fears and discards all the lies and

schemes to come clean to her beloved and be married happily. It is at this point that Melchor finally understands the intrigues behind all the action.

MELCHOR: Conózcola, y con vergüenza
en ella sello mis labios. (3.3502-03)

With all the secrets now out in the open, the male protagonist is yet again able to savor his commitment to Magdalena and her family. His honor has thus been restored. As the play is now resolved quickly, with Ángela being married to Jerónimo and Quiñones to Ventura, it is the latter character who states the obvious as final resolve of the story.

VENTURA: Acabemos pues, y tengan
fin alegre estos desvelos. (3.3504-05)

Magdalena's final words ascribe a type of epicness to the play as Molina references the importance of the title once more.

MAGDALENA: Ya, señores, no seré
la celosa de mí misma. (3.3525-26)

2.1.1 A SECRET FUTURE: MAGDALENA'S DILEMMAS BEYOND THE PLAY

*From one moment to the next,
I seemed to be in a different place,
to forget where I was.
Thoughts stop where the world begins,
I kept telling myself.
But the self{ XE "self" } is also in the world, I answered,
and likewise the thoughts that come from it. (Auster 341)*

With Melchor's famous last words to the play, "Ni Tirso estará quejoso, / si os agrada esta comedia" (3.3527-28), the author presents some (narrative) secrets of his own, first and foremost with regard to the rapid exposure scene at the end. All three acts of Molina's play have carried on at roughly the same pace, with the author taking the time to explain his complicated ideas thoroughly in extensive dialogues. Molina has laid out all the secrets in excruciating detail, and it remains with no wonder to the reader that he has largely been criticized for the complexity of his story lines and the unexplained matters-of-course the reader has to deal with. However, as the play comes to a close with all participating characters present, Magdalena reveals her own as well as Ángela's secret to Melchor in only thirteen lines, and the rest of the story, from Melchor's moment of realization to the arranging of all three marriages transgresses in only thirty-six lines. What Molina proves by condensing the key scene of the play is that the focus of the entire story was on building up the various secrets, lies and scenes of deception and having the reader identify with and believe in his characters. It is not for nothing that Molina has been tagged the master of character formation and

development, and it is in relation to the secret of identities in the given play that he has accomplished this mastery.

It remains problematic, however, that Magdalena cannot in the end disregard the entirety of the secret she established throughout the story. As she says “yo soy la condesa, / si en el título fingida, / en la sustancia de veras, / a quien don Melchor adora” (3.3482-85), it could not be more apparent that she identifies herself more with the Countess than with her as Magdalena. This is due to what has been mentioned before: the female protagonist has grasped early on that Melchor’s desire will remain ever more extensive for the cloaked woman than for Magdalena herself, even after he finds out the truth. Thus, “[n]ot only are there too many suitors waiting in the wings, but the [reader] is left to wonder who Magdalena really is, and what will happen when reality and imagination again clash in Melchor’s life” (Turner 92), should this be the case. In terms of this analysis, it seems that the secret identity Magdalena has created has intrinsically split her personality for life. She does expose the original nature of her identity, but keeps her real self – those traits which distinguish her as Magdalena – as hidden as possible. “The presentation of disguise in this play is one which emphasizes how [secrets] can be both a path to greater freedom, as well as a threat to one’s sense of self” (Turner 92), and it also proves how the issues of identity and secret-keeping as well as disguise are inextricably linked in the case of *La celosa de si misma*. Tying on to psychological studies that relate an individual’s sense of self with his/her need to hide certain personal aspects, it remains clear that the secrets Magdalena keeps about herself turn out as both a blessing and a curse. While Melchor’s belief that the mystery woman and Magdalena are two different people is based on an honest misunderstanding that he cannot be made responsible for, it is Magdalena the reader immediately blames for the long run of secrets held up during the story. At any point after she finds out Melchor is both her unknown beloved as well as her arranged fiancé could she expose the ambiguity of the situation. Her fear with regard to Melchor’s volatile character, nevertheless, almost seems to force her to disguise herself, whereby the original strength and depth of her character is temporarily undermined. She seems like a helpless fragile woman afraid of facing the truth, and while her physical masquerade blesses her with the opportunity to disclose Melchor’s true intentions without revealing her own agenda, she has to experience reality the hard way when she

uncovers the flightiness of the galán's character. The further Magdalena takes her secret identity, the further she seems to fade away from who she really is – thereby, the secrets an individual keeps will only push themselves further from what they are trying to avoid in the first place. When Magdalena goes as far as acknowledging her feelings of jealousy towards herself, the reader feels a slight notion of paranoia and even schizophrenia in her character. She has separated the later so-called Countess of Chirinola and Doña Magdalena in her heart as if they were actually two individuals, which comes back to haunt her when Ángela actually impersonates the Countess and thereby provides an outside body for the fake identity. This scenario is only made possible through Magdalena's lack of control over her secrets and her selves. Magdalena manifests her belief in her multiple personalities, for example, towards the end of the play when Melchor ascends the balcony and speaks to Magdalena and the Countess respectively. Molina's stage directions read:

Sale doña MAGDALENA, a una ventana (3.3170-n.l.)

***Doña MAGDALENA habla con distinta voz,
fingiendo que es Doña Magdalena que llega
¿Qué es esto?
Responde con la voz que primero*** (3.3385-n.l.)

She appears first as the Countess, then as Magdalena, and indicates the transition in identities through the change in her voice and, on closer consideration, her choice of words. This transformation sends the reader back to the questions asked in the introduction to this analysis: depending not only on *what* is transmitted through a secret, but even more prominently on *who* conveys this secret, Molina renders voice and language essential in Magdalena's establishing of her identity and the secrets she must defend. This demonstrates that physically shielding herself cannot be enough to uphold her various identities, as Ventura proves when he acknowledges Magdalena's hand as identical to the cloaked woman's. The lady must pay close attention to the words she uses, to the amount of content she reveals and to the tone she uses with a specific identity. This entails that each of her selves must not know or speak about aspects another must definitely be familiar with, and, therefore, she must keep close track of who knows what and how. The different forms of silence that this requires from Magdalena and the Countess respectively thus play a transcendental role in her speech acts: "la ausencia de palabras en una obra dramática, *significa*, mucho más que

en la vida. Sirve para señalar que dos seres no pueden entenderse, expresa la emoción de un personaje o su impotencia” (Larthomas qtd. in Béziat 12). What is implied here is that the silence a secret presupposes establishes a boundary between two individuals who do not share the same information, and in the case of Molina’s play, this applies not only to Magdalena and Melchor but to Magdalena’s split identities among each other as well. Larthomas also stresses that silence and secret-keeping indicate a character’s failure to express themselves, which, in the case of the female protagonist stems from her fear of marrying an unsteady or even labile man, and thereby her fear of losing the love of that same man.

Magdalena even takes her fear a step further. As she transforms into her own opponent, she stresses over the potential consequences her exposure might have with herself.

Con ese mismo desvelo
quejas de mí misma doy;
pues si la condesa soy
que él ama y mi opositora
finge estar la misma agora,
mal conmigo misma estoy. (3.3097-3101)

It becomes clear that the lady is well aware of her impending internal conflict should she continue her secretive game, yet she is unwilling, or “impotente”, to resolve the situation, despite the fact that, at this point in the story, it is clear that none of the other characters will expose her. Had Ventura, for example, actively schemed to disclose her agenda to someone other than Melchor, he would have succeeded earlier in the story. Therefore, Magdalena is intrinsically forced to continue her “juego de manos” (3.3123), as Quiñones calls it, and fight for Melchor’s ultimate affection.

Interestingly, it appears that Magdalena is pressured both into and out of her charade by external parties. When she finds out Melchor is both her mystery beloved as well as her promised fiancé, her second identity as the cloaked woman is automatically established by Melchor’s fictional image of her as not-Magdalena. The galán unknowingly projects his fantasies onto an empty canvas and leaves no room for the truth to set this misunderstanding free. When Magdalena then enters the world of secrets by playing both parts, she automatically reacts to the image Melchor has created of her without ever having actively planned to scheme in the first place. The

same holds true for when her new servant Santillana invents an actual personality for her as the *tapada*; again, she can only participate in this game of pretense as the Countess of Chirinola in order to avoid humiliation. When in the end Ángela joins the role-play and also disguises herself as the Countess, Magdalena is for the third time inclined to respond to such an act of presumption by maintaining her fake identity until the situation reaches its climax.

Magdalena must disclose her secret when she nearly ends up as Sebastián's wife; she is forced by Ángela to step out from behind her mask in order to secure a rightful end to this web of secrets that has been created. Even though it is Magdalena herself who decides from the very beginning not to unravel the truth in her own interest, the reader cannot characterize her as the sole culprit of the scene. "Disguise is presented [...] as an element of chaos which works against the good of the main character" (Turner 94), and, in a way, outside influence paves the way for Magdalena's predicament to spin out of control. She intends to escape her role as the cloaked woman by trying to convince Melchor of her true qualities; however, his stubborn blindness and unwillingness to see what is right in front of him seems so preposterous that it borders on ignorance. Physical disguise as such could be expected to extend an individual's range of action in that the Countess has no prescribed boundaries and rules she must move in or adhere to. Magdalena, however, is clearly a victim of the restrictions of her own secrets.

Robert Turner explains that *La celosa de si misma* is a play which reflects a "constant attempt by the various characters, especially Don Melchor, to capture the imaginary, rather than the real" (96). It is Melchor's imagined fantasy of Magdalena as the *tapada*, or rather, a third unnamed identity, that dominates the story, and that also dominates her true personality. It can be deduced that this "imaginary" is what ultimately transforms into the universal mystery of the story, which makes Melchor the original creator of the secret. While it remains clear that he is incapable of acknowledging this misunderstanding-turned-arcanum as such, it is just as apparent that what Melchor chases is exactly this secret, and not the true identity behind it. Ultimately, both Magdalena and Melchor are trapped in a vicious circle, where the former falls victim to the latter's imagination.

3. JUAN RUIZ DE ALARCÓN

Alarcón's is an eminently practical outlook concerned with helping man as a social animal to live more meaningfully – authentically, one might say – and to profit more fully from his temporal existence, [...] implying all the while that some semblance of utopia may yet be salvaged from the mire of dystopia. (Parker, Sourcebook 26)

A longstanding contemporary and close friend of Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón excelled as one of the best-known “novo-Hispanic” writers of the Spanish Golden Age. Born in Mexico into the nobility of a Spanish family, the Mendozas, Alarcón was a dedicated law student at the University of Salamanca and later law practitioner in the early 1600s. Upon his arrival in Madrid, his literary career took a slow start with his first plays receiving only mild success and his personal connections stalling due to an ongoing rivalry with Lope de Vega, Luis de Góngora, Francisco de Quevedo and others. “To some extent he was to blame, due to his excessive pride, his pedantry, and ironically enough, his Don Juanism: he insisted on being a ladykiller” (Flores 136). Alarcón was often ridiculed for his stature and posture, and also for his American heritage, but never let any personal attacks get in the way of his literary productivity. Surprisingly, Alarcón’s success dates only to approximately 25 written plays of which many were attributed to other dramatists of his time. It has been speculated, but never confirmed, that a number of his plays came into existence in association with Tirso de Molina; what can be confirmed, however, is that it was the Spanish playwright who influenced Alarcón’s body of work to a very large extent.

As has been observed in an extensive study on Alarcón by Jules Whicker, the dramatist produced his masterpieces during “an age in which Spaniards increasingly came to perceive Spain as a nation in decline”; they were prone to

seek the remedy for their country’s malaise in a whole series of economic, political, social, and, in particular, moral reforms. In view of their concerns about the future of Spain, it is not surprising that many of those who wrote in this vein [...] turned their attention to the behaviour of young noblemen and women, and to the moral impact of theatres which they attended so enthusiastically. (2)

Similar to Tirso de Molina but in a much more intense manner Alarcón was concerned with portraying morality and the lack thereof in his social, political and magical dramas. It only follows naturally, as has been mentioned before, that the theme of secret-keeping and deception runs through Alarcón’s entire literary production like a common thread. He, too, was subject to censure by the Junta de Reформación because of the issues he treated, but he was in luck, as his first collection of plays was published in 1628, several years after he had already had it licensed. His second collection was published in 1634 in Barcelona, a place where the Madrilenian literary suspension had no effect on his writing either. In 1625 Alarcón received his appointment to the Royal and Supreme Council of the Indies, a highly relevant appeals court and administrative organ to the Spanish Empire in the New World, through which his political success took over the literary. After many years of service to the Council his health condition deteriorated drastically in 1639, the year in which he eventually passed away in Madrid. *La amistad castigada* and *El dueño de las estrellas*, both published in the second collection of plays of 1634, stand out as his most prominent historical plays, *Las paredes oyen* (1617) and *La verdad sospechosa* (1618/21), the latter of which is most relevant to this analysis, have been classified as masterpieces of his morality plays.

