THE DRAMAS OF DON ANTONIO DE SOLÍS Y RIVADENEYRA. THESIS

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649296378

The Dramas of Don Antonio de Solís Y Rivadeneyra. Thesis by Daniel Ernest Martell

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

DANIEL ERNEST MARTELL

THE DRAMAS OF DON ANTONIO DE SOLÍS Y RIVADENEYRA. THESIS

Trieste

The Dramas

OF

Don Antonio de Solís 124492 y Rivadeneyra

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Department of Philosophy of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

.

.

BY

DANIEL ERNEST MARTELL

PHILADELPHIA: INTERNATIONAL PRINTING CO. 1902

868 5690 M38

÷

ş

.

.

•

÷

.

CONTENTS.

ar Geo

90 D D

		CC	DN	ITI	EN	T	S.											59
9 ⁻ O													8	(į	PAGE
PART I																		
Introdu	ction	•••		•	• •	1	•	•		•	•	•	۰.	•		•	•	5
PART II																		
Analysi	s of Plays																	
1. L	Gitanilla de	Madri	d.					÷				•		•				10
2. El	Amor al Uso		1				÷			÷	i,						2	14
3. A	mparar al En	migo																17
4. E	Doctor Carli	no									•				•		•1	20
	n Bobo hace																	23
6. E	uridice y Orfe				1		1							•				26
7. E	Alcazar del S	ecreto																29
8. L.	as Amazonas			•				œ.					•	•			•	32
9. Ti	riunfos de An	or y I	or	tun		•		•	•	×	•	•	•	•	٠	3	•	35
PART III																		
Criticist	n of Plays .	•••		•				ŝ		÷		•			3			37
(a) C	omedias de C	apa y	Es	pad	a						•	ŝ	•	•				39
	comedias de H																	44
(c) C	omedias Here	icas .	•				×.	÷				•		8		•		45
(d) F	estival Plays						•	ŝ				•	•		•		•	48
(e) (ther Plays As	cribed	to	ou	r A	utl	hor	•							•		•	50
Language ar	d Versificatio	n	•	• 3		• •		•	•		•	•		•	•			51
Solis and Ca	lderon		53				•	•	3	•		•				•		51
Summary .								•		•				•				53

(*****)

.

а . 2

20 27 - 545 29 - 6 20 - 6 20 - 20 - 20

*

e.

5 2

I.-Introduction.

Although a number of volumes have been published upon the works of the two greatest of the Spanish dramatists, Lope de Vega and Calderon, yet little work of a detailed nature has ever been done concerning the minor dramatists, amongst whom Don Antonio de Solis occupies a prominent place. The best known writers on Spanish literature and art dismiss him, as a rule, with comparatively little notice; some giving a brief epitome of his life and a short general criticism of his work; others, again, content themselves with barely a mention of his name. All agree, however, with one notable exception, in bestowing much praise upon him, especially the critics of his own nationality. The exception I refer to is Schack, in his well-known work on Spanish Dramatic Art, although he also grants him a fair meed of merit.

The eruditos who, at the beginning of the XVII century, had censured with so much bitterness the national form of the Spanish Drama, and had recommended the observation of the rules of the ancients regarding the "Unities," grew almost completely silent toward the end of the epoch in which Lope de Vega and Calderon lived. The last writer of any importance who insisted on the propriety of imitating the ancient dramas, was Jusepe Gonzalez de Sulas, died 1651. In his work, Nueva Idea de la Tragedia, he treats, in the first three chapters, of the theory of the tragedy, arranging the same in accordance with the rules of ancient philosophy; and terminates this work with an appendix, in which is described and recommended the external arrangement of the Greek theatres. His later work, Teatro Escenico à todos los Hombres, is an apology for the theatre in general, in which he

makes certain observations relative to the Spanish theatre, but not in the condemnatory manner of some of his contemporaries. The author desires for the drama of his nation a more regular and fixed form, but in spite of this he qualifies the existing drama in so favorable a manner, as to give the assurance that the Spanish theatre, in his estimation, is much superior to that of the ancients. Another eminent critic of this period, Nicolas Antonio, in his Biblioteca Hispana Nova (1788), goes very wide of the dictum which qualified the limited circle of the ancients as the only medium of salvation for the theatre. So far does he go from this opinion, that he actually declares that no poet of ancient or modern times can compare with Lope de Vega, because to him the Spanish drama owes its origin, which, "discarding from it certain insignificant defects, is, without dispute, by its great beauty the first in the world." (1)

The first half of the XVII century in Spain gave birth to a large number of dramatists, of more or less merit. The encouragement which Philip IV gave to the drama doubtless contributed not a little to this; but the chief reason is perhaps to be sought in the eager desire to emulate those great masters Lope and Calderon. There was no intention to reform the principles on which the Spanish drama was founded; nor even much attempt at originality. We may safely affirm that the vast bulk of the output of the second-rate dramatists was inspired and influenced by the work of the more celebrated poets. Their plays resemble each other to a greater or less extent, and contain the same general characteristics. It was the Comedia Nueva as it had been brought into vogue by the great Lope, and this model was carefully followed, and its distinguishing marks closely adhered to by the other dramatists, among whom was Calderon, who exaggerated

(1) Historia de la lit. y del arte dramatico en España, por el Conde de Schack, trad. por E. de Mier (Madrid, 1887) vol. V, p. 193, el seg.

6

some of its features, often descending into an artificiality and mannerism which contrasts strongly with the simplicity and naturalness of Lope.

Of the multitude of such writers who were attracted by the brilliant success to be found in writing for the stage, the greater part were mere imitators of Calderon, and only a few deserve more than a passing recognition. Among these minor dramatists was Don Antonio de Solis y Rivadeneira. He wrote the preludes (*loas*) to some of Calderon's plays, and appears to have been connected by the ties of friendship with that great poet, whose junior he was by ten years, and to have shared somewhat in his celebrity. (*)

Solis was born in Alcalá (some say Plasencia) July 18, 1610; and from an early age showed a zeal for learning above his fellows, and a strong aptitude for letters. He received his earlier education at the university of his native city, and then proceeded to the University of Salamanca. When only seventeen years old, and while at Salamanca, he wrote a play, entitled AMOR Y OBLIGACION, which was well received, and which had been considered as lost, but a manuscript copy of which is preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid.* Later he entered the service, as Secretary, of Don Duarte de Toledo y Portugal, Count of Oropesa, and Viceroy of Navarre, a distinguished patron of letters. He showed himself a keen man of afairs, and continued at the same time to cultivate the Muses, producing, in 1642, the play

7

^(*) Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur, von A. Wilh, von Schlegel (Leipzig, 1846), p. 387.

^{*} The play was unknown to Barrera. See the Catálogo de las Piezas de Teatroque se conservan en el Departamento de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional, [por D. Antonio Paz y Melia], Madrid, 1899, No. 187, where the lines quoted from the beginning and end of the play show that it is different from the play of the same title by Moreto, which is printed in the Parte XII. de Varios.