Considering Time in Hispanic Women’s Cultural Production

Summary
“Considering Time in Hispanic Women’s Cultural Production” draws upon advances in History, Literature and Musicology to examine temporality in early modern Hispanic women’s artistic production. Using a comparative approach, we propose to raise questions about women’s experience of and engagement with time across distinct expressive modes: poetry, theater and music.

Organizers
Ray Ball, University of Alaska Anchorage, History
Sarah Finley, Kenyon College, Spanish
Stephanie Kirk, Washington University in St. Louis, Spanish, Comparative Literature and Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies

Description
The workshop will be divided into three parts to reflect its three disciplinary approaches. At the beginning of each section, one of the organizers will introduce the topic by offering a brief reflection along with a reading of pertinent themes within her area of specialization (5-7 minutes). We will then welcome further discussion from other participants about the themes raised in our readings and their broader significance to early modern women’s writing and cultural production in Spain and the Americas.

We will begin by considering time in comedias. In the early modern Spanish Atlantic World, including Spain and Mexico, women held significant roles as actresses and acting troupe directors. How did their experiences of time differ from their male counterparts and those of other women who were not involved in the theater business? Here we propose to explore the ways women experienced time in theatrical production: theatrical temporality including cross-dressed time, the impact of time on women’s perceived ability to play key roles of leading ladies in comedias, the demands on women's time, and the ways that women used their timely experiences as daughters and wives of male actors and directors to leverage themselves into positions of authority.

Continuing, we will turn to the temporal concerns of the artistic process. The discussion will open with a reflection upon the two collected volumes of her work the Mexican nun, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, published during her lifetime as well as the third collected volume published posthumously, alongside another text published by a powerful bishop without her consent. We will then continue by inviting participants to join us in examining the complexities of early modern women's publishing. Using the case of Sor Juana as a point of departure, we will analyze how the questions of time and timing come to bear on how early modern women’s published works challenged patriarchal restrictions on women’s intellectual activity and participation in the public sphere. Aiding us in her reflections will be a discussion of Sor Juana’s Autodefensa espiritual (in a translation by Nina Scott) in which she reflects on the question of fame and her public literary life.
Yet another portion of our workshop examines Hispanic women's engagement with musical time. When considering music's temporal connotations, many first think of “tempo,” “rhythm” or related notions that govern musical speed and duration. Others perhaps consider song's capacity to transcend time by evoking memory. Nonetheless, additional links between time and music as structures of universal organization—vestiges of the so-called Music of the Spheres—persisted in early modern thought. With the aim of drawing out these associations, we propose to discuss women's re-imagination of musical time. Building upon our previous discussions, this part of the workshop will begin with a reading of the temporal-musical metaphor at the beginning of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz's loa 384 (best known as “Encomiastic Poem”). The opening interpretation will explore resonances of one of Athanasius Kircher’s fantastic solar clocks from *Ars Magna Lucis et Umbrae* (1646), this one particularly well-suited to our discussion because it was at once a timekeeping device and a musical instrument. Then, having shown how both Kircher's clock and Sor Juana's poem can be read as musical-temporal microcosms, we will open the conversation to debate about other representations of musical time in Sor Juana's work and elsewhere in Hispanic women's cultural production.

We intend to close by inviting participants to reflect upon similarities and differences among Hispanic women's experience of theatrical, written and musical temporalities in order to establish common paradigms that may lead to further discussion.

**Readings**


Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. Frontispieces from *Inundación castálida* (Madrid 1689), “Carta athenagórica” (Puebla 1690), *Obras* (Sevilla 1692) and *Fama y obras póstumas* (Madrid 1700).

**Recommended readings**


Iconografía del retrato de actor: «La Calderona», «Juan Rana» y Pablo de Valladolid
Fig. 2. Anónimo, *Alegoría de la Vanidad*. Primer tercio del siglo XVII. Óleo sobre lienzo. 113 x 84 cms. Madrid. Convento de las Descalzas Reales. Copyright © Patrimonio Nacional (nº inv. 00610746)

Fig. 3. Anónimo, Insignia alemana de comadrona. Principios del siglo XVII. Loir-et-Cher. Château du Gué Péan.