Angel Flores writes that

[i]f he was one of the least prolific writers of the Golden Age, he was also the most critical and one of the most consummate craftsmen. [H]is well-contrived plays, admirably versified and deeply concerned with motivation and characterization, did immortalize his name. (136)

Despite the fact that the corpus of Alarcón’s works is not very extensive, *La verdad sospechosa* had left room for a wide range of interpretative approaches, all of which

combine classical Spanish Golden Age stereotypes with the author's personal notion of society. The given analysis will prove how Alarcón's most outstanding comedy blends into the theme of secret-keeping and -exposing. In contrast to most critical studies, which have dealt with the tactics and consequences behind lying and deception initiated by the main character, Don García, it shall here be proven that this protagonist's scheming is a form of secret-keeping that leads to his ultimate downfall. Therefore, in comparison with and contrast to Molina's *La celosa de si misma*, Alarcón ends his play as would be expected and demonstrates how García's secrets are constituted on different levels of identity confusions, creations and dismissals, as well as highly elaborate verbalism and imagination.

3.1 LA VERDAD SOSPECHOSA: DON GARCÍA'S NOTORIOUS GAME OF DECEPTION

*¡Qué fácil de persuadir,
quien tiene amor, suele ser
y qué fácil en creer,
el que no sabe mentir! (2.1744-47)*¹⁶

Throughout the play, Garcia is both a liar and a bungler, the duper and the duped, the villain and the victim. In his conflicted psyche he joins both meanings of the word error, which designates [...] both cognitive and moral lapses. (Gaylord 226)

In contrast to Tirso de Molina's play herein analyzed, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón presents the reader with his protagonist, Don García, in the very first scene of his story *La verdad sospechosa*. Don Beltrán, García's father, offers his son a friendly welcome upon his arrival in Madrid and immediately provides him with a servant, Tristán.

BELTRÁN: No es criado el que te doy;
más consejero y amigo. (1.17- 18)

Beltrán's words indicate to the reader that the protagonist has found his future accomplice and partner in crime. It is only shortly after that, in a conversation with García's travel partner, "un letrado viejo de estudiantes de camino", that Beltrán then establishes the whole ground for the upcoming story. He demands to know the letrado's opinion of his son and that the old man offer some insight into García's character:

¹⁶ Henceforth, all references to Alarcón's play will be marked in parentheses as act.line-line.

[Q]uiero, señor Licenciado
que me diga claramente
sin lisonja lo que siente
supuesto que le ha criado,
de su modo y condición
de su trato y ejercicio
y a qué género de vicio
muestra más inclinación.
Si tiene alguna costumbre
que yo cuide de enmendar,
no piense que me ha de dar
con decirlo pesadumbre:
que él tenga vicio es forzoso
que me pese, claro está;
mas saberlo me será
útil, cuando no gustoso. (1.97-112)

It remains clear that Beltrán does not ask this question out of sheer curiosity, but out of concern for and about his son. At the same time, the reader understands that this is what the core of the story will revolve around, García's "vicios." The letrado praises the young man for his well-formed qualities, but immediately points Beltrán in the direction of his son's most dangerous quality:

LETRADO: Deciros verdad es bien;
que, demás del juramento,
daros una purga intento
que os sepa mal y haga bien.
[...]
Es magnánimo y valiente,
es sagaz y es ingenioso,
es liberal y piadoso,
si repentino, impaciente.
[...]
Mas una falta no más
es la que le he conocido,
que, por más que le he reñido,
no se ha enmendado jamás.
BELTRÁN: ¿Cosa que a sus calidad
será dañosa en Madrid?
LETRADO: Puede ser.
BELTRÁN: ¿Cuál es? Decid.
LETRADO: No decir siempre verdad.(1.133-57)

As Beltrán reacts shocked and disappointed to the despicable quality of a liar in his son, Alarcón has established the core secret of the comedy, which exists in García hiding the truth from the world. While most studies about Alarcón's play have analyzed this trait as inherent in lying and deception, it shall be argued that what García masters thereby is a twofold dimension of secret-keeping. The secret encompasses the actual act of lying, as well as the real truth that is concealed. In the

previous play, the protagonist based the mysteries on actual versions of herself and played roles that were all based on the real Magdalena while trying to win Melchor over with who she really was. She impersonated the Countess of Chirinola, but essentially always remained herself and tried to convince the galán of her ingenuous love. García, however, will never show his true face, but will invent, claim and show off as fake personalities he cannot live up to. He does not offer the lady the chance to love him for who he is, but plays someone else all along. The fact that disclosing the truth can never end well is foreshadowed by the letrado:

Guárdeos Dios; dolor extraño
le dio al buen viejo la nueva;
al fin el más sabio lleva
agramente un desengaño. (1.233-36)

What the reader is also left with very openly is that García is well aware of the psychological crimes he commits. When Tristán indicates a metaphor of Pinocchio the liar to his master (“las narices le crecieron” [1.253]), García admits that he is a “mozo” (1.290), a rascal, bold and cheeky, and very much intent on telling lies. As García tries on a new dress outfit and demands Tristán’s approval, a discourse ensues that yields all of García’s essential character flaws. The servant responds to his request in a very indicative manner.

GARCÍA: ¿Díceme bien este traje?
TRISTÁN: Divinamente, señor;
bien hubiese el inventor
deste holandesco follaje,
con un cuello apanalado
¿qué fealdad no se enmendó? (1.237-42)

While Tristán does not seem to want to scold García at this point in time, the reader understands the metaphoric meaning in his words: as the galán disguises himself in a costume that will fit his new character in Madrid, Tristán indicates in an inherently sarcastic style that disguise always turns ugliness into beauty. It is clear that Alarcón alludes to the mental- and character-“fealdad” García will come to demonstrate. When the two men’s attention finally falls to the subject of women, the galán’s deceptive self comes to show:

GARCÍA: De gobernar nos dejemos
el mundo; ¿qué hay de mujeres?
TRISTÁN: El mundo dejas, ¿y quieres

que la carne gobernemos?
¿es más fácil?
GARCÍA: Más gustoso. (1.283-88)

The innocent Tristán becomes the victim of his master's treacherous character; as he discloses stories about the court he has served on for all this time, García realizes that despite Tristán's elementary profession as a servant, he is smart, perceptive and easily included in García's schemes. The galán promises his servant that he may be able to pursue a woman he loves, if he finds his beloved first.

Pues yo al fin (quien fuere sea)
la quiero, y he de servilla;
tú puedes, Tristán, seguilla. (1.409-11)

Clearly, "quien fuere sea" reminds the reader of Don Melchor: he was never intent on marrying a specific woman, let alone Magdalena, but was fanatically obsessed with the self-created image of a perfect woman that never existed. García, similarly, does not seem to care for a particular bride, but will marry "whoever it will be." His pursuit of women seems just as independent from the actual individual as Melchor's did.

When García meets Jacinta – the future lady of his affections – in the street for the first time, he secretly gives away his unfaithful character by saying that "las acciones / del agravio y el favor / reciben todo el valor / sólo de las intenciones" (1.461-64). All he commits are "acciones del agravio", and these clearly stem from his bad intentions, which do not include actual verbal insults directed at a specific person, but the intended alteration of the truth to deceive. In the same conversation with Jacinta, he already presents the first lie to her:

GARCÍA: ¿Que hasta aquí de mi afición
nunca tuvistes indicio?
JACINTA: ¿Cómo, si jamás os vi?
GARCÍA: ¿Tampoco ha valido (ay Dios)
más de un año, que por vos
he andado fuera de mí?
TRISTÁN: ¿Un año, y ayer llegó (Aparte.)
a la Corte? (1.479-85)

As García promises that he has been in love with Jacinta for more than a year, it is Tristán, like Ventura before, who questions his master's words and realizes more and more that the facts do not conform to reality. While the servant remains confused but cannot mention anything due to his honor code to the galán, García obviously intends

to ameliorate his reputation with Jacinta. By implying that he has (secretly) pursued his interest for her for a long time, he can avoid being seen as a trustless character in love with the first woman he catches sight of. While in fact he is just as volatile a galán as Melchor was, García takes the lead when he conceals his flakiness. It is in the following instance that García then follows in the footsteps of Molina's Magdalena to a certain extent.

JACINTA: ¿Sois indiano?

GARCÍA: Y tales son
mis riquezas, pues os vi,
que al minado Potosí,
le quito la presunción.

TRISTÁN: ¿Indiano? (*Aparte.*) (1.496-501)

As of this moment, it remains clear that García's true identity has been replaced by a newly invented one and demonstrates that the secret at the center of the play revolves as much around the question of identity as in *La celosa de si misma*, if in different ways. While Magdalena's identity was compromised by Melchor and later Santillana without her ever intending to deceive any of the characters, García determinedly casts his self aside for his own purpose. He, therefore, does not comply with a specific role ascribed to him by someone else, but establishes the parameters of his secrets himself. Furthermore, his schemes appear much more spontaneous at times. Magdalena was overwhelmed by having to play along with a prescribed game and spent many scenes planning her next moves with Quiñones.

On the contrary, García surprises the reader, as well as Tristán, with the facts he presents to Jacinta without having mentioned them to anyone before. Clearly, García has not made out all of these details before, but presents them along the way as he will see fit, indicating how well-versed and experienced he already is as a liar. After his encounter with Jacinta, García retreats with Tristán and discloses that "[e]stoy perdido, Tristán" (1.527). As boastful and pretentious García presented himself to Jacinta, the reader now realizes that he might not be able to handle his secrets as well as he had wished. It is almost as if he were to show a redeeming quality and establishes hope in the reader as to possible honesty in the future. At the same time, his words to his servant indicate that he is at a loss for Jacinta, for, "[i]n spite of Garcia's many ethical faults, his love for Jacinta creates an honest core for his extravagant deceptions"

(Castells 41). He is obviously capable of feeling true love, but cannot grasp that his deceiving words and acts do not enhance, but only weaken his reputation and destabilize his existence.

Still in the same conversation with Tristán, García finds out for the first time who his beloved lady is – or so he thinks. He inquires of his servant the name of the more beautiful of the two ladies he saw in the street, and while Jacinta was on her way with her friend Lucrecia, it is Tristán who causes confusion in his response.

TRISTÁN: Doña Lucrecia de Luna
se llama la más hermosa,
que es mi dueño, y la otra dama
que acompañándola viene,
sé dónde la casa tiene,
mas no sé cómo se llama:
esto respondió el cochero.
GARCÍA: Si es Lucrecia la más bella,
no hay más que saber: pues ella
es la que hablé, y la que quiero.
[...]
TRISTÁN: Pues a mí la que calló
me pareció más hermosa.
GARCÍA: ¡Qué buen gusto!
TRISTÁN: Es cierta cosa
que no tengo voto yo. (1.551-69)

He mentions that, to him, Lucrecia is the more beautiful of the two ladies, and García immediately assumes that his servant has his master's best interest at heart. He presupposes that the more beautiful of the two can only be meant for him, and that, because the coachman only referred to Lucrecia by name, she must be of higher esteem and thus more interesting to him. The cochero, however, referred to his own liking of Lucrecia. It appears that as soon as García catches her name, he is unequivocally certain of her entire identity, because "no hay más que saber" but her name; in reality, the fact that Jacinta, García's actual betrothed, is not mentioned in this conversation illustrates her interchangeability in the eyes of the galán. He does not focus on who his future bride really is, but what she represents to him.

Tristán tries to resolve the confusion immediately by pointing out that Lucrecia is not the one García was in conversation with and that the more beautiful of the two was "la que calló." The galán ignores his servant's musings of the lady, and Tristán, in turn, dismisses his responsibility for the situation due to his position as servant ("no tengo

voto yo”). As in *La celosa de si misma*, it is not the key protagonist who is primarily to blame for the main confusion of identities in the play. Nevertheless, just as Magdalena could have disclosed the truth to ensure a stable early ending of the story, García could have open-mindedly listened to Tristán’s comment and resolved the situation. Instead, he shows traits similar to those of Melchor; as he is so fixated on a woman he essentially does not know that he oversees the core issue of the situation. Jacinta and Lucrecia’s identities are confused and mystified, which adds another aspect to the secret of the story.

Alarcón then works in the metaphor of silence when Tristán says that he is “tan aficionado / a cualquier mujer que calla, / que bastó, para juzgalla / más hermosa haber callado” (1.569-72). This implies that the real Lucrecia’s silence is what was appealing to him in the first place, just as García would appear “más hermoso” would he benefit from sparing the audience his deceiving words. The metaphor establishes that silence would have eliminated the possibility of García’s secrets arising in the first place: had he not lied and/or kept the truth hidden from the beginning, his character would be safe from its ultimate defeat in the end.

As García meets his old friends Don Juan and Don Félix in the following scene, Alarcón brings the protagonist’s ways of disguise into play.

