

EL REY DON PEDRO
EN MADRID Y
EL INFANZÓN DE ILLESCAS

Attributed to Lope de Vega

Critical Edition of the Text of
the Primary Tradition
by CAROL BINGHAM KIRBY

Kassel • Edition Reichenberger • 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	XI
ABBREVIATIONS RELATED TO TEXTS	XV
INTRODUCTION	
I. The Place of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas</i> in the <i>Comedia</i> : Past Critical Evaluation of the Play	1
II. The Textual Tradition of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	
A. Inventory of the Seventeenth-Century Texts of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	
1. The Manuscripts	
a. The Biblioteca Nacional Manuscript (<i>N</i>)	4
b. The Biblioteca Municipal Manuscript (<i>M</i>)	8
2. The Printed Texts	
a. The <i>Parte veinte y siete</i> Texts (<i>VS</i>)	13
b. The 'Calderón' Texts	
1. The <i>Suelta</i> Tradition	17
2. The <i>Quinta Parte</i> Tradition	19
B. Moreto's <i>El valiente justiciero</i>	20
C. The Modern Editions of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	21
III. The Nature of a Critical Edition	23
IV. The Transmission of the Text	26
A. The Stemma of the Primary Family	27
1. Proof of an Ancestor in Common	31
2. Proof of the Independent Nature of Each Witness	31
3. The Relationship between <i>M-VS</i> and the Existence of a Subarchetype	32
B. The Stemma of the Secondary Family	36
C. <i>El valiente justiciero</i> in the Stemma	42
D. The Nature of Hartzenbusch's Text and Its Place in the Stemma	43
E. Modern Editions subsequent to Hartzenbusch	47
F. Procedures Followed in Editing the Text of the Primary Tradition with the Use of the Stemma	48
V. The Title of the Play	51
VI. Performances of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	54

VIII

VII. The Dating of the Primary Tradition	
A. Past Scholarship	56
B. Objective Evidence from the Primary Texts and Conclusions regarding the Dating of the Primary Tradition	62
VIII. An Objective Approach to the Authorship of the Primary Tradition of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas</i>	
A. The Positivistic Evidence	69
1. Versification	69
2. The Orthoëpy	85
a. Individual Words	86
b. Groups of Words	88
c. Problematic or Distinctive Word Groupings	90
d. Conclusions regarding the Orthoëpy	92
3. Aspects of Poetry Other than the Orthoëpy	92
4. Conclusions regarding the Positivistic Evidence	98
B. The Evidence of <i>Comedia</i> Lists	99
C. Summary: The Case for Authorship by Specific Dramatists	101
1. Pedro Calderón de la Barca	103
2. Andrés de Claramonte	105
3. Lope de Vega	108
4. Juan Pérez de Montalbán	109
5. Tirso de Molina	110
6. Luis Vélez de Guevara	111
7. Final Conclusions regarding the Authorship of the Primary Tradition of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	112
IX. The Received Idea and the Concept of Sources	113
A. The Major Events of Pedro's Reign (1350-69)	113
B. The Don Pedro Material	117
1. The Discourse of the Don Pedro Ballad Cycle	118
2. The Discourse of History	119
3. The Discourse of the Moralists	122
4. The Official Royal Discourse	123
a. The Formation of the Official Royal Discourse in Early Modern Spain	123
b. Santo Domingo el Real	125
c. Two Apologetic Works in the 1640s	127
5. The Legendary Discourse	130
6. The Discourse of the <i>Comedia</i>	131