Fig. 4. Anónimo Español, *Marta reconviendo a su hermana María* (supuesto retrato de la Calderona), S. XVII, Óleo sobre lienzo. Madrid. Colección Abelló.
“IF YOU ARE NOT PLEASED TO FAVOR ME, PUT ME OUT OF YOUR MIND . . . ”: GENDER AND AUTHORITY IN SOR JUANA INÉS DE LA CRUZ

And the Translation of Her Letter to the Reverend Father Maestro Antonio Núñez of the Society of Jesus

NINA M. SCOTT
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, 421 Herter Hall, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, U.S.A.

Synopsis — In 1980, Monsignor Aureliano Tapia Méndez found a heretofore unknown letter by the Mexican nun Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz to her Jesuit confessor, Father Antonio Núñez. Critics have estimated that the letter was written about 1681, 10 years before her later and more famous “Reply to Sister Philotea,” one of the first feminist defenses of the right of women to an intellectual vocation. This letter is even more explicit in her defiance of patriarchal and ecclesiastical authority over her person, her soul, and the life of her mind.

“I have found a letter by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz!” exclaimed Monsignor Aureliano Tapia Méndez in April of 1980 while leafing through an obscure volume in the library of the Archdiocesan Seminary of Monterrey, Mexico. (Méndez, 1986: 9. All translations in this article are mine.) The thick folio in his hands bore the title Varios Ynformes (Various Accounts); it contained assorted handwritten manuscripts as well as printed materials dating from the 18th century, among them a text of some five and a half pages which bore the title: “Letter from Mother Juana Inés de la Cruz Written to the Most Reverend Father Antonio Núñez of the Society of Jesus.” The letter is neither dated nor signed and the hand is not Sor Juana’s, for the script has been identified as belonging to the beginning of the eighteenth century (Sor Juana died in 1695); furthermore, palaeographic scrutiny of the text shows a change of hand near the end, indicating that it was the work of two different scribes (Méndez, 1986: 11).

Tapia Méndez published his great find in 1981, in a small volume entitled Autodefensa espiritual de Sor Juana (Sor Juana’s Spiritual Self-Defense); Octavio Paz (1983), whose monumental study on Sor Juana (Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz o Las trampas de la fe) was about to be published, also called attention to the importance of the document, first in an article in Vuelta (May 1983), a journal which Paz edits, and then in the third edition of his book, where it appears in an Appendix as “Sor Juana: Witness for the Prosecution.” The letter has been further discussed in two recent articles by Marie-Cécile Bénassy-Berling (1986), the well-known sorjuanista from the Sorbonne, but up to this time the text itself has been inaccessible to English-speaking readers.

No one seems to doubt the authenticity of the letter, in spite of a very marked difference in tone when compared with the “Reply to Sister Philotea,” written some 10 years later.¹ Paz affirms that there is “nothing which would lead me to assume a forgery . . . the language and the peculiarities of style are those of Sor Juana or of someone else who appropriated her way of writing and thinking. In case of the latter, why and for what purpose?” (Paz, 1983: 634).² Bénassy-Berling concurs with this opinion: “The facts contained in the letter are so concrete and fit in so well with that which is already known about her that it would be very difficult to make them up . . . Even more to the point: who would be capable of writing this? And who would want to fabricate a hoax for such a very small number of people?” (Personal letter, February 28, 1987). In spite of the fact
that the manuscript is not dated, both Paz and Tapia Méndez assume that it was written somewhere between 1681 and 1682, basing their estimates on the fact that Sor Juana alludes in the letter to certain other works of hers whose dates are known. What we are dealing with, then, is a document written approximately 10 years before the “Reply,” but which already anticipates many of the points contained in the latter.

The internal structure of the two documents is very similar, so much so, in fact, that Paz refers to the Núñez letter as almost a “draft copy” of the “Reply” (1983: 634). A comparison of the two documents reveals some variations in vocabulary and there are several grammatical errors in the letter which are most likely due to two factors: the speed with which Sor Juana was known to write and the fact that the letter found by Tapia Méndez may contain errors of transcription.