GARCÍA: Don Juan de Sosa.
JUAN: ¿Quién es?
GARCÍA: ¿Ya olvidáis a don García?
JUAN: Veros en Madrid lo hacía,
y el nuevo traje.
GARCÍA: Después
que en Salamanca me vistes
muy otro debo de estar.
JUAN: Más galán sois de seglar,
que de estudiante lo fuistes. (1.591-600)

Juan is surprised to see García so different to how he remembers him; he mentions his new dress and a different kind of attitude unveiling. Thereby, Alarcón alludes to the protagonist’s way of presenting himself in Madrid, and intrinsically hints at the deceptive behavior García conceals under his new robes. In contrast to Molina’s Magdalena, whose physical disguise stemmed from the social convention of being the *tapada* and painted her as a woman changing clothes dependent on the identity she was

impersonating, in the case of García it is the identities he adjusts to his outside appearance. While both Magdalena and García's core goals remain truthful, García's way of working around secrets and lies to get what he wants exhibits a more malevolent character. The secrets he conceals are inherent in the words he uses, and, thus, Alarcón utilizes language in a very diplomatic and metaphorical to refer to these secrets. A major example of this elaboration is García's comment "[h]e estado hasta aquí secreto" (1.637), which is both a literal and metaphorical reference to his situation. As he tries to convince Jacinta and Juan of the fact that he has covertly been in Madrid for a long time, the real underlying meaning of this statement refers to the actual secrets García is concealing. At any given point in the plot García could easily be found out if someone were to consult his father Don Beltrán or Tristán. Therefore, García's secrets are much more instable as Magdalena's were previously, since no one would have been able to figure out her true identity until the very end.

In order to seem better esteemed to Juan, García invents a story about a "fiesta" he celebrated the night before, during which he enjoyed the acquaintance of and wedding to his unmentioned bride. It is again Tristán who secretly wonders about his master's words and realizes that a bigger agenda must be behind them: "Ayer llegó, voto a Dios; / él lleva alguna intención / [...] el diablo por hombre" (1.665-66, 753). García paints a mental image of this party in such surprising detail that Tristán can only be astounded by his imaginative gift, and Juan and Félix can only be "[r]abio de celos" (1.757) while at the same time harboring "ciertas [...] sospechas" (1.776). Yet again, when García retreats with Tristán after this encounter, he seems aware of the psychological damage and confusion he is causing. Through his vigorous story-telling and picture-painting, he has by now established a truly unfaithful identity for himself that could not be further from the truth and the real García for that matter. He admits that "[e]s verdad, mas no soy dueño / de mí mismo" (1.797), through which he both approximates himself to Magdalena and verbalizes the main predicament he will find himself in for the rest of the play. He has clearly concealed his true identity so much and it is by now so far gone that it has become an irretrievable secret even to himself. His psychological self-splitting is complete as he justifies his actions to Tristán:

GARCÍA: Cosa es cierta,
Tristán, que los forasteros

tienen más dicha con ellas;
y más si son de las Indias,
información de riqueza.
TRISTÁN: Ese fin está entendido:
mas pienso que el medio yerras,
pues han de saber al fin
quién eres.
GARCÍA: Cuando lo sepan,
habré ganado en su casa,
o en su pecho ya las puertas
con ese medio, y después
yo me entenderé con ellas. (1.814-27)

Thus, without any apparent reason for this belief, García would rather opt for secretive deception than for giving his beloved the chance to love him for who he really is. He is unwilling to listen to Tristán's judgment of his actions as he realizes that he has gone too far to uncover the truth now anyway. Towards the end of this act, it is Beltrán who schemes behind García's back again. In a private conversation with Jacinta, he tries to convince her to marry his son; Jacinta complies despite her previous engagement with and remaining love for Juan, who is from now on established as García's true enemy and competitor. As this marriage is thus arranged, Alarcón approaches again an idea previously discussed in Molina's play. Magdalena and Melchor fell in love in the street without knowing that they were promised to be married to each other before; now, García and Jacinta's interest is just as mutual and their marriage has just as much been arranged. However, Jacinta is unaware of the equality of identities of her mystery man and her fiancé while García is ignorant to the arrangement as well as Jacinta's true identity, let alone her name. It is Beltrán who is responsible for this extension of the secret in the story. The final scene of the first act presents Jacinta in a worried conversation with her friend and *criada*, Isabel, during which they discuss this circumstance of not knowing who Beltrán's son and Jacinta's fiancé really is.

JACINTA: Amiga,
¿quieres que verdad te diga?
pues muy bien me pareció,
y tanto que te prometo,
que si fuera tan discreto,
tan gentilhombre y galán
el hijo de don Beltrán,
tuviera la boda efeto.
ISABEL: Esta tarde le verás
con su padre por la calle.
JACINTA: Veré sólo el rostro y talle;
el alma, que importa más,
quisiera ver con hablalle. (1.998-1010)

Jacinta is prone to know her husband's true personality, which she is very eager to find out through conversation. Having already met García, Jacinta was fed nothing but lies, so, ironically, she cannot know his truthful self. As she is worried that her previous lover Juan will be offended by her encounter with her new suitor, the ever-selfish and deceiving servant Isabel, just as Quiñones in Molina's story, suggests going behind Juan's back in order to protect him. When Jacinta is still too afraid of the consequences, here enters Alarcón with yet another dimension to the secret of identities. Jacinta uses her friend Lucrecia as her accomplice so that she write a letter to García in Jacinta's name and evaluate his potential as future husband.

Papel

La fuerza de una ocasión me hace
exceder del orden de mi estado.

Sabrála v. m. esta noche por un balcón,
que le enseñará el portador, con lo
demás, que no es para escrito, y
guarde N. Señor.

GARCÍA: ¿Quién este papel me escribe?

CAMINO: Doña Lucrecia de Luna. (2.1111-18)

As the messenger mentions Lucrecia's name as the sender of this letter to García, honest confusion of names and identities again ensues. Before the galán can meet his beloved on the balcony, Juan sidetracks him in a conversation about Jacinta. Juan is worried about García stealing his woman, which is when the protagonist's secrets really catch up with him. He keeps his concerns hidden, even from Tristán, who realizes that this secret must be "cosa pesada" (2.1190). In an attempt to secure his son presents himself as rightful, Beltrán consults Tristán, who is intent on disclosing García's treacherous endeavors:

TRISTÁN: De Salamanca reboza
la leche, y tiene en los labios
los contagiosos resabios
de aquella caterva moza.

Aquel hablar arrojado,
mentir sin recato y modo,
aquel jactarse de todo,
y hacerse en todo extremado.

Hoy en término de un hora
echó cinco o seis mentiras.

BELTRÁN: Válgame Dios. (2.-1241-51)

Shocked that the letrado's words from the beginning of the story have been verified by Tristán and that his son has thus been established as a notorious liar, Beltrán plans to

call off the wedding between García and Jacinta so that his son cannot be mocked by the court. He scolds his son for this dishonorable behavior, but García still defends his stance by claiming that “[q]uien dice que miento yo, / ha mentido” (2.1464-65). Thereby, the notion of secrets and lies spirals out of control as the conversation ensues in a fight between father and son: “También eso / es mentir, que aun desmentir / no sabéis, sino mintiendo. / [...] ¿No seré necio si creo / que vos decís verdad solo, / y miente el lugar entero?” (2.1465-71). Beltrán then promises his son “un gran casamiento” (2.1495), whereafter García loses himself in thoughts of Jacinta in an offside remark during which he mentions Lucrecia’s name as his betrothed. It is yet again this unfortunate string of events that does not disclose the truth – had García mentioned Lucrecia’s name out loud, Beltrán would have been able to resolve all of the story’s mysteries. Instead, Alarcón takes García’s level of deceptiveness even further when he has his protagonist falsely telling his father that he is already married. Thereby, García shows characteristics of Molina’s Melchor once more: just as Melchor painted a picture of his perfect bride in his mind that he could no longer free himself from long enough to grasp his love for Magdalena, García invents an imaginary woman as his wife, ascribing to her in his typical detailed fashion all the qualities to his liking. He loses his sense of reality completely as he slips deeper and deeper into his secrets and lies up to a point where he realizes that “tan terribles cosas hallo / que sucendiendo me van / que pienso que desvarío: / vine ayer, y en un momento / tengo amor y casamiento; / y causa de desafío” (2.1750-55). After every lie he tells he appears to snap out of this fictional world he keeps forming to realize how dangerous his actions are and how far from reality they have taken him. When he lies, however, he seems to be speaking in a trance, forced to conceal what would in reality set him free. Like Magdalena before, he performs an intrinsic separation of identities: he splits himself off from the rich “indiano” he claimed to be in the beginning, from the long-concealed admirer of Jacinta, from the man who organized an overwhelming feast the night before, and ultimately from the husband of an imaginary wife, only to find that he has erased his true identity.

At this point, it is Jacinta who reminds the reader yet again of Molina’s *La celosa de si misma*. When she sees Beltrán in the street with García, she realizes that her mystery beloved and her future fiancé are one and the same, just as Magdalena did with

Melchor. At the same time, however, again transfixed, García informs Juan of his secret (and really inexistent) wife, which is when Juan realizes that the protagonist is an inscrutable liar and challenges him to a duel.

Eso un ciego lo vería:
porque tanta variedad
de tiendas, aparadores,
vajillas de plata y oro,
tanto plato, tanto coro
de instrumentos y cantores
¿no eran mentira patente?
[...]
Tendrá el mentir por costumbre,
y por herencia el valor. (2.1898-1911)

In one of the final scenes of the second act, García eventually meets who he thinks is Lucrecia at the balcony as promised. He really converses with Jacinta and the two ladies have the opportunity to expose him as an “embarrador” and “embustero” as they realize that “para todas tiene amor” (2.1970-72). The reader is now reminded of the balcony scene in Molina’s play wherein Magdalena pretended to be two women at once, speaking to the Countess inside the house and vice versa. In the given case, the two women are physically separate and two actual individuals, but García cannot understand who his beloved is for a lack of naming any of the two. When Jacinta confronts him with the fact that he is married, García does not take hold of the opportunity to relieve some of his lies, but extends them even further: “Mi padre llegó a tratarme / de darme otra mujer hoy” (2.2040-41). He is trying to excuse his father’s behavior and thereby intends to establish Beltrán as a scapegoat for his own secrets. He is unwilling to admit to his wrong-doings while still believing that his situation might be resolved happily. At the core of all his deceptions still lies his true love for Jacinta, who he still thinks is Lucrecia, but the lady is by now reluctant to trust him. When García grows desperate for her love, Tristán appears as the moral of the entire story and tries to educate his master on what he has been telling him all along:

¿Qué te admiras,
si en cuatro o cinco mentiras
te ha acabado de coger?
De aquí, si lo consideras,
conocerás claramente,
que quien en las burlas miente,
pierde el crédito en las veras. (2.2145-51)

In the final conversation between Jacinta, Lucrecia and García in the third act, the identities of the two ladies almost fuse into one. As García reminds his beloved of the moment they shared on the balcony and the letter he wrote her and thereby addresses the wrong woman, the two friends become suspicious of each other and suspect that the respective other has betrayed them. Jacinta mentions that her bond with Lucrecia is so tight that “en mí y en [Lucrecia] / vive sólo un corazón” (3.2601-02), whereby she refers to the (con)fusion and splitting of identities that led to the need of keeping secrets and telling lies in the first place. The two ladies have been somewhat indistinguishable to the reader and also to García who uses the one’s name for the body of the other.

As Beltrán is again presented as a deeply disappointed and embarrassed father, whose worries and fears about García have all come true in the end, he orders his son “[que] no me llames padre; / vil, enemigo me llama, / que no tiene sangre mía” (3.2850-53). He has been robbed of his honor by his own unfaithful son, who, in the end, must marry the real Lucrecia. He addresses Jacinta as his bride, but as he realizes that “el nombre erré”, he claims that “no erré la persona” (3.3079-80), but his realization has come too late and Jacinta officially accepts Juan’s offer to marry her. As he is stuck marrying a woman he never loved or even pursued, García accepts the disgrace he has caused himself: “Perdí mi gloria” (3.3090).

In typical Spanish Golden Age fashion, Alarcón closes his comedy with the wise words of his most moral character, Tristán, finally able to direct at García what he has known all along. His master is to blame for all of his actions and has brought about his woeful downfall himself.

TRISTÁN: Tú tienes la culpa toda:
que si al principio dijeras
la verdad, ésta es la hora
que de Jacinta gozabas:
ya no hay remedio, perdona;
y da la mano a Lucrecia,
que también es buena moza.
[...]
Y aquí verás cuán dañosa
es la mentira y verá
el Senado, que en la boca
del que mentir acostumbra,
es la verdad sospechosa. (3.3099-3111)

He scolds García for having lied and makes him aware of the fact that a notorious liar will lose his credibility even in truth, which is what constitutes the ultimate “verdad sospechosa.”

3.1.1 THE SECRET BEYOND THE PROTAGONIST: BELTRÁN, MADRID, AND THE LABYRINTH OF PARADOX

[Y]a no hay remedio.
[...]
Y aquí verás cuán dañosa
es la mentira. (3.3103-08)

*If the play's characters somehow trust implicitly in the existence of something one
might call truth, none of them steps forward to praise the truth,
much less to defend it. (Gaylord 234)*

In Alarcón's play, it is difficult to establish the term secret as equally applicable to the characters' actions as lying and deception. This stems from the fact that even the two latter notions are often confused or used interchangeably while many studies argue that lying is a sub-category of the larger concept of deception.¹⁷ This analysis has presented another dimension to the discussion, namely that the characters of the play lie and deceive *in order to* conceal certain secrets. Thus, the secret can be established as the mother-concept of the illusive "crimes" the characters commit. This was proven in the previous chapter about the protagonist García, whose lies have clearly served the purpose of hiding who he really is, both from others as well as from himself. One of

¹⁷ Ricardo Castells quotes Sissela Bok's *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*: "When we undertake to deceive others intentionally, we communicate messages meant to mislead them, meant to make them believe what we ourselves do not believe. We can do so through gesture, through disguise, by means of action or inaction, even through silence. [...] A lie is an intentionally deceptive message which is *stated*. Such statements are often made verbally or in writing. [...] Deception, then, is the larger category, and lying forms part of it" (35).

the questions that remain to be answered is why García cannot accept his true self and must lie to defend a variety of identities which are obviously all not in line with reality.