X.	The Versification of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid</i>	
A.	The Polymetry of the <i>Comedia</i>	135
B.	The Versification of the Play in Relation to <i>Cuadro</i> Divisions	135
C.	The Uses of the Verse Forms in the Play	139
XI.	The Staging of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid: An Inter- pretation</i>	146
XII.	The Role of Imitation and History: An Interpretation of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas</i>	173
XIII.	The Present Critical Edition of the Text of the Primary Tradition of <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas</i>	
A.	Criteria Followed in Preparing and Presenting the Reconstructed Primary Text	190
B.	The Critical Apparatus	
1.	Variants of the Primary Tradition	194
2.	Textual Notes	196
3.	Explanatory Notes	197
C.	The Illustrations	197
D.	The Appendices	198
	ABBREVIATIONS RELATED TO REFERENCE WORKS	201
	WORKS CITED	204
	THE RECONSTRUCTED TEXT OF THE PRIMARY TRADITION OF <i>El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas</i>	235
	ACT I WITH VARIANTS	237
	ACT II WITH VARIANTS	279
	ACT III WITH VARIANTS	325
	TEXTUAL NOTES	371
	EXPLANATORY NOTES	417
	ILLUSTRATIONS	461
	Watermarks in MS. <i>N</i> and in <i>VS</i> (Pennsylvania Copy)	462
	Watermarks in MS. <i>M</i>	463
	MS. <i>N</i> , Title Page	464
	MS. <i>N</i> , Act I, Folio 10 ^v	465
	MS. <i>N</i> , Act III, Folio 16 ^v	466

MS. <i>N</i> , Act III, Folio 17 ^r (Copyist/Hand B)	467
MS. <i>M</i> , Title Page	468
MS. <i>M</i> , Act II, Folio 4 ^r	469
MS. <i>M</i> , Act III, Folio 1 ^v	470
MS. <i>M</i> , Act III, Folio 2 ^r	471
Comparative <i>Licencias</i> : MS. <i>N</i> and <i>El Bastardo Mudarra</i>	472
APPENDICES	473
I: ANDALUSIAN SPELLINGS IN THE PRIMARY TRADITION	474
II: HARTZENBUSCH (= <i>HT</i>) VARIANTS AND THE RECONSTRUCTED PRIMARY TEXT	476
III: VARIANTS INTRODUCED INTO MODERN EDITIONS SUBSEQUENT TO HARTZENBUSCH (= <i>HT</i>), EXCLUDING ROSARIO ASTURIAS (= <i>RosAst</i>)	494
INDEX OF WORDS, NAMES, THEMES, AND TOPICS ANNOTATED IN THE EXPLANATORY NOTES	497

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This critical edition of the text of the primary tradition of the play, *El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas* (henceforth *RDP*), has been many years in preparation. The play was the subject of my Ph.D. Dissertation (1977), specifically, the transformation of the historical, legendary, and ballad material surrounding the figure of D. Pedro I of Castile into this masterful drama. My dissertation, however, followed the work of earlier scholars, especially the 1963 Ph.D. dissertation of Sister Rosario Maria Asturias, with regard to the state of the texts of *RDP*. The present critical edition represents a thorough analysis of all of the known extant texts of *RDP*, based on consultation of the originals, and a scientific comparison of these texts to establish the relationships between them, as represented in a stemma of the primary and secondary traditions of the play. All material herein, therefore, supersedes the treatment of the textual tradition of *RDP* in my dissertation. It is important that the reader be aware that numerous errors of fact have been perpetuated in bibliographical treatments of the textual tradition of *RDP*. These errors have been annotated throughout this edition.

At the time that I prepared my dissertation, I believed that the authorship question surrounding the play had no clear solution, and therefore I referred to the "dramatist" as the author. In the introduction to this edition, I have reexamined in detail this question, along with the dating of the primary tradition, using what I consider to be a more objective methodology than that employed by many earlier, and some contemporary, scholars. I have concluded that there is sufficient persuasive positivistic evidence supporting Lope's authorship of the primary tradition of *RDP*, but no clear scientific evidence to support the patrimony of the other dramatists associated with the play's textual history. Because there is this amount of objective evidence in support of Lope's possible authorship of *RDP*, I have decided to publish this edition of the reconstructed text of the primary tradition of the play as "Attributed to Lope de Vega". All material in the introduction to

this edition is therefore meant to supersede the treatment of authorship, texts, and date of composition (Chapter 1) in my dissertation.

Several individuals have provided valuable guidance in the preparation of this edition, but no one as much as my husband, Steven D. Kirby. His knowledge of textual criticism was essential in the preparation of the stemmas for the primary and secondary traditions of the play, and in developing the methodology applied herein. In addition, Steve has given me constructive suggestions during the many years in which I labored on this text. I find it hard to believe that I would have persevered this long had it not been for his encouragement and help. For these reasons, I dedicate this edition to Steve.