The substantive difference between the two texts is one of tone. In spite of some expressions of humility and obedience, the letter to Núñez is so strident, openly rebellious and at times insolent that Tapia Méndez has called it “the explosion of a tormented soul . . . [which], because she is his spiritual daughter, wants to express some accusatory truths about her unjust treatment by her Confessor” (1986: 29). Some critics speculate that she may have written the letter to give vent to her pent-up feelings but never actually sent it; there is no way to be sure, but given the fact that the letter was copied at least once leads one to conjecture that Sor Juana did actually send it and that copies of it circulated among at least some people.

To anyone familiar with the basic facts of Sor Juana's life it should not come as a total surprise that she was already battling with the same problems which were to reach crisis proportions 10 years later. In this document she draws the battle lines between herself and her confessor. In all fairness to Núñez, he saw her attraction to the world as perilous to the salvation of her immortal soul and attempted to dissuade her from this inclination, whereas the content of this letter makes patent that Sor Juana perceived their clash as a matter of gender and authority. It is her perception of this conflict which will be the primary focus of this essay.

Paz has pointed out how it was that the nun could even conceive of speaking in this rebellious way to one of the most respected and powerful clerics of the time: in 1681 the viceroys were the Marquesses of la Laguna, and the Vicereine—who was instrumental in the publication in Madrid of Sor Juana's first book of poetry—was Sor Juana's closest friend. According to Paz “the letter to Núñez was written at the height of her favor with the Countess of Paredes. She felt her position to be strong and safe” (1983: 636). The letter itself reflects this assurance, especially in her repeated references to “the favors and affection of Their Excellencies (favors so undeserved and unmerited)” (1983: 642) whose function it was to remind Núñez of the powerful support outside of his ecclesiastical sphere on which she could count.

The discovery of the 1681 letter also contains some heretofore unknown details about Sor Juana's life of which the most significant is the matter of the substantial dowry she had needed in order to be admitted to as prestigious a convent as that of the Jeronymites. Up to this point Sor Juana scholars had relied on Núñez's biographer Oviedo, who stated that “with the intervention and assistance of Father Antonio, she took the veil and professed, the entire day's festivities paid for by the Father . . . who spared no expense” (Maza, 1980: 279–80), assuming therefore that her confessor had also organized the requisite dowry which was beyond the financial means of Sor Juana's family. Had this been so, she would indeed have been perennially beholden to him for her present status, but in the new letter she apprises us otherwise and can therefore better dispute the personal and spiritual control which Núñez apparently wished to exercise over her.

Whereas the “Reply” was prepared with great care, destined as it was to circulate more or less publicly, in the letter to Núñez we are dealing with a discourse directed at one very specific person. The first paragraph consists of one extremely long and syntactically-tangled sentence which presents a considerable challenge to the modern reader, yet, as Paz observes, “the inner coherence is not broken and the reader, although a bit dizzy, makes it to the end in one piece” (1983: 633). This introductory paragraph already addresses the principal tenets of her dialectical contention with her confessor: his repeated
public criticism of her; the extent of the authority wielded by him as opposed to her "small reputation," and finally, her decision to break her previous silence because she was unable to bear the situation any longer.

Sor Juana was upset both by Núñez's method of censure and by the content of his criticism of her. She registered the complaint that her confessor had classified her actions as "a public scandal" and had not proceeded against her "in secret as befits paternal correction . . . but publicly, in front of everyone" (Paz, 1983: 645) The fact that Núñez indulged in public censure of her not only irritated Sor Juana personally but was endemic of a larger, gender-determined problem: that of public versus private spheres of action. In this letter she underscores once again the fact that it was forbidden for women to have access to the public world of action, authority and ideas. The same was true for formal education: "I know that studying publicly in schools is unseemly to a woman's modesty because of the hazardous familiarity with men and this would be the reason for keeping women from public studies, that, and not challenging a place destined for men . . . " (Paz, 1983: 642). Sor Juana, restricted from public life by her vows of perpetual enclosure, nevertheless defended her right to develop her intellectual capacities in the privacy of her own world: "My studies have not been undertaken to hurt or harm anyone and have principally been so private that I have not even made use of the guidance of a teacher but have relied solely upon myself and my work . . . " (Paz, 1983: 642). More specifically, she dared to question the foundations of an authority which denied women any access to the world of the intellect:

. . . who has forbidden women to engage in private and individual studies? Have they not a rational soul as men do? Well, then, why cannot a woman profit by the privilege of enlightenment as they do? Is her soul not as able to receive the grace and glory of God as that of a man? Well, then, why should she not be just as capable in matters of information and knowledge which are of less import? What divine revelation, what rule of the Church, what reasonable judgment formulated such a severe law for us women? (Paz, 1983: 642)

If her transgression was judged to be not only a case of exceeding the parameters of social conduct but entered into the realm of moral sin, Sor Juana was quick to defend herself on this front as well. Attacking the internal logic of such a position she queried: "Is not God as ultimate goodness also ultimate wisdom? Well, then, why should ignorance be more pleasing to Him than learning?" (Paz, 1983: 643) In order to further strengthen her position she adopted a tactic that would be repeated in the "Reply": she cited the names of various male and female saints whose learned condition had not stood in the way of either their salvation or their canonization, and concludes by asking, "Then why is that, which in all others was considered good, judged to be evil in my case?" (Paz, 1983: 643) She even went so far as to pose a fairly caustic question to Núñez: "And Your Reverence, bowed down under the weight of so much learning, do you not plan to be saved?" (1983: 642) Sor Juana refused to accept that a woman's life had to be spent in ignorance and inanity, drawing a graphic contrast between the lifestyle of her sister nuns and her own: "Why should it be judged evil that the time which I might spend in foolish chatter at the grille, or in a cell sniping at everything that goes on in and out of this house, or fighting with someone or shouting at a poor servant or wandering idly through the world with my thoughts, be invested in studying?" (Paz, 1983: 645)

But in spite of having insisted that her intellectual activities were restricted to an exclusively private sphere, the fact was that Sor Juana was not modest and withdrawn when it came to displaying her considerable intellectual talents. According to Oviedo (1980), it was precisely because the young Juana Inés had been so well known en la publicidad (in public) that her confessor had initially been concerned about her (Maza, 1980: 279) and she had followed the same path ever since, in spite of the convent walls which were ostensibly there to separate her from the secular world outside. The nun knew very well that an attack would come from this quarter, and organized her defense by dividing her works into "public" and "private" categories. As
"public works" she classified those which circulated openly, maintaining that in this category there were but two carols to the Virgin Mary (written eight years apart and both submitted to Núñez's scrutiny before being released) and the so-called "Arch to the Church," commissioned by direct order of the municipal Council and of the Viceroy, who at that time happened to be a religious. With respect to the "private works," Sor Juana minimized her undoubtedly already copious production of secular and occasional poetry by saying that all it contained was "a couplet here or there written to honor the birthday of some person whom I esteemed" (Paz, 1983: 640).

It is evident that Sor Juana's sustained contact with the public sphere of the viceregal court caused her confessor constant tribulation. As representatives of the Spanish crown the viceroys had the right to visit the cloister of any religious institution they wished, and in the case of the Marquesses of La Laguna, they sought her out very frequently. Oviedo made note of the fact that "[Núñez] was bothered by . . . the publicity and continued verbal and written communication with those on the outside . . . " (Maza, 1980: 280) Although physically confined by the walls of her convent, there is nothing in Sor Juana's writing that indicates that this was particularly onerous to her; what she fought against was the walling-in of her intellect, the imposition of reduced parameters of intellectual activity because of her condition as woman and as nun. According to Josefina Ludmer: "There is another type of discord with respect to specific place: in the relationship between the kind of space this woman takes and occupies as against that which the institution and the other's word grant her; it also becomes a matter of social relationships and the production of texts" (1984: 47).