In contrast to Molina's *La celosa de si misma*, in which the protagonist Magdalena's core secret is spurred on by external influences, Alarcón's main character has no such excuse. While the confusion of Jacinta and Lucrecia is based on honest ambiguities, García's excessive and exaggerated stories as well as their falseness are not. He is the sole creator of his secret misery, which is why he must learn his lesson and ultimately fail. As García's lies are all established to provide him with a better reputation in the eyes of others; what he fails to understand is that it is his own self-esteem which is in desperate need of care. As Beltrán's second son, García was sent to Salamanca to study and was therefore left uncared for by his father until his brother's, and Beltrán's first son and rightful heir's, death. It can be argued at this point that, since a "*segundón* has little social or economic value in contemporary Spanish society" (Castells 37), Beltrán did not primarily send him to Salamanca because of the university's academic worth, but because he was in no need of a second son to roam around his court. Even though Beltrán would never disclose this fact, its possibility clearly classifies as a secret the father keeps from the world. When the protagonist moves back to Madrid to follow in his brother's footsteps, Beltrán learns of his deceitful nature from the *letrado* and is yet again stricken with fear of his own reputation deteriorating on the Spanish court. When the *letrado* assures him that his son's flaws will adjust and vanish with time, Beltrán is sure of the fact that García's character has already been shaped for life and that alteration will be in vain ("qué hará / siendo ya tronco robusto?" [1.168-89]). In this sense, Beltrán is just as notorious a liar as his son as he hopes for his son to adjust rightfully to Madrilenian society but claims at the same time he is already lost.

Furthermore, he does not address his son about his behavior, but intends to keep his misgivings as quiet as possible and simply find him a wife. In this sense, Beltrán is the first liar and secret-keeper of the play and abuses his position as the powerful master, as nobody would expect him to deceive. He distinguishes himself from his son only in that he is a much less obvious liar, capable of hiding what would hurt him were it out in the open. Beltrán's high expectations of his second-choice son are clearly a first step in the direction of García's demise: the young man tries so hard to esteem himself in

the eyes of his skeptical father that he can but lie to achieve this. The “protagonist finds himself in a double bind: society, and especially Garcia's father, tell him in the same breath to lie and not to lie” (Gaylord 225) as lying is despicable but at the same time necessary to fulfill Beltrán's expectations. García, therefore, finds himself in a vicious circle even before the core secrets of the play have been established. He cannot live with himself as the second-rate son only issued back out of lack of other choices and thus accommodates himself in a castle of secrets because no one else could possibly accept him like this either. García's “skill in manipulating language and literary fictions is, of course, no accident: as a second son, Garcia has cultivated not arms but letters, and his stories bear the traces of “las ficciones de la poesia,” poetry's seductive lies” (Gaylord 232). He is desperate for his father's approval, but fails to gain just that through committing the societal and psychological crime his father deems unforgivable.

A further reason for García's need to lie and deceive seems is self-discovery. What he conceals is his true self, a complex individual unidentifiable by the reader due to the lack of disclosure of the truth. However, as his secret remains only to be known by himself, at the same time he does not spare the audience with words, but uses language vividly to characterize himself as several different identities. This duality of silence versus openness, already inherent in Molina's Magdalena, is what constitutes the “labyrinth of [secret] paradox” (Gaylord 230) that runs through the story like a golden thread. Because García is such an obvious liar it is so easy for his fellow characters to become suspicious of his words and to expose his secrets. However, the problem that remains is that while they may as well uncover that he has not been telling the truth, the reader never finds out what is actually beneath the verbal and physical disguise. García exits the play as an epitome of the *secreto a voces*, because his stories already seem to enter the other characters' ears as lies before they even had the chance to verify them. Also, García still pretends to be able to uphold his secrets and fake identities even after Juan's suspicions, for example, have already proven otherwise.¹⁸ No one seems to trust his words entirely at any given point in the story and thus the so-

¹⁸ What the *secreto a voces* constitutes is that „[j]emand glaubt da also, ein Geheimnis wahren zu können, das schon längst dem Käfig diskreter Behandlung entflohen ist“ (Aichinger 12).

called truth, which really encompasses invented personalities, facts and figures, lies openly before everybody.

An aspect also essential to analyzing the origin and reason for secret-keeping in the play is constituted by the location of the action, Madrid. As Dawn Smith has discussed in her study about Molina's *La celosa de si misma*, the

preoccupation with Madrid reflects a historical reality: in 1606 [...] Madrid was confirmed as the capital of the country [...] and this led predictably to all the evils attendant on fast urban expansion. [This] corrupting glitter of Madrid is so palpable that [...] it [could] easily fill a role of its own as "Desengaño". (1998)

What this suggests is that Madrid can be analyzed in the context of this study as a sort of deceiving character. At the beginning of Molina's play, Melchor, who has just arrived in the capital from León, points out that "[b]ello lugar es Madrid. / ¡Qué agradable confusión!" (1.1-2). The contrasting duality in these remarks make the reader understand that the location is just as two-sided as the characters roaming it. Full of 17th-century splendor, wealth and courtly prestige on the one hand, Madrid is destined to bring about the chaos the play ultimately presents on the other. The city serves as "direct cause of the action" (Smith 1998), not only in Molina, but also in Alarcón's play. When García presents himself as an "indiano" at the very beginning, his intent lies in sparking the ladies' interest in the Spanish American colonies, far away from the city that is "artificial and avaricious" Madrid (Castells 40). García claims that it will be easier to woo a lady as a "perulero", because "los forasteros / tienen más dicha con ellas; / y más si son de las Indias, / información de riqueza" (1.815-18). Thus, García uses the secretive yet intriguing quality of an exotic foreign country to abuse the dullness and normality of Madrid just as he thereby enhances his own flatness.

Furthermore, as has been mentioned before, Juan and Félix are incapable of recognizing García at first glance and indicate how much he has changed, both in terms of his physical and psychological nature. The protagonist has assimilated to the Madrilenian dress code which obviously entails a transformation in character within him. The diabolic opposition of the city is reflected in his own duplicity, which brings the mysteries of the capital onto the same level with García's own secrets. Kate

McCarthy-Gilmore argues that “identities are different in Madrid, that Madrid through its connection with empire and the court is a world set apart from Spain” (136), just as much as the artificial Madrilenian García is set apart from his true self.

4. PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA

Calderonian plays could [always], through the ideas they developed, pass human life in review in a way not only historically important for understanding their age, but also universally significant [...] beyond the time and the place of their composition. (Parker, Mind and Art 13)

Pedro Calderón de la Barca was born in 1600 in Madrid to Diego Calderón de la Barca and Ana María de Henao, the young daughter of a noble Spanish family. To secure his career in the Church, he began his studies of Latin, Greek and Theology as a young boy at the Jesuit College of Madrid before continuing at the University of Alcalá. After the death of his father in 1615 he enrolled in the University of Salamanca, but interrupted his theological career to become a soldier of the Spanish army after he had already debuted as a playwright: his first comedy, *Amor, honor, y poder*, was staged in Madrid as early as 1623. “That play’s title marks preoccupations that would persist throughout his career: the conflicting claims of personal desires, the public exigencies of the honor code, and the demands – and limits – of royal and paternal power” (Greer 3). From this follows that Calderón’s literary cycle can be divided into two phases, the first extending from the 1620s to the 1640s, and the second following censure and closure of the Madrid stage from the 1650s to his death in 1681.

While his first phase of literary production shows traces, both in content and structure, of the Spanish comedy’s forefather, Lope de Vega, Calderón’s later style “developed a new direction for the Spanish stage, as the more spontaneous approach found in the work of [Lope] was replaced by [his] narrative complexity and often elaborate

stylization” (Tully 2-3). As he worked both for the *corrales* as well as the king’s private theaters, Calderón rejoined the army in the 1640s and several years later the Third Order of Franciscans. He died in May of 1681 in Madrid, where, in 1878, a monumental statue was erected in his honor as one of the greatest dramatists of the 17th-century Spanish Golden Age.

His extensive body of work includes more than 100 comedies and 70 *autos sacramentales* as well as a number of *entremeses*. His most invigorating collection of literary productions, his comedies, “exhibit [tight] plot construction, with no superfluous characters or irrelevant digressions, and with [few] locales for the action” (Appelbaum xi). His best-known masterpiece representing his elaborate style is *La vida es sueño* (~1635), a philosophical drama full of metaphors and symbols pertaining to aspects of religion, mythology and the question of destiny. One of Calderón’s most famous comedies is *La dama duende* (1629), in which he excels in the presentation of intrigues of love a strong-willed female protagonist is enveloped in.

As mentioned in the introduction to this analysis, Calderón’s works would not be as characteristic for his writing style were he not to explore the complex issue of the secret on the court. The most prominent of his plays ranking among these comedies of intrigue or cloak-and-dagger is *El secreto a voces*, which introduces the very global notion of the “open” or “public secret.” Therein, the author plays with information kept secret despite its already common knowledge as well as the circumstances and consequences of keeping or sharing these secrets. Other plays dominating this concept, also in their titles, include *Nadie fíe su secreto* (1623/24) and *Basta callar* (1638/39).

Calderón’s play significant to this study was written between 1642 and 1644 under the title *El agua mansa*. Several years later, approximately in 1649, he brought out a revised version entitled *Gúardate del agua mansa*, the latter of which will here serve as the primary source. Despite the fact that it definitely does not pertain to his most famous works, the ease with which Calderón masters its plot structure, character development and exploration of the origin, treatment and consequences of certain secrets must be honored. Basing his story on the common proverb “still waters run deep”, Calderón establishes the significance of the play’s themes and morals already in the title and bestows upon it a very universal and contemporary character.

4.1 GUÁRDATE DEL AGUA MANSA: THE DUAL POWER OF THE SECRET

*[D]e sus desvelos
uno y otro me han fiado
el secreto; de manera,
que obligado a embarazar
su empeño estoy, y a callar. (3.215-19)¹⁹*

*To know the difference between good and evil. Let no one tell his secret. Beware of
still waters that run deep. There is nothing like silence. Give Time time.
Because tomorrow will be another day. (Wilson 127)*

This play bodes well as the final part of this analysis, as it combines a variety of aspects concerning secret-keeping and exposure previously discovered in Molina's and Alarcón's stories, while still introducing the reader to new facets of the subject. For the third time, we find a court in the capital of Madrid, where a widowed father is concerned with marrying his daughters. The rich Don Alonso has ordered his nephew Don Toribio, a poor and characteristically terrible man, to his house to join him in matrimony with his younger daughter Eugenia. Despite the fact that Alonso discloses his agenda from the very beginning, he does not inform any party of his wish to marry Eugenia, but leaves Toribio open to choose. The reader does not meet the two ladies in the beginning, but Calderón characterizes them through the words of Mari-Nuño, the criada, in their absence.

Doña Clara, mi señora,

¹⁹ Once more, references to the play will be given in parentheses as "act.line-line."

mayor en cordura y años,
es la misma paz del mundo:
no se ha visto igual agrado
hasta hoy en mujer. Pues ¿qué
su modestia y su recato?
Apenas cuatro palabras
habla al día: no se ha hallado
que haya dicho con enojo
a criada ni a criado
en su vida una razón:
es, en fin, ángel humano
que a vivir solo con ella,
pudiera uno ser esclavo. (1.153-66)²⁰

Clara, the elder of the two daughters, is immediately classified as the female protagonist of the play, as her attributes clearly reflect the title of the story. The servant defines her as the “paz del mundo,” the silent water that runs through the whole story. What the author implies is that with the silence of the key female character and especially the double play her name implies will emerge secrets, for one must never underestimate the quiet “ángel humano” inherent in “la imagen de lo fluido que presenta el título: cuidado con el agua limpia y “clara”, que siempre esconde un secreto en la oscuridad de sus profundidades” (Santo-Tomás 640). When Mari-Nuño then describes the younger sister, Eugenia, another dichotomy is established as the two could not be more different in character and attitude.

Doña Eugenia, mi señora,
aunque en virtud ha igualado
sus buenas partes, en todo
lo demás es al contrario.
Su condición es terrible:
no se vio igual desagrado
en mujer: dará, señor,
una pesadumbre a un santo.
Es muy soberbia y altiva,
tiene a los libros humanos
inclinación, hace versos;
y si la verdad te hablo,
de recibir un soneto
y dar otro, no hace caso. (1. 167-80)

Eugenia is the “dichosa” of the two sisters; she is of despicable character and cannot be honored as a rightful woman of the court due to her loose mouth and rough

²⁰ Again, subsequent references to Calderón’s *Guárdate del agua mansa* will be presented in parentheses as “act.line-line.” However, as the primary text numbers verse lines in each act anew, so will this analysis. The numbers indicating the relevant act will serve as the main distinguisher.

inclinations. However, it seems that as the frank of the two sisters, Eugenia is more prone to honesty and revolution, even her name resonates the power of “una joven temperamental que se rebela contra la autoridad paterna y adopta como nueva ley la cartografía urbana con todos sus peligros y placeres” (Santo-Tomás 640). As the “contrario” to her sister Clara, Calderón defines two opposite identities within two separate bodies as he plays with the notions of angel and devil. As will be made clear throughout this chapter, that same concept of the two poles will arise within the (pseudo)-innocent Clara and transform her, unexpectedly to the *dramatis personae*, into the epitome of immorality in the story.