I would also like to thank Professor Don W. Cruickshank, whom I have consulted frequently regarding bibliographical matters, in particular, seventeenth-century printing. Professor Cruickshank, along with Professors Michael D. McGaha, Charles Ganelin, and Vern G. Williamsen, made valuable suggestions regarding an earlier version of portions of this edition, and I thank them for helping me to avoid several mistakes. My friend, Nereida Cole Nazzaro, read the reconstructed text from the perspective of a general reader of Spanish. Professors Kurt and Roswitha Reichenberger deserve my special thanks for their interest in and support of this project for more than a decade and, most particularly, for their skill, patience, and dedication in preparing my typescript for appearance in book form in their respected series.

Librarians at the British Library in London, the Biblioteca Municipal and the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, and the Biblioteca de Catalunya in Barcelona were helpful when I consulted printed texts and manuscripts in their archives. I thank the Biblioteca Municipal and the Biblioteca Nacional for their permission to reproduce selected folios of the manuscripts of *El rey don Pedro en Madrid*. Some portions of the introduction draw from earlier published work, but have been changed sufficiently to constitute new text; the source of this material is so indicated in the corresponding footnotes. Substantial portions of my study, "The Preparation of a Genuine Critical Edition of Golden-Age Dramatic Texts," are included here, specifically in "The Transmission of the Text", with the permission of the publisher, *Michigan Romance Studies*.

I would like to conclude these acknowledgments by thanking two individuals who also have shared my interest in *El rey don Pedro en Madrid*, the late William C. McCrary and Sister Rosario Maria Asturias. Sister Rosario Asturias's edition, done as a dissertation at the University of Southern California with Everett W. Hesse, was a fine piece of work in terms of the state of our knowledge of the texts at that time. At one time, William C. McCrary, my dissertation director at the University of Kentucky, had begun an edition of the play. When he learned that I was interested in proceeding with my edition, he assured me that he expected that he would never return to the project and generously gave me his xeroxes of several printed texts, as well as a transcription that he had made of the Biblioteca Nacional manuscript some years earlier. I used this transcription as the basis of my own reading of the Nacional manuscript.

It is my hope that other *comedia* scholars will find the approach and methodology applied here to the textual tradition of *El rey don Pedro en Madrid* to be helpful in editing other plays which exist in a minimum of three independent, non-authorial witnesses. Beyond issues of editorial method, however, the play warrants serious study for its intrinsic merit. I hope that the scholarly community will now devote to this play the attention which it clearly deserves.

Carol Bingham Kirby
20 January 1998

INTRODUCTION

I. THE PLACE OF *EL REY DON PEDRO EN MADRID Y EL INFANZÓN DE ILLESCAS* IN THE *COMEDIA*: PAST CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE PLAY

When eminent drama scholars and influential historians of literature unanimously, repeatedly, and enthusiastically praise a play for well over a century, it would be logical to expect that drama to have a wide readership, frequent performances, and a respectably abundant critical literature examining its merits in detail. *El rey don Pedro en Madrid y el infanzón de Illescas* (henceforth *RDP*) has elicited tributes from Hartzenbusch, Menéndez Pelayo, Cotarelo y Mori, and Blanca de los Ríos in their respective editions and studies of dramatic works, and from Hurtado/González Palencia, Mérimée/Morley, Valbuena Prat, and Díez-Echarri/Roca Franquesa in their respective histories of Spanish literature in publications extending from 1848 through 1982.¹ Hartzenbusch has called the play a “notabilísimo drama” and “una obra . . . muy digna de ser estudiada” (x), as well as “una de las creaciones más notables del teatro español en su época” which incorporates at least one element that is “digno de Shakespeare” and certain