Sor Juana was fully aware that the matter of her social relationships was indeed a source of conflict with Núñez, but when the Jesuit reproached her for her sustained contact with the outside world, Sor Juana retaliated by reminding him that it was the Viceroys themselves who sought her out. Furthermore, she pointed out another inconsistency of his: "She reproaches him for wanting to forbid to others that which he allowed himself . . . the company of the powerful of the world" (Bénassy-Berling, 1985: 24).

Aside from these specific quarrels Sor Juana challenged the whole issue of Núñez's right to control her life in general. In the part of the letter which refers to her dowry she demanded to know what authority had granted her confessor power over her person: "Then from whence comes Your Reverence's displeasure and your saying that 'had you known I was going to write poetry you would not have made me a nun but would have arranged for me to marry?'" (Paz, 1983: 643) She minced no words in refuting this assumption: "Well, dearly beloved Father . . . what direct authority (leaving aside that which my love gave and always will give you) did you have to dispose of my person and my God-given free will? . . . Has Your Reverence any stake in my betterment by reason of obligation, blood relation, upbringing, Church authority or anything else?" (Paz, 1983: 643-644). Sor Juana also reproached him for his attempts to coerce her into correction and even salvation, reminding him that in the Catholic faith salvation was a matter of free will; in this vein she urged him to proceed "gently, because exasperating me is not a good way to bring me around, for I do not possess such a servile nature that I will do something when threatened which reason would not persuade me to do . . . " (Paz, 1983: 644). She further challenges Núñez's right to assume that he is the only one responsible for her salvation: "What rule dictates that this salvation of mine must be by means of Your Reverence? Cannot it be someone else? Is God's mercy restricted and limited to one man, even if he be as prudent, as learned and as saintly as Your Reverence?" (Paz, 1983: 646) In the matter of deciding over the course of her life Sor Juana was thus prepared to accept God's authority and her own, but not that of Núñez as a member of the institutionalized Church, and her statement that "salvation consists more in the desiring than in the knowing and the former depends more on me than on a confessor" (Paz, 1983: 646) even has surprisingly Lutheran overtones for a Catholic nun.

Anticipating the probable effect of her words on her confessor, Sor Juana refused to give Núñez the opportunity to act first: at the end of the letter she seized the initiative and
severed her relationship with him: “And so I beg Your Reverence that if you no longer wish or are disinclined to favor me . . . put me out of your mind” (Paz, 1983: 645).

Feminist critics cite numerous traditional mindsets which have contributed to the silencing of women’s voices: “it is known that in the historic distribution of emotions, functions and faculties (transformed into myth, fixed in language) women were given suffering and passion as against reason, the concrete as against the abstract, interior vs. exterior, reproduction rather than production” (Ludmer, 1984: 47).4 In Sor Juana’s case these neat categories break down: in her there is both passion and reason, concrete and abstract, self-reproduction in the production of the text. This letter, with its repeated Leitmotiv of “public vs. private” (or “exterior and interior”) metonymically addresses the traditional dichotomy of male versus female spaces. In this text — where she directs the discourse — Sor Juana made manifest that in spite of her status as a nun the life of her mind meant more to her than the dictates of ecclesiastical authority. This amazing letter thus records the temerity of a 17th-century woman who dared to appropriate the word, the public domain of her intellect and the authority to decide over her person and her free will.

LETTER FROM MOTHER JUANA INÉS DE LA CRUZ TO THE REVEREND FATHER MAESTRO ANTONIO NÚÑEZ OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

The Peace of Christ.

Although for a long time now various persons have informed me that I am the only one to blame in Your Reverence’s conversations, as you criticize my actions with such bitter criteria so as to classify them as a public scandal and other epithets no less dreadful, though it would be only natural for me to defend myself, as I am not the absolute mistress of my reputation, linked as it is to the condition I have and the community in which I live, in spite of all that I have wanted to sacrifice my suffering to the highest veneration of filial affection with which I have always respected Your Reverence, desiring sooner that all these objections fall on me rather than that it seem that I were deviating from just and proper respect by engaging in a counter-argument with Your Reverence; in this matter I confess openly that my actions do not merit divine reward because it was more a matter of human respect for your person than of Christian patience; [I say] this not ignoring the veneration and great esteem which Your Reverence (with good reason) receives from everyone, for they listen to you as to a divine oracle and value your words as though dictated by the Holy Spirit, so that the greater your authority, the more my reputation suffers; yet even so, in view of all of this, I have never wished to yield to the requests to answer you that you have urged me to do, I know not whether it was a matter of reason or of self-esteem (for perhaps the latter in the guise of reason sways us), judging that my silence would be the greatest means whereby Your Reverence might be restored to calm, until in time I came to realize that it appears that my patience irritates you, and so I resolved to reply to Your Reverence, all the while certifying and implying my love, my duty and my respect.