When Don Félix, who can be named the male protagonist, enters the next scene, he verbalizes the predicament Clara has found herself in her entire life. As he contemplates with his servant Hernando which of the two sisters he has previously caught sight of he will woo, his decision seems set in stone immediately.

FÉLIX: Diversas cosas colijo
de ambas que apruebo y condeno,
porque hay del pan y del palo.
HERNANDO: Una es callada.
FÉLIX: Eso es malo.
HERNANDO: Otra es risueña.
FÉLIX: Eso es bueno.
Para la alegre, por Dios,
habrá sonetazo bello;
y para la triste aquello
de «ojos, decídselo vos». (1.258-68)

Without knowing either Clara or Eugenia personally, Félix establishes that marrying a quiet woman can only hurt his position and that, therefore, he must go after the “risueña” of the two sisters, Eugenia. Since both remain equally beautiful to him physically, Félix judges Clara based on her silence and, in a way, reminds the reader of Molina’s Melchor and Alarcón’s García. All three galanes commit the crime of ascribing status to characteristics which will eventually not get them what they want. Despite the fact that Melchor ended up with Magdalena, she is essentially not who he wanted her to be all along, and so the importance he put on his imagined bride’s perfection came back to haunt him. García turned out as an even more apparent victim of his own flaws as his castle of lies would eventually not ameliorate his esteem, as he had planned, but forced him to accept his fate and marry a woman he does not love. In

the given case, Félix admits that “pues aunque ellas son bellas, / me quiero a mí más que a ellas” (1.374-75), which is why his egoistic self automatically discards Clara as his wife; despite her beauty, the submissive characteristics he interprets from Hernando’s comment about her have put him off. Calderón proves that his galán-protagonist, like the two previously analyzed ones, is in no way interested in a specific woman or in real love, but is focused on the chase of the perfect object. It remains for the reader to suspect that he will fail in his endeavors, for manipulation and self-centeredness has not boded well for anyone so far.

As Félix meets his friends Don Pedro and Don Juan, the three decide to spy on the two sisters from afar to establish who each of their affections is directed at. They obtain their hiding place, a location that metaphorically represents their secret affections for the ladies, which none of them discloses to the respective two others.

JUAN: Veámoslas todos.
(Llega DON JUAN a mirar.)
(Aparte. ¡Qué veo!
Ella es.)
PEDRO: Pues las visteis vos,
a mí me dejad llegar.
(Llega DON PEDRO.)
FÉLIX: A fe que hay bien que admirar
en cualquiera de las dos.
PEDRO: **(Aparte.** ¿Qué es lo que veo? Ella es, ¡cielos!)
Gran dicha ha sido venir **(A DON FÉLIX.)**
a vuestro barrio a vivir.
JUAN: **(Aparte.** Disimulen mis desvelos.)
Bizarra cualquiera es.
PEDRO: **(Aparte.** Finja mi pena amorosa.)
Cualquiera es dellas hermosa. (1.705-17)

In a game of verbal hide and seek, the three galanes reveal to the reader in offside remarks that they have discovered their beloved women. Out of fear of the consequences, they all keep the truth to themselves and thus become bearers of the core secret of the play that will eventually lead to all the betrayal and confusion. What ensues is suspicion in the reader: even though no one has mentioned the name of their wishful bride yet, it can only be suspected that their love will be directed at one and the same woman, most probably Eugenia, for Clara has taken on the position of the “herida” of her “vanidad de dama hermosa” (Arellano 5) and will thus be disregarded by the men. As soon as Don Toribio, Alonso’s nephew, arrives at their home, Calderón

proves that Clara is entirely underestimated in her personal “wealth.” She is the first of the two sisters to address Toribio and does not silently withstand the scene as would be expected of her from her introduction. This dramatic detail is what elevates Calderón as a master dramatist; his clever use of language and *mis-en-scène* for Clara foreshadows that she does indeed carry a secret trait very much the opposite to that which she presents in public. Interestingly, she is drawn to Toribio despite, or maybe even because of, his horrifying character. As he addresses Mari-Nuño as an “animal / de las Indias / [...] que [no] es hombre ni mujer” (1.1057-60), he makes no mistake about this personality which resembles Eugenia’s right to the point. Calderón emphasizes the duality between the sisters when Eugenia calls Toribio a “tonto por extremo” (1.1062); as the reader might expect the two despicable personalities to match each other perfectly, it is Eugenia who is repulsed by character traits she bears intrinsically herself. While resting assured of her strong position as the “dichosa” and honorable sister, it seems that seeing her own appalling behavior in someone else is more than she can tolerate. Eugenia openly presents her “vicios femeninos” (Santo-Tomás 645) so unidentifiable in her sister, which is what will ultimately challenge Clara to turn the tables on her.

As Juan and Pedro seek the help of their friend Félix in their quest for their beloved, it is the latter galán who plays tricks on them to find out the identities of either of their subjects of affection, suspecting, like the reader, that they will turn out to be one and the same: “Mas lo hago por saber / si es que es la dama una mesma” (2.97-98). As the three friends approach the ladies in the street, and Juan and Pedro both pray that the respective other is not in love with their own beloved, Calderón presents the key confusion of identities between the two sisters. Félix inquires in an offside remark who Juan’s love is, he answers “la del pañuelo en la / mano” (2.518-19), clearly identifying Eugenia, as Clara has left the house without one. Directly thereafter, Eugenia hands her handkerchief to her sister and Félix spots Juan’s object of desire at this very moment. His honest mistake then lies in confusing Clara for Eugenia, just as García did with regard to Jacinta and Lucrecia. At this point, however, this confusion could not bear more irony due to the extreme opposites the two sisters represent.

FÉLIX: Ya puedo ver, pues que tengo
nombre, seña y contraseña,

cuál es la dama que adoran. (2.541-43)

This statement is clearly erroneous, but Félix, honoring his commitment to Juan and Pedro as a truthful friend, decides to court the other sister, thereby naturally mistaking Eugenia for Clara. Calderón again stresses the obvious interchange of the two sisters. While Clara is believed to be the sweet and innocent, and Eugenia the rough and rebelling sister, Félix's honest mistake can be read as a metaphor for these identities being swapped in the end: Clara will turn out to be the manipulative, and Eugenia essentially the betrayed one. Thus, the secret inherent in Clara's personality will be triggered and exposed because or even in spite of Félix's ingenuous error.

In the same scene Calderón makes use of physical disguise to further separate the sisters' real personalities from those they present in public.

CLARA: Sin pañuelo me he venido,
el tuyo, hermana, me presta;
que ir tapada me congoja **(Destápase.)**
EUGENIA: A mí el venir descubierta,
pues por si fue encuentro acaso,
que me hayan visto me pesa.
(Tápase y da el pañuelo a CLARA.) (2.535-40)

Clara enters the street as the *tapada* while Eugenia remains uncovered, only with the handkerchief in her hand. When the former mentions that the cloak makes her uncomfortable, and the latter that she would rather remain "descubierta," on the surface they exchange the cloak and the handkerchief. This moment is a highly dramatic one, as in their give-and-take of material objects what they really swap are their identities. As Clara discards her physical mask, which previously conformed to her silence as a verbal cover, she now seems ready for her secret to emerge from within. In the following scene, this change in her character becomes apparent in a short address she makes to her sister and father when Alonso announces that Toribio has chosen Eugenia to be his bride.

Aunque pérdida es penosa,
yo estimo que el bien posea
Eugenia, para que sea
mi hermana la venturosa,
feriando el pesar a precio
del parabién que la doy. (2.787-92)

Eugenia remains silent to the news while Clara congratulates her sister and wishes her well with her future husband. All that is left for Eugenia to say at this moment is that “[h]oy muero / pues tras mis penas, he sido / objeto de un ignorante” (2.823-25). She experiences the curse of the loud-mouthed and rebellious woman as she is expected to surrender to her prescribed destiny. She does not, however, resort to full silence but detours to lying to Toribio for lack of other options in sight. Eugenia submits herself to deceptive scheming when she implies to Toribio that, in reality, she is not his prima and will not marry a man who lacks grace and attractiveness (“no tenéis filis” [2.869]). Shocked and disgusted by her behavior, Toribio gives away her agenda to Alonso, which is when Eugenia upheaves her lies to another level and says that it is indeed Toribio who has been lying and that she has not seen him, let alone spoken to him.

In the following conversation between the two sisters it becomes clear to the reader that Clara has also ascended to another level. She clarifies that “de otra manera me estimen / que a ti” (2.960-61), and the way she indicates this fact suggests that she will make sure to distinguish herself from Eugenia also in the future, because Toribio has rendered her “imposible” (2-964) as a prospect wife. When Félix shows up at their house to hand a letter to Clara, who he still thinks is Eugenia, it is suddenly the latter sister who remains hidden to eavesdrop on their conversation. As previously Clara was the silent bystander of the two, it is now Eugenia who underlies her sister’s change in perspective. Clara is surprised by Félix’s wish to meet her and assures him that she knows neither him nor Juan or Pedro as she suspects that the letter is really meant for Eugenia. She complains that “¿Que sola una vez que quise / yo no ser yo, no he podido?” (2.1028-29) as she “experimenta sentimientos de envidia y vanidad herida al comprobar que la galanteada es su hermana” (Arellano 4). At this moment Calderón has reached a point that was also mentioned with regard to the two previous stories: Clara has understood that she is being mistaken for her sister, and so does Eugenia, who has additionally realized that Clara is in no way willing to resolve the situation but is at the verge of betraying her. Both are given the opportunity to lift the secret that by now encompasses all five of the lovers, but, like Magdalena and García before them, neither of them is ready to admit defeat. Calderón thus spurs on his story by letting the two sisters keep their secrets and build upon them to prove their superiority over each other. In the given case, this play-off against each other distinguishes the

two sisters from previous protagonists, who have refrained from disclosing their secrets out of despair or sheer arrogance. Clara and Eugenia, however, will keep participating in the game of secrets until somebody's breaking point.

Clara then yells for her sister and father to join her, but her attempt is in vain as "[n]o hay nadie que pueda oírme" (2.1062). This verbal intermezzo is only a small detail, but at the same time another indicator of her disregarded position as the "agua mansa." Calderón shows that she has still remained the overlooked sister, so "clara" that she becomes invisible at times. This point is strengthened by her aforementioned complaint, for the only time a suitor has now come to woo her, he has mistaken her for her terrible sister.

The beginning of the final act of the play also marks Clara's ultimate provocation of chaos. She sheds herself completely off of her own identity and impersonates her sister in order to be able to pursue Félix herself. The secret facet in Clara's personality has progressed excessively by now and she seems so far gone that no aspect of her previous calm self has remained. She plans to win over Félix, with him "ignorando que soy yo, / a hablarme más claramente / esta noche" (3.17-19). The obvious irony in her use of the word "claramente" further boosts the game of secrets that is being played. The more the story develops the clearer it becomes that Clara may as well be victorious in her charade as the "agua mansa," especially when the two sisters take a moment to declare their feelings in offside remarks.

EUGENIA: (**Aparte.**) Sola esta vez salgo triste,
porque alguno no me encuentre
destos dos necios amantes.

CLARA: (**Aparte.**) Sola esta vez salgo alegre,
por si en las fiestas, por dicha,
a este caballero viese. (3.175-80)

Calderón's emphatic repetition in their respective first lines stresses the distinction that has driven the two sisters apart: while Eugenia is far too used to celebrate personal victories so that her current sadness now overwhelms her, Clara can, for the first time, enjoy a moment of success as she intrinsically takes revenge on Eugenia for her eternal attempts to push herself to the fore. Clara thus reflects the ultimate curse of the "agua mansa": whoever keeps a secret for too long will eventually break, and Clara's ongoing pretense of the good and innocent sister has now led to the chaos of the story.

On the side of the suitor-galanes, the predicament of the silent secret-keeper is also close to reaching its climax. They have all installed themselves in the house of the sisters, and as Juan approaches Félix and demands to know the truth behind all the suspicions as well as his word to honor their friendship, Calderón makes the duality between secret-keeping and exposure more explicit than ever.