1 J. E. Hartzenbusch, ed., *Comedias escogidas de Fray Gabriel Téllez*; M. Menéndez Pelayo, ed., *Obras de Lope de Vega*, vol. 9, his “Observaciones Preliminares” cited in the reissue, *Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega*, ed. E. Sánchez Reyes; E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Tirso de Molina. Investigaciones bio-bibliográficas* and E. Cotarelo y Mori, ed., *Comedias de Tirso de Molina*, 2 vols.; B. de los Ríos, ed., *Obras dramáticas completas*, by Tirso de Molina, 3 vols.; J. Hurtado y J. de la Serna and A. González-Palencia, *Historia de la literatura española*, in both the 1921–22 and 1949 editions; E. Merimée, *A History of Spanish Literature*, ed. and trans. S. G. Morley; A. Valbuena Prat, *Historia de la literatura española*, ed. A. Prieto; and E. Díez-Echarri and J. M. Roca Franquesa, *Historia de la literatura española e hispanoamericana*. In the annotation of bibliographical references, I have followed *The MLA Style Manual* (1985). Full references are found in Works Cited. Arabic numerals indicate volume numbers, followed by a colon and page numbers, with no abbreviation for pages; e.g., 2: 223–25. Roman numerals are used for Books, Parts, and Acts; for example, *DQ I 1* refers to Part 1, Book 1, and *Con su pan se lo coma II 183b* refers to Act II, p. 183b.

scenes which "rayan en lo admirable, en lo sublime del drama" (xlii). Menéndez Pelayo in 1899 called the work a "grandioso drama histórico-fantástico" in his introduction to Lope's dramatic works ("Observaciones preliminares", cited in the reissue, *Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega* 4: 326), and later in the same introduction he termed the play a "maravilla" (336) whose don Pedro is a "creación mucho más compleja y más rica de vida poética que la de Don Juan" (338), resulting in a play which is "una de las maravillas de nuestro Teatro" (368). Cotarelo y Mori termed it in 1893 an "obra admirable" (125) and fourteen years later a "grande obra" (2: xlv). In 1946 Blanca de los Ríos called *RDP* a "soberano drama" (1: lxiv).

Widely respected and widely read histories of literature whose authors were also well-qualified Golden Age scholars have expressed similar enthusiasm for the play. Hurtado/González Palencia called it a "magnífica comedia" in 1921 (661), and they continued to hold this opinion in 1949 (577). Mérimée/Morley in 1930 called it "a dramatic episode, splendidly presented, from the legendary history of Peter the Cruel (or, *el Justiciero*)" (354). Valbuena Prat, in the 1982 (posthumous) reissue of his classic literary history, termed it "la más impresionante y bella de estas creaciones [sobre Don Pedro], citada por el valor que en ella adquiere lo sobrenatural" (3: 506). Finally, in 1960 Díez-Echarri/Roca Franquesa called it a "comedia intensa, de fuertes contrastes, y que refleja a las mil maravillas la descomposición social de una época, [que] se hace notar por la psicología de don Pedro, soberbiamente trazada" (474).

Paradoxically, all of this enthusiastic and well-deserved praise appears to have fallen largely on deaf ears because the play seems to be seldom read today (either by scholars or students), and hence has been little studied and never performed in modern times. The reasons for this neglect are understandable consequences of the unusually abundant complexities surrounding this masterpiece. The play's textual transmission is enormously complicated. There is no satisfactory, annotated reading text available, in part because of the involved textual tradition. The work has been attributed to all three of Spain's greatest Golden Age playwrights, as well as to Claramonte and Luis Vélez de Guevara. This lack of definite attribution has led to a further impasse on the part of critics in studying the play for its artistic merits. Final-

ly, in many ways *RDP* has been unjustly overshadowed by Moreto's *refundición*, *El valiente justiciero*, which enjoyed popularity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in performance and in reading texts, and which has been studied more extensively in contemporary times than its superior source.²

The purpose of this edition is to provide a reliable reading text, one that can also serve as the basis of a performance text, for scholars and students of the Spanish Golden Age theater. I have called this a critical edition because I have used the genealogical or neolachmannian approach to textual criticism in preparing the reconstructed text of the primary tradition of *RDP*. In addition to preparing a reliable reading text using a stemma based on the analysis of all extant primary and secondary texts, I have provided a complete textual apparatus which allows the user of the edition to follow and evaluate how I have determined all readings. The introduction includes a full treatment of past and present work done on the question of attribution and my conclusions regarding this debated topic. The Explanatory Notes will aid the reader in understanding the possible meaning(s) of the text, and the introduction will provide one interpretation of this marvelous work.

2 The recent treatment by I. Arellano, *Historia del teatro español del siglo XVII*, exemplifies my two assertions: that the authorship debate has diverted critical attention from the value of the play (351, 391), which is not analyzed in its own right by Arellano, and that critics tend to treat the *VJ* reworking, and not its source (531-32).