The focus, then, of Your Reverence’s anger (most beloved Father and Sir) has been none other than those unfortunate verses which Heaven—most contrary to Your Reverence’s wishes—has bestowed on me.4 I have always tried mightily to refrain from writing them and I have excused myself from doing so as much as possible, not because I found in them either good or evil, as I have always held them (as indeed they are) as something quite indifferent and though I could tell you how many holy and learned persons have made use of them, I do not want to get involved in defending them for they are not that important (they are neither my father nor my mother); I only say that in order to please Your Reverence I would refrain from composing them without even searching for or attempting to ascertain the reason for your displeasure, for one of the characteristics of love is to obey blindly; furthermore, by doing this I would also be able to give in to the natural aversion which I have always felt while writing them, as is well known to all who know me; however, it was not possible to do this so rigorously as not to admit some exceptions, as for example two pieces to the Most Holy Virgin which, after repeat-
ed requests and an interval of eight years, I composed with the permission and leave of Your Reverence, which at the time I thought more important even than those of my Prelate, the Lord Archbishop and Viceroy, and proceeded with them with such modesty that I refused to sign my name to the first, and as to the second, my name appeared on it with neither my consent nor prior notice to me, and both the former as well as the latter were first submitted to Your Reverence for correction.

These [pieces] were followed by the Arch to the Church. This is my unforgivable fault, which was preceded by my having been asked to write it three or four times and I having refused as many until two lay magistrates went to the Mother Superior before coming to me and summoned me to do it in the name of His Excellency the Lord Archbishop, because the entire municipal council had voted in favor and His Excellency had approved it.

Now I ask that Your Reverence, with your great clarity of judgment, put yourself in my position and ask yourself what you would have done under similar circumstances? Would you have answered that you were unable to comply? That would be a lie. That you did not want to? That would be disobedience. That you did not know how? They did not ask me to go beyond the extent of my knowledge. That they had voted badly? That would be boldfaced impudence, base and rude ingratitude towards those brilliant minds who honored an ignorant woman with their request. Therefore I could do no less than to obey.

These are the public actions which have so scandalized the world and contributed to the detriment of good souls, so let us go on to those actions which are private: one will find perhaps a couplet here or there written to honor the birthday of some person whom I esteemed and who has helped me with things I needed (which were not a few, given the fact that I am very poor and have no income whatever). A panegyric on the occasion of the birthday of Our Lord the King, written by order of His Excellency Don Fray Payo, another by order of Her Excellency the Countess of Paredes.

Well, then, my Father and good Sir, I beg Your Reverence to suspend for a while the affection you feel for your own advice (even the most holy are swayed by this tendency) and tell me, Your Reverence (since in your opinion it is a sin to write poetry), in which of these occasions was it a grave sin to compose verses? And even supposing it was a sin (though I cannot conceive for which reason it would be deemed such), the same circumstances and occasions which forced me do it so much against my will would excise it, and this can be clearly proved, for should the gift which all know I possess be joined to vanity (perhaps it is actually chagrin), what greater punishment could Your Reverence envision for me than the pain which this very applause occasions me? Of what envy am I not the target? Of which evil intention am I not the object? What action do I take without quailing? What word do I utter without misgiving?

Women take offense that I surpass them, men that I seem to equal them; some wish that I did not know quite so much, others say I should know more to merit such praise; old women do not want others to know more than they do, young women resent those who attract more attention and one and all want me to comply with the rules of their judgment, and all these sources together produce such a strange kind of martyrdom that I know of no one else who has undergone the like.