JUAN: No sé
lo que os diga...
FÉLIX: (**Aparte.**) ¡Muerto quedo!
JUAN: Que ni hablar ni callar puedo.
[...]
Porque os ofendo en hablar,
y en callar me ofendo a mí:
con que es preciso que aquí
no pueda hablar ni callar.
FÉLIX: No os entiendo.
JUAN: Yo tampoco;
mas si entenderme queréis,
como licencia me dies
diré el dolor que me aqueja.
FÉLIX: Sí doy. (**Aparte.** ¡Empeño cruel!)
JUAN: Pues enseñadme un papel
que os dieron por esta reja. (3.232-48)

Juan finds himself in a vicious circle caused by the consequences that would await him both if he were to speak or remain silent. He does not want to offend his friend, and neither himself, by disclosing his true feelings and concerns and demonstrates that damnability and faultiness lies within keeping as well as exposing a secret. Therefore, the core issue Calderón, as well as Molina and Alarcón, have dedicated themselves to treating is the point in time at which the story is ready for the secret to be unveiled. While both Juan and Félix subtly mention that “callar” is what they actively participate in at this moment, in the following scene the truth starts to unravel slightly, entailing, however, more confusion at the same time.

Juan, again hidden within the house, becomes a silent witness to Félix’s declaration of love for the real Eugenia, who is still Clara to him. Félix has been a loyal friend at the core throughout the whole play; for lack of information and honest confusion, however, Juan and Pedro’s betrayal by their friend and accomplice is now complete.

[Y]o, don Pedro, he fiado
de don Félix que estoy enamorado
de una dama; y habiéndome valido
dél, no sólo ayudarme ha pretendido,

pero contra su honor, contra su fama,
sé que festeja aquesta misma dama. (3.353-58)

In this instant, Pedro sees no other way than to erase the secret of his disclosure to Félix in order to reestablish rightful harmony between the two truthful friends. Félix, entirely confused as to Juan and Pedro's fury towards his intended loyalty, feels just as offended so that "[c]alle la lengua pues, y hable el acero" (3.405). The galanes exchange words for swords in order to defend their honor and thereby let their actions speak. The same holds true for Clara whose diabolic plan defines her as the vicious of the two sisters more and more. "[M]ostrando que era "agua mansa", toma una gran actividad directora en los tramos finales" (Arellano 4): she locks Toribio out onto a balcony and deceives her sister into the same finale. Promising Eugenia that she will "desvela[r] más tu inocencia" (3.843-44), Clara tricks her into believing that she has her best interest at heart. In her malevolent fit of self-preservation Clara, however, locks out her sister and can then be alone with Félix, who confesses his affections for her. When he finds Toribio on the balcony and the two demand each other's names, the secrets are almost lifted. Juan enters, however, urging Félix and Toribio to hide once again until Pedro steps in and threatens the latter galán. As they all eventually enter the same room at the same time, the story has finally reached the point at which the secrets must be exposed and the mistaken identities clarified.

FÉLIX. Teneos,
que yo doña Eugenia he dicho,
no vos. **(Señala a CLARA.)**
ALONSO: ¿Cómo, cómo es eso?
¿Luego tú eras la que un hombre
escondido tenías dentro?
EUGENIA: ¿Luego tú con nombre mío,
Clara, la traición has hecho?
TORIBIO: ¿Luego tú por eso a mí
me tenías al sereno,
hecho avestruz del amor?
LOS TRES: ¿Qué es esto, ingrata? ¿Qué es esto? (3.1015-26)

With all the betrayed characters present in the room of "desvelos," Calderón now attacks solely Clara as the ultimate culprit of the ensued chaos and confusion. As Juan and Pedro realize that Félix's mistake was an honest one, they return to honoring their friendship and supporting him in his wish to now marry Clara ("FÉLIX: [Y]o lo soy suyo. / CLARA: Y yo suya" [3.1048-49]). Eugenia has at the same time come to the sense that Toribio should have been hers to marry all along, but as she assures him that

she has never had bad intentions, the stubborn man refuses and decides to return home unmarried. As Juan then offers to take his beloved as his bride after all, Alonso can but accept Juan as “del mal el menos” (3.1086), indicating that Eugenia has ultimately failed and must marry the second-best. Toribio leaves with nothing after offering the play’s final moral message:

¿Quién no lo creyera?, pues
siempre en el mundo lo vemos,
que las aguas mansas son
de las que hay que fiar menos,
y tienen mayor peligro
porque sin duda por eso,
Guárdate del agua mansa
dijo un antiguo proverbio. (3.1051-1058)

Ultimately, it is Eugenia’s identity that is compromised by all the secrets, far more than Clara’s, who, like García before her, would deserve to be punished for her deceitful actions. Eugenia has missed to land the man of her desire, mostly because she never verbalized who her heart belonged to in the first place. Therefore, indecisiveness is just as much a reason for punishment as obsessive desire for a particular individual. Toribio fails for lack of resoluteness and courtship; he does not add any action to the story, for his comic surrendering at the end proves that he was never a real competitor for the love of any of the sisters, let alone Eugenia. The younger sister, in turn, has put too much emphasis on her perseverance and personal rebellion against patriarchy to be able to stop Clara’s secret from gaining the upper hand. Both sisters distance themselves from their original identities, and while Clara’s new self clearly stirs in a more deceptive direction, it is the older sister who prevails in the end. “Eugenia, pues, representa las posibles degeneraciones de lo que en el siglo XVII era lo moderno: la moda, el coche, el galanteo mundano, que llevan implícito un concepto del honor como anticuado” (Campbell 45). This deterioration of Eugenia facilitates the doctrine of the “agua mansa” to yield ultimate ultvictory.

4.1.1 THE STILLNESS OF THE WATER:

MERGING MOLINA, ALARCÓN AND CALDERÓN

So ist Calderóns Geheimnis doppelt energetisiert: Erstens setzt es Dialoge und Handlungen in Gang, erzeugt Verwicklung, Spannung und dramatische Höhepunkte; es ist also literarisches Verfahren in einer perfekt konstruierten Komödie; zweitens werden beim Spiel um Geheimnisse wechselnde Bilder gebündelter sozialer Wirklichkeit in den Raum der Bühne projiziert. (Aichinger 14)

Looking at Calderón's Clara as the female intriguer of the play, she brings to light a variety of aspects that remind the reader of Molina's Magdalena. For example, Clara's intended plan to deceive by keeping verbal and written secrets from other parties is equally spurred on by external influences as Magdalena's. As the epitome of the still water, Clara's personality is difficult to trace in the beginning: her silence dominates her and her "clara" position has forced her to remain the disregarded sister, while Alonso is dedicated to find a husband for the more difficult Eugenia. As the two ladies envelop in a dance of secrets and lies and distance themselves from their pure selves, it is Clara who makes use of verbal masquerade. Thereby, she splits her new identity so decisively from her old one that the extreme opposition in her character borders on that between her and Eugenia. So, Calderón merges what Molina and Alarcón have presented separately: Magdalena was concerned with her intrinsic self-splitting, while Jacinta and Lucrecia were dedicated to keeping their identities from conflating in the love for the same man. Calderón's protagonist is now prone to establish a new identity for herself while still remaining as far away from Eugenia character-wise as possible. Interestingly, this theater within the theater ends well for her, which manifests that

“‘[a]ll is fair in love and war’, [which] applied in Spain, as elsewhere, sanctioning the deceptions that the secrecy of love-making required and thus, going beyond strict comedy, could lead to serious moral conflicts or dilemmas” (Parker, *Mind and Art* 138). Thus, it is ultimately these acts of secrecy with regard to relationships that evoke the characters’ errors and lead to their undisputed success or downfall. What Wolfram Aichinger has said about Calderón’s *El secreto a voces* applies to the comedy at hand as well: the author inspires certain horizons of expectation in the title²¹ and so *Guárdate del agua mansa* is an outcry of critique directed at the societal dimensions of 17th-century Spain. Apart from Eugenia and Clara’s personal falling apart, Toribio serves as a good example to illustrate this point.

Toribio manifiesta las posibles degeneraciones de los valores tradicionales: el linaje basado sólo en la ejecutoria, con ello lo solariego y la hidalguía, y la exageración en la aparente defensa de honor. Todo ello con fundamento en sí mismos y no en las características individuales, pues el figurón es un cobarde e ignorante cuyo discurso de opone a la acción, ya que sus bravuconadas disfrazan su carácter medroso. (Campbell 45-46)

Thus, ultimately, the secret inherent in the “agua mansa” and the morale implied in the title are directed at the characters as well as the reader and must warn despite the story’s comedic genre of the dangers of lying, deception and concealment of the truth. As in Molina’s *La celosa de si misma*, a strong female lady like Eugenia can easily be undermined if she underestimates the power of the concept that is the secret.

²¹ cf. Aichinger 13.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has offered a comparative analysis of 17th-century Spanish Golden Age comedies by Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón and Pedro Calderón de la Barca under special consideration of the concepts of secret-keeping and -exposing. All three authors' literary productions herein discussed rely first and foremost on the standard of the *comedia nueva* in terms of their structure (3-act plays) and presentation of certain stock characters (*galanes*, *damas*, *graciosos*, *criadas*). They all also advocate, in typical Golden Age fashion, a complex conglomerate of amorous relationships which are constantly strengthened and undermined either by members of these couplings themselves or by external parties. This investigation has shown that in either case, the characters', especially the protagonists', tampering with what has been termed "the truth" contributed majorly to their mistakes and confusions and, particularly, to the eventual finales of success or failure. The destabilizing of this truth through lying and deception, two concepts which have been classified herein as dependent subcategories of the secret, has led to all protagonists discarding and/or (re)discovering one or several versions of their identity at some point during the respective stories. Under this premise, the main argument of this analysis has been that whichever secret the protagonists have kept, the extremes to which this concealment has carried them has played a major role in the (de)construction of their identities.

As a starting point, this investigation has examined Tirso de Molina's *La celosa de sí misma*, a comedy of intrigue that features a typically powerful tirsianan female protagonist. Through the author's mastery in character development, the reader is

taken on a journey that presents Doña Magdalena as her true self, as the unknown tapada and the fictitious Countess of Chirinola, the last two of which have almost entirely been created by external influences. The male main character, Don Melchor, is a dandy galán whose main goal is not to pursue Magdalena for her individuality, but for the invented characteristics he has ascribed to her in his love-crazed mind after only seeing her hand. As Molina makes it clear that his beloved mystery woman and his previously promised fiancée are one and the same, Melchor can still not see the resemblance between the two and Magdalena refrains from revealing this fact because she fears that the galán lacks affection for her true self. Magdalena keeps this key secret of the story all the while her identity is constantly split and reassembled by herself, Melchor, Santillana and Ángela, which forces her to frequently resort to physical and verbal disguise. She submits to this form of concealment by adjusting her robes and voice to the identity she impersonates at the given moment, triggering an ongoing process of falsities taking over her life. As Molina brings the comedy's title into play, Magdalena loses control of her charade up to a point where she becomes jealous of herself, leading the reader to wonder whether she truly believes to have split herself into two. When in the end Ángela offers a second personified version of the fabricated Countess, Magdalena has no other choice than to overthrow the instable system of secrets and reveal the truth to Melchor. Even though the two end up married, the reader doubts whether Magdalena can ever entirely discard all the pieces of her other identities, as she is well aware that the galán's love is still primarily directed at the wholly unreal image of her in his mind. The secrets Magdalena must keep force her into and out of her psychological separation of identities.

The outcome of Juan Ruiz de Alarcón's *La verdad sospechosa* bodes even worse for the protagonist Don García. Established from the very beginning as a man who prefers to avoid telling the truth, the author presents the concept of secret-keeping mainly on the verbal sphere. While García still adjusts his costume when he arrives in Madrid to match the new personalities he will impersonate, it is the excruciatingly detailed fictions he disseminates among all of his co-characters that eventually spin his castle of secrets out of control. As García falls in love with lady Jacinta, whose name he believes to be Lucrecia, he shows traces of Molina's Melchor in that he equally does not care for her character, but for who and what he believes her to be. While the

confusion of the two identities is based on an honest mistake inherent in ambiguous conversations between Melchor and his servant Tristán, the protagonist's affinity for naming and re-naming himself as an exotic indiano or an already married man leaves his true identity shattered to pieces in secret. The notoriousness of García's way of concealing the truth depict him as a subtle version of the *secreto a voces*, because, unlike Magdalena, his publicly known position as Beltrán's son makes it easy to discover and expose his lies. When it is again the woman who finds out that her admirer and her fiancé merge into the same person, Jacinta also refuses to come clean; instead, she joins García in a vicious circle of (un)covering her own as well as Lucrecia's identities only to realize that, like Melchor, he seems to be in love with only for love's sake. In the end, it is too late for García to be saved or to save himself: he must marry the real Lucrecia and is, therefore, punished for his despicable actions. Alarcón uses his *magnum opus* to critique Spanish Golden Age society and to cast a warning message against the corrupt morals of the vicious liar and secret-bearer.

The final stage of this study treats Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *Guárdate del agua mansa*, a comedy of intrigue that seems to conflate the previously discussed plays in another morale-boosting plot. What the master of the Spanish comedy creates are two female protagonists on opposite sides of the characteristic poles: Eugenia, the loudmouthed despicable younger sister, and Clara, the innocent still water that gives the play its title, seem to exchange identities when Don Félix, Calderón's male protagonist, mistakes the latter for the former in an equally honest fashion as Melchor before him. Thereby, Clara's position as the uncherished bystander fades to make room for the secret impersonation of her sister, which approximates the two ladies to Alarcón's in their development. The exchange of the cloak for the handkerchief makes for the most dramatic scene of the play, as the materials metaphorically represent the sisters' identities. From this point forward, Clara is not who she used to be: it seems that Félix has unlocked the secret that was her real personality, urging her, like Melchor did Magdalena, to claim a new self far from the "agua mansa." The series of lies told and betrayals committed henceforth among the sisters, their three suitors and between these two groups culminates in Eugenia's downfall when, similar to García, she has to marry someone she never actively wanted, and Clara's clear success when, like Magdalena, she ends up with her beloved Félix. However, it seems that her secret

pursuit of the galán is based solely on her wish to split herself not only from her despicable sister, but primarily from her still self.

Ultimately, all three dramatists present identities “in flux”:²² just as the rapid change of Madrid into the splendid capital of Spain at the time, so oscillate the protagonists’ multidimensional identities in the given plays. Molina, Alarcón and Calderón have mastered the concept of secret-keeping as an indicator of identities and have critically painted society as well as its members as constant abusers of this notion. Whether their protagonists ultimately succeed or fail, the moral of the story is that secrets behave like “agua ciertamente revuelta” (Santo-Tomás 640) and push its bearer outside the lines of a stable existence.

²² This term was borrowed from Kevin Keane’s study on identities in fiction by Paul Auster.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichinger, Wolfram, and Simon Kroll, eds. *Laute Geheimnisse. Calderón de la Barca und die Chiffren des Barock*. Wien: Turia, 2011.
- Alarcón, Juan Ruiz de. "La verdad sospechosa." *Cibertextos de la Biblia Poliglota Moderna del Sistema MGARCI*. <<http://mgarci.aas.duke.edu/cibertextos/RUIZ-ALARCON-J/VERDAD-SOSPECHOSA/>>.
- Appelbaum, Stanley. "Introduction." *Life Is A Dream. A Dual-Language Book*. Ed. and Trans. by Appelbaum. Newton Abbot: Dover, 2002. v-xviii.
- Arellano, Ignacio. *El agua mansa / Guárdate del agua mansa*. Kassel: Reichenberger, 1989.
- Auster, Paul. *The New York Trilogy*. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Béziat, Florence. *El silencio en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Tirsianos, 2004.
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. "Gúardate del agua mansa." *Cibertextos de la Biblia Poliglota Moderna del Sistema MGARCI*. <<http://mgarci.aas.duke.edu/celestina/CALDERON-BP/GUARDATE-AGUA/>>.
- Campbell, Ysla. "Aspectos ideológicos en *Guárdate del agua mansa*." *Teatro calderoniano sobre el tablado: Calderón y su puesto en escena a través de los siglos*. Ed. Manfred Tietz. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003. 43-48.
- Castells, Ricardo. "Lies and Deception in Ruiz de Alarcón's *La Verdad Sospechosa*." *Latin American Literary Review* 36.72 (Jul.-Dec. 2008): 34-51.
- Cull, John T. "'Hablen poco y dicen mucho': The Function of Discovery Scenes in the Drama of Tirso de Molina." *The Modern Language Review* 91.3 (1996). 619-34.

- DiLillo, Leonard M. "Moral Purpose in Juan Ruiz de Alarcón's *La verdad sospechosa*." *Hispania* 56 (1973): 254-59.
- Flores, Angel, ed. *Great Spanish Plays in English Translation: 16th-20th century*. New York: Batnam Books, 1962.
- Gaylord, Mary Malcolm. "The Telling Lies of *La verdad sospechosa*." *MLN* 103.2 (Mar. 1988): 223-38.
- Greer, Margaret R. "Foreword." *Eight Dramas of Calderón*. Trans. Edward FitzGerald. Champaign: U of Illinois P, 2000. 1-6.
- Halkhoree, Premraj R. K. *Social and Literary Satire in the Comedies of Tirso de Molina*. Ed. José M. Ruano and Henry W. Sullivan. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1989.
- Hernández García, Carmela. *Fondo y forma del teatro del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: J. García Verdugo, 1998.
- Hochman, Stanley, ed. *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc, 1984.
- Hornby, Richard. *Drama, Metadrama and Perception*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1983.
- Josa, Lola. "El tiempo en las comedia de caracteres de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón." *Espacio, tiempo y género en la comedia española*. Ed. Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez, Rafael González Cañal and Gemma Gómez Rubio. Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2005. 93-102.
- Keane, Kevin. "Doubles in *The Locked Room* by Paul Auster: Identity in Flux." *Journal of Language and Culture* 4 (2009): 51-64.
- McCarthy-Gilmore, Kate. *Subversive Frontiers: Space, Gender and Literature in Colonial Latin America*. Diss. Washington University in St. Louis. 2009.
- Molina, Tirso de. "La celosa de sí misma." *Association for Hispanic Classical Theater*. Ed. David Hildner. 2003. < <http://www.comedias.org/tirso/CELOSA.pdf>>
- Nedelmann, Birgitta. „Geheimhaltung, Verheimlichung, Geheimnis – Einige soziologische Vorüberlegungen.“ *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean & Near Eastern Religions*. Ed. Hans G. Kippenberg and Guy G. Stroumsa. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Nitsch, Wolfram. *Barocktheater als Spielraum. Studien zu Lope de Vega und Tirso de Molina*. Tübingen: Narr, 2000.
- Pérez, Janet, and Maureen Ihrie, eds. *The Feminist Encyclopedia of Spanish Literature*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002.

- Parker, Alexander Augustine. *The Mind and Art of Calderón: Essays on the Comedias*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Parker, Mary. *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age: A Bio-Biographical Sourcebook*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Pavis, Patrice. *Diccionario del teatro*. Barcelona: Paidós, 1998.
- . *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Rozik, Eli. *Comedy: A Critical Introduction*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2011.
- Santo-Tomás, Enrique García. "Calderón y las aguas revueltas de Guárdate del agua mansa." *Arbor* 177 (Mar.-Apr. 2004): 639-48.
- Simmel, Georg. "Das Geheimnis und die geheime Gesellschaft." *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. By Simmel. Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1908. 256-304.
- Smith, Dawn. „La celosa de sí misma: A Comedy in Spite of Itself." *Romance Languages Annual* 10 (1998): 827-31. <<http://tell.fll.purdue.edu/RLA-Archive/1998/spanish-html/Smith,%20Dawn.htm>>.
- Turner, Robert L. *Disguise, Identity, and Female Cross-Dressing in Selected Works of Tirso de Molina*. Diss. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 2006.
- Tully, Carol. *Pedro Calderón de la Barca. La devoción de la cruz. / August Wilhelm Schlegel. Die Andacht zum Kreuze*. London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 2012.
- Valpy, Francis Edward Jackson. *An Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language*. London: Baldwin & Co., 1828.
- Vázquez, Luis. "La originalidad ingeniosa de La celosa de sí misma de Tirso en relación con el manuscrito previo de Ramón Tres mujeres en una." *El Ingenio Cómico de Tirso de Molina. Actas del II Congreso Internacional, April 27-29, 1998*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1998. 325-38.
- Whicker, Jules. *The Plays of Juan Ruiz de Alarcón*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2003.
- Wilson, Edward Meryon, and Don William Cruickshank, eds. *Spanish and English Literature of the 16th and 17th Centuries: Studies in Discretion, Illusion, and Mutability*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Willi, Rosalind. "Public secrets und Geheimnisse als Leitmotive der Komödien Calderóns: Freundschaft, Loyalität oder Liebe?" *Aichinger und Kroll* 159-93.

7. APPENDIX

7.1 RESÚMEN ESPAÑOL

REFLEXIONES PRELIMINARES

Trata este trabajo el concepto de la comunicación que ha preocupado los seres humanos desde su existencia. Tan complejo es que no había sido posible definirlo de manera amplia, y los innumerables trabajos empíricos y críticos demuestran y prueban este hecho. Se han desarrollado tantos medios y maneras de comunicar en nuestro mundo que el ruido de las palabras parece abrumador y tapa el silencio de los pensamientos.

Sin embargo, igual que al estruendo, personas conviviendo en cualesquiera comunidades se quedan fascinadas de lo cubierto y de cada instance en la que uno puede desvelar al otro: eso es lo que define el secreto, una noción que ha puesto en marcha una tradición en curso de estudios presentados por antropólogos y sociólogos que se interesan por su importancia y significado. Uno que se ha mencionado en esto es Georg Simmel, uno de los sociólogos y filósofos de los siglos XIX y XX más prominentes de este ámbito. Es su teoría que cada detalle que el ser humano presenta al público es sólo un fragmento del entero que es su alma. Distinguimos hechos

esenciales de los sin importancia cuando decidimos si nos desvelamos a alguien, y los trozos que seguimos escondiendo, no importa sus atributos, al final constituyen el secreto de nuestra personalidad. Simmel también menciona la posibilidad de mentir como característica del secreto, y depende de la intención del hablante si se define como acto vicioso o protector, por ejemplo.

Lo que aprende el lector del estudio de Simmel sobre el secreto en la sociedad es que nos preocupa esta noción mucho más de que nos damos cuenta. Wolfram Aichinger investiga el concepto común del *secreto a voces*, creado por Pedro Calderón de la Barca a través de una producción literaria del mismo título, probando que cada uno se queda rodeado por secretos de los que toda la comunidad es consciente. El hecho de que el portador de este mismo secreto aún así pretende como si fuera el único en el ajo demuestra lo del “Heimliche” en la sociedad y al mismo tiempo la versatilidad del concepto así.

Lo que los estudios teóricos sobre el secreto traen consigo son tratamientos literarios de ficción que se ocupan de encubrimiento de informaciones y exposición de crímenes, tanto de violencia física como de maldades psicológicas. Un género maestro que destaca en sus tratos de estos “delitos” de abrigo es la comedia del siglo XVII de España, el llamado Siglo de Oro, que ha producido autores que siguen investigando esa importancia del secreto para el individuo y la sociedad en la que vive.

Los escritores de esa época se dedican a explorar diferentes tipos de secretos inherentes en grupos de caracteres habitando la corte española. Por eso, tras una evaluación del género principal del Siglo de Oro, cada uno de los dramaturgos critica al ser humano y su tendencia a ocultar su verdadero “yo” a través de fingir ser otra persona.

La comedia de enredo del Siglo de Oro por eso marca maneras de ocultamiento y desvelo de diferentes tipos de secretos. Destacan caracteres que desempeñan ciertos roles en el proceso hacia el descubrimiento: el secreto-portador, su cómplice, el no consciente del secreto y el descubridor del secreto.²³ Estos se confunden en un red

²³ Eso se llama “sacasecretos” en la comedia *El amor médico* (1620) de Tirso de Molina.

complejo de mentiras y alteraciones de la verdad que, como ellos creen, debería ayudarlos a mejorar su estatus en la sociedad o con el sexo opuesto. Los apuros que entonces deprimen los caracteres y, sobre todo, los protagonistas secreto-portadores, se desarrollan de que su situación empeora en cambio. Queda para aclarar cuál es el tipo de ocultamiento y desvelo que saca más éxito o fracaso respecto al secreto particular que se trata.

PRESENTACIÓN DEL SUJETO SECRETO

La presente investigación ofrece un análisis comparativo de comedias de Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y Pedro Calderón de la Barca del Siglo de Oro español, considerando especialmente diferentes maneras de ocultar y sacar a la luz el secreto. Las producciones de los tres autores discutidas en esto son todas basadas en el estándar de la comedia nueva, introducido por primera vez por Lope de Vega en su *Arte nuevo de hacer Comedias* de 1609, en su estructura (obras de tres actos) tanto como en su presentación de caracteres típicos o modelos (galanes, damas, graciosos, criadas)

Todos también defienden un conglomerado complejo de relaciones amorosas frecuentemente intensificadas y al mismo tiempo debilitadas por los miembros de estas parejas o por individuos externos.

Ha resultado de este estudio que, en ambo caso, la falsificación del concepto que llamamos “la verdad” por los protagonistas de las historias ha espoleado e influido fundamentalmente en los errores que cometen y las confusiones de identidades a las que sucumben al final que les deja con éxito o fracaso personal. Esa destabilización de la verdad ocurre a través de mentiras y decepciones, conceptos que se han establecidos como categoría subordinada del secreto. Todos los protagonistas se desechan de y entonces (re)descubren una o varias versiones de su identidad propia alguna vez mientras transcurre la acción de la obra. Por consiguiente, el argumento principal de este análisis ha sido que el mantener de cualquier secreto los lleva a extremos, y esa noción de encubrimiento de informaciones o disimulación de emociones contribuye de manera esencial en la (de)construcción de su propia identidad.

TIRSO DE MOLINA
LA CELOSA DE SI MISMA

Como punto de partida, *La celosa de si misma* de Tirso de Molina, una comedia de enredo estándar, presenta una protagonista típicamente tirsiana: el autor consigue la presentación y evolución magistral de la resuelta Doña Magdalena, y el lector presencia su transformación de su carácter verdadero al de la tapada desconocida e invisible al de la Condesa de Chirinola, y al revés. Las últimas dos sufren de influencias externas, especialmente del protagonista Don Melchor, un dandi cazando el amor de cualquier mujer. El lector entiende muy al principio que no se interesa por la verdadera Magdalena, sino por la afición de la más hermosa dama que puede encontrar en Madrid. Al ver sólo una mano de Magdalena, le atribuye ciertas características a ella para formar una imagen perfecta, si inventada, en su pensamiento.