What more can I say or think? Why, even writing a more or less reasonable hand has cost me lengthy and difficult persecution only because they say my writing seemed to be that of a man and that was unseemly, so I was obliged purposely to alter it and to this the whole community can bear witness; in short, this is a matter not just for a letter but for a number of very lengthy volumes. For what have I said that is so sinful? Did I ask for praise and common approval? And the special favors and honors which Their Excellencies the Lords Marquesses bestow on me only by their favor and unequalled kindness, did I strive to obtain these?

So differently did it happen that Mother Juana de San Antonio, Prioress of this convent and a person incapable of lying under any circumstances, is witness to the fact that the first time that Their Excellencies honored this house with their visit, I asked her permission to withdraw to my cell and neither
see them nor be seen (as though Their Excellencies had done me some harm), with no other motive than to flee from the praise that subsequently is turned into most painful barbs of persecution, and I would have been able to do it had the Mother Superior not commanded me otherwise.

What fault is it of mine that Their Excellencies find my company pleasant? Even if there were no reason for this, can I refuse to see such hight born persons? Should I regret the honor they do me with their visits?

Your Reverence knows very well I should not, as you yourself experienced in the times of Their Excellencies the Lords Marquesses of Mancera, for many was the time that I heard Your Reverence complain of the occupations you had to put aside in order to attend Their Excellencies without being able to do otherwise, and if His Excellency the Lord Marquis of Mancera entered convents as saintly as those of the Capuchins and the Carmelites any time he wished without anyone thinking ill of it, how can I prevent His Excellency the Marquis of Laguna from visiting this one? Besides, I am not the one in charge here nor is the governance of this convent my responsibility.

Their Excellencies do me honor because they wish to, not because I deserve it nor because I originally courted it.

I cannot, and would not wish to even if I could, be so barbarously ungrateful for the favors and affection of Their Excellencies (favors so undeserved and so unmerited).

My studies have not been undertaken to hurt or harm anyone and have principally been so private that I have not even made use of the guidance of a teacher but have relied solely upon myself and my work, for I know that studying publicly in schools is unseemly to a woman's modesty because of the hazardous familiarity with men and this would be the reason for keeping women from public studies, that, and not challenging a place destined for men; it may also be that as the Republic has no need of women for the government of magistrates (from which area, for the same reasons of propriety, the former are also excluded), [the state] is not concerned with that of which it has no need, but who has forbidden women to engage in private and individual studies? Have they not a rational soul as men do? Well, then, why can-

not a woman profit by the privilege of enlightenment as they do? Is her soul not as able to receive the grace and glory of God as that of a man? Well then, why should she not be just as capable in matters of information and knowledge which are of less import? What divine revelation, what rule of the Church, what reasonable judgment formulated such a severe law for us women?

Does learning now prevent, when in other times it furthered salvation? Were not St. Augustine, St. Ambrosius and all the other Doctors of the Church saved? And Your Reverence, bowed down under the weight of so much learning, do you not plan to be saved?

And if you answer that men are governed by other rules I say: did not St. Catherine, St. Gertrude and my mother St. Paula study without harming their lofty contemplations, and was the latter's travail in the founding of convents impeded by her knowledge of Greek? By having learned Hebrew? By having been instructed by my Father St. Jerome to understand and interpret Holy Writ, as the Saint himself tell us? Who also, in one of his epistles dealing with all manner of knowledge, praised St. Paula's daughter Blesilla as being extremely learned, [and this] when the latter was very young indeed, dying as she did when she was twenty?

Then why is that, which in all others was considered good, judged to be evil in my case? Is it only I whose salvation is hindered by books?

If I have read the prophets and secular orators (a lapse of which St. Jerome himself was guilty), I also read the Holy Doctors and Scripture and cannot deny that to the former I owe countless gifts and rules of good conduct.

For which Christian will not avoid wrath when confronted by the patience of a pagan Socrates? Who can be ambitious in view of the modesty of the Cynic Diogenes? Who does not praise God in Aristotle's intelligence? And finally, what Catholic can fail to be astonished when contemplating the sum of moral virtues in all of the pagan philosophers?