Tanto Magdalena como Melchor habían prometidos a alguien por sus padres antes de la acción de la obra, y es la dama que descubre que su amante desconocido y su prometido se unen en la misma persona: Melchor. Sin embargo, el galán no puede alcanzar este parecido entre su amante-tapada y la verdadera Magdalena por que se fija de forma obsesionada en su imaginación de ella. La dama descubre el carácter frívolo de Melchor, razón por la que no desvela el secreto de su identidad sino a su criada, Quiñones. Tiene miedo de las consecuencias que podría tener esa coquetería que manifiesta Melchor para su relación futura con él, y, por eso, mantiene escondido su carácter único-excepcional. Esa no-revelación la hace dividir y reunir constantemente el núcleo de su alma, también por la ayuda de Melchor, Santillana y Ángela, proceso que la fuerza a emplear disfraces físicos y verbales. Se somete a cambiar su ropa tanto como su voz según la identidad que está imitando; por eso provoca una series de falsidades que van tomando el control de su vida más y más. Conforme al título de la comedia, Magdalena parece perder su razón cuando empieza a sentir celos por ella misma. El lector se pregunta si la farsa de mantener el secreto ocultado ha destrozado la identidad de la dama tanto que ya no puede ver que es de verdad. Esa paranoia que demuestra parece una sutil version de esquizofrenia de la que solo se puede desechar con la ayuda de otros personajes otra vez.

Al final, Ángela imita otra variante de la Condesa fabricada, y, entonces, Magdalena no tiene más remedio que acabar con el sistema inestable de secretos y revelar la verdad a Melchor. A pesar de que los dos terminen casados, el lector duda que Magdalena pueda descartar por completo todas las piezas de sus otras identidades, como el claro que el amor del galán todavía está principalmente dirigido a la imagen totalmente irreal de ella en su mente. Los secretos Magdalena debe mantener la presionan a ella a moverse adentro y afuera de manera fluida de su separación psicológica de las identidades.

JUAN RUIZ DE ALARCÓN
LA VERDAD SOSPECHOSA

El final de *La verdad sospechosa* de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón representa una señal aún peor para el protagonista Don García. Creado desde el principio como un hombre que prefiere evitar decir la verdad, el autor presenta el mantenimiento de los secretos principalmente a través del ámbito verbal. Mientras que García de hecho se ajusta el traje cuando llegue a Madrid para adaptarse a las nuevas personalidades que hará pasar, son las ficciones increíblemente detalladas que difunde entre sus compañeros que a la larga hacen girar su castillo de los secretos fuera de control. García se enamora de la dama Jacinta, cuyo nombre él cree que es Lucrecia, y por eso muestra rastros de Melchor en que él mismo no se preocupa por el carácter de su amante, sino por lo que él cree y quiere que ella represente. Mientras que la confusión de las dos identidades se basa en un error de buena fe inherente en las conversaciones ambiguas entre Melchor y su siervo Tristán, la afinidad del protagonista para darse nombres y seguir renombrándose como un exótico indiano o un hombre casado se hace añicos de su verdadera identidad de manera secreta.

La notoriedad con la que García oculta las realidades lo establecen como una versión sutil del *secreto a voces*, ya que, a diferencia de Magdalena, su posición públicamente conocida como hijo de Beltrán hace que sea fácil de descubrir y exponer sus mentiras. Cuando es otra vez la mujer que descubre que su admirador y su prometido se funden en una misma persona, Jacinta también se niega a confesar ese hecho. En cambio, se une a García en un círculo vicioso de (des)cubrir su propia así como la identidad de

Lucrecia sólo para darse cuenta de que, como Melchor, él parece estar enamorado sólo por el concepto de amor. Al final, es demasiado tarde para García ser salvado o salvarse a sí mismo: tiene que casarse con la verdadera Lucrecia y es, por tanto, castigado por sus acciones despreciables. Alarcón utiliza su *magnum opus* como crítica de la sociedad española del Siglo de Oro y emita un mensaje de advertencia en contra de las costumbres corruptas del mentiroso y del portador vicioso del secreto.

PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA
GÚARDATE DEL AGUA MANSA

La última parte de este trabajo considera *Guárdate del agua mansa* de Pedro Calderón de la Barca, una comedia de intriga que mezcla aspectos discutidos sobre las comedias anteriores y los combina para formar otra obra sobre la (im)moralidad del secreto-portador. Lo que el maestro de la comedia española ha creado son dos protagonistas femeninas posicionadas en lados opuestos de los polos de características: Eugenia, la joven hermana malhablada y despreciable, y Clara, el “agua mansa” aún inocente que da la historia su título, parecen intercambiar identidades cuando don Félix, protagonista masculino de Calderón, confunde la una por la otra de forma igualmente honesta a la de Melchor. De esta manera, la posición de Clara se queda desalentada como espectadora desapreciada. Esta manera de desvanecimiento de su identidad la hace capable de imitar ser su hermana secretamente, y, por tanto, a través de su desarrollo, las dos se aproximan a las amigas-damas de Alarcón. El intercambio de la capa para el pañuelo presenta una escena clave dramática, ya que los objetos materiales metafóricamente representan las identidades de las hermanas. Desde este punto hacia adelante, Clara queda nada de lo que fue: parece que Félix ha descubierto el secreto que era su verdadera personalidad, presionándola a ella, como Melchor en la obra anterior, para que reclame un nuevo “yo” muy lejos del “agua mansa.”

La serie de mentiras dichas y traiciones cometidas entre las hermanas, sus tres admiradores y entre estos dos grupos resultan de esta divisón intrínseca y culminan, por fin, en la perdición de Eugenia. Igual que García, la hermana joven tiene que casarse con alguien a quien nunca activamente quería mientras tanto el éxito de Clara queda “claro” cuando, como Magdalena, ella termina con su amado Félix. Sin embargo,

parece que su búsqueda secreta del galán se basa únicamente en su deseo de alejarse no sólo de su hermana despreciable, sino sobre todo de su mismo manso.

PARA TERMINAR: OBSERVACIONES FINALES

En última instancia, los tres dramaturgos tratados en este trabajo presentan identidades “en flujo”:²⁴ el cambio de Madrid en la capital de esplendor de la España del Siglo de Oro presenta un estado de movimiento, así como la fluctuación de identidades inherente en los protagonistas multidimensionales en las obras dadas. Molina, Alarcón y Calderón han dominado el concepto de mantenimiento del secreto y lo han establecido como un indicador de esas identidades. Han pintado críticamente la sociedad española barroca, así como a sus miembros como profanadores de esta noción. Ya sea que sus protagonistas por último tienen éxito o fracasan, la moraleja de la historia es que los secretos se comportan como “agua ciertamente revuelta” (Santo Tomás-640) y empujan su portador fuera de las líneas de una existencia estable.

²⁴ Este término fue tomado de un estudio de Kevin Keaven sobre construcciones de identidad en la ficción de Paul Auster (2009).

7.2 ABSTRACT (DEUTSCH)

Die vorliegende Arbeit behandelt Komödien von drei der prominentesten Dramaturgen des Goldenen Zeitalters in Spanien: Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón und Pedro Calderón de la Barca leisteten im 17. Jahrhundert einen erheblichen Beitrag zur (Weiter)Entwicklung des Dramas und brachten somit die von Lope de Vega vorgestellte *comedia nueva* auf eine neue Ebene. Die Autoren beschäftigen sich in ihren respektiven Stücken *La celosa de si misma*, *La verdad sospechosa* und *Guárdate del agua mansa* mit der Gesellschaft, in der sie lebten, und präsentieren deshalb charakteristische 3-Akt-Stücke mit Stereotypen wie *galanes*, *damas*, *graciosos* und *criadas* und spezialisieren sich gleichzeitig auf komplizierte Liebesbeziehungen und Verwicklungen zwischen jenen Personen. Alle drei zeichnen sich aber vor allem dadurch aus, dass sie in ihren Intrigenkomödien ein Konzept in den Mittelpunkt stellen, ohne welches das spanische Theater des 17. Jahrhundert nicht dasselbe wäre: das Geheimnis.

Molinas Magdalena, Alarcóns García und Calderóns Clara verstricken sich alle in einem Netz aus Verschleierungen, Lügen und Täuschungen und verlieren dadurch immer mehr den Bezug zur Realität. Ihr Versteck-spielen, sowohl in verbaler als auch physischer Form, treibt sie bis an ihre persönlichen Grenzen und das stetige jemand-anders-sein führt letztendlich in allen Fällen dazu, dass sie ihre einzig wahre Identität verlieren und nicht mehr in ihr gewohntes Selbst zurückfinden. Die drei Protagonisten werden von externen Begleitern (meist ihren eigenen Dienern) zu ihren geheimen

Taten angestiftet und verlieren so lange die Kontrolle, bis ein unglückliches Ende der einzig mögliche Ausweg scheint.

Obwohl Molinas Magdalena am Ende ihren geliebten Melchor heiratet versteht der Leser, dass sie nie wieder völlig zu sich selbst zurückfinden wird. Sie bleibt eine Verdeckte, die *tapada*, und imitiert eine Frau, die es nicht gibt, die Melchor aber zu lieben vorgibt. Alarcóns Protagonist García hat es am Ende seiner Laufbahn als notorischer Lügner noch schwerer: das Austauschen seiner Identität für die anderer fiktiver Gestalten führt letztendlich dazu, dass er eine Frau heiraten muss, die er nicht liebt und welcher er auch niemals den Hof gemacht hat. Er verwechselt Jacinta und Lucrecia aufgrund eines unbeabsichtigten Missverständnisses, welches letztendlich (sowohl wörtlich als auch metaphorisch) zu seinem Untergang führt. Calderóns Clara widerum bekommt, ebenso wie Magdalena, die Chance ihren Geliebten zu heiraten. Sie bezahlt dafür allerdings den Preis ihrer Identität: als „stilles Wasser“ fühlt sie sich ihr Leben lang gegenüber ihrer jüngeren Schwester Eugenia benachteiligt. Als sie eines Tages mit ihr verwechselt wird ergreift sie die Gelegenheit und gibt sich als Eugenia aus: sie nähert sich dadurch ihrer Schwester so sehr an, dass die beiden im Endeffekt ihre Rollen tauschen und Clara nicht mehr wiederzuerkennen ist.

Durch die vorliegende Analyse wird der Bezug zwischen Identität und Geheimnis klar. Die Hauptcharaktere der drei Stücke verlieren sich in unwahren Geschichten und Verkleidungsspielchen und müssen am Ende mit den Konsequenzen ihrer Geheimhaltung leben. Alle drei spalten sich von ihrem wahren Ich ab, um ihren Geliebten gegenüber einen besseren Ruf zu vertreten. Jene Täuschungen verfolgen sie aber bis zum Moment der Aufklärung, welcher zwar die fiktiven Identitäten erlöschen lässt, den Protagonisten ihre wahren Identitäten aber nicht automatisch zurückgibt. Molina, Alarcón und Calderón zeigen dem Leser die komische Seite ihrer Darsteller, beleuchten dabei aber auch die spanische Gesellschaft des 17. Jahrhunderts mit einem kritischen Auge. Die verschiedenen Arten der Geheimhaltung, welche es in dieser Arbeit zu analysieren galt, qualifizieren das Theater des Goldenen Zeitalters als ein literarisch sehr tiefgründiges und beweisen sowohl die literarische Qualität von Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón und Pedro Calderón de la Barca, als auch, dass Ehrlichkeit letztendlich doch am längsten währt.

7.3 LEBENSLAUF

PERSÖNLICHE DATEN

NAME	Hauke
VORNAME	Alexandra
GEBURTSTAG/-ORT	01. März 1988 / Linz
E-MAIL	lexi_hauke@hotmail.com

AKADEMISCHER WERDEGANG

1994-1998	Volksschule 47, Linz/Ebelsberg
1998-2006	Linz International School (LISA) im Europagymnasium Auhof (biling. Realgymnasium mit Englisch als Unterrichtssprache)
2006	Abschluss der österreichischen Matura und des Internationalen Bakkalaureats (IB) am Europagymnasium Auhof
2006-2012	Diplomstudium Anglistik und Amerikanistik sowie Diplomstudium Romanistik Spanisch an der Universität Wien
2012	Erwerb des Mag.phil. an der Universität Wien, Anglistik und Amerikanistik

BERUFSERFAHRUNGEN

Aug. 2004	Praktikum in der Marketingabteilung der voestalpine Stahl GmbH
Aug 05/06	Mitarbeiterin der Post AG Linz / Ebelsberg
2007-2008	Mitarbeiterin der Schülerhilfe Linz / Ebelsberg in den Fächern Englisch und Spanisch
2009-2011	Tutorin am Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik der Universität Wien im Bereich „Phonetics and Communication Skills“
seit April 2010	Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin des Kanadazentrums der Anglistik Wien unter Leitung von Univ.-Prof. Dr. Zacharasiewicz

BESONDERE WEITERBILDUNG

5-monatiger Aufenthalt in College Park, Maryland (USA), im Zuge eines jointstudy
Auslandssemesters inkl. Absolvierung eines Teilgebiets des Studiums der American
Studies