Why should it be judged evil that the time which I might spend in foolish chatter at the grille, or in a cell sniping at everything that goes on in and out of this house, or fighting with someone or shouting at a poor servant
or wandering idly through the world with my thoughts, be invested in studying?

And all the more so since God disposed me to be in this way and it does not appear to be against His most holy law nor contrary to the obligations of my profession; I have this inclination and if it is evil I am not the one who formed me thus\textsuperscript{13}—I was born with it and with it I shall die.

Your Reverence wishes that I should be saved by force in a state of ignorance, but my beloved Father, can one not accomplish this end and be learned? In the final analysis, for me it is the easier path. Because why should one be led to salvation by the way of ignorance if this is repugnant to one’s nature?

Is not God as ultimate goodness also ultimate wisdom? Well, then, why should ignorance be more pleasing to Him than learning?

Let St. Anthony achieve salvation with his holy ignorance and well and good, while St. Augustine goes by a different path and neither one of the two is wrong.

Then from whence comes Your Reverence’s displeasure and your saying that “had you known I was going to write poetry you would not have made me a nun but would have arranged for me to marry?”

Well, dearly beloved Father (to whom, obliged and with all modesty, I say that which I would prefer not to utter), what direct authority (leaving aside which my love gave and always will give you) did you have to dispose of my person and my God given free will?

Because when all that happened I had only very recently had the pleasure of knowing Your Reverence and although I was indebted to you for your very great concern and interest in my condition, for which I will always be very grateful as indeed I ought to be, as to the matter of my dowry,\textsuperscript{14} long before I got to know Your Reverence my sponsor Captain Pedro Velázquez de la Cadena had already set it aside and in making the arrangements for this same sum, and in no other way, God gave me the means [to enter the convent], for which reason I do not know on what your assumption is based, though I do not deny that I owe Your Reverence other kindnesses and favors for which I will be eternally grateful, such as having paid for a teacher of mine, and others; there is no reason that these might not continue except that they have been converted into insults and there seems to be no conversation in which my faults are not mentioned and in which my conversion\textsuperscript{15} is not the topic of Your Reverence’s zeal.

Am I perchance a heretic? And even if I were, could sheer force make me a saint? Would that saintliness were something to be commanded, for then I would be sure to possess it, but I feel that one must be persuaded of it, not ordered, and if it were a matter to be commanded I have had prelates who have done it; if external precepts and pressures are tempered and prudent they make a person circumspect and modest, but if they are excessive, result in despair. Only the grace and assistance of God are capable of producing saints.

On what, then, is this anger based? Why this discrediting of my person? Why this attitude of making me out to be scandalous in front of everyone? Do I annoy Your Reverence in some way? Have I asked you to help me in remedying any of my needs? Or have I impor tuned you with any other spiritual or temporal request?

Has Your Reverence any stake in my betterment by reason of obligation, blood relation, upbringing, Church authority or anything else?

If it is pure charity, let it seem pure charity and have it proceed as such, gently, because exasperating me is not a good way to bring me around, for I do not possess such a servile nature that I will do something when threatened which reason would not persuade me to do; neither would I do for human respect that which I would not do for God, for to give up everything that might give me pleasure—even though it might be very just—is good if I do it to humble myself when I might want to do penance, but it is not when Your Reverence wishes to obtain it by dint of reprimands, and these not in secret as befits paternal correction (given that Your Reverence has decided to be my Father, something for which I consider myself to be very fortunate) but publicly, in front of everyone, where each one reacts to a situation to the extent of his understanding and speaks as he may feel.
Then in all this matter, my Father, is it not natural that I should be hurt by a person whom I love with such veneration and whom with such love I esteem and revere?

If these admonishments were to fall upon some scandalous statement of mine, I am so obedient that (in spite of the fact that neither in matters secular nor spiritual have I been answerable to Your Reverence) I would desist from it and would try to reform and please you, even though it went against my will.

But this not being the case, as our dispute centers on the fact that it amounts to the same thing whether I write verses or not and, considering that I dislike them intensely, so that for my penance there could be no greater punishment than constantly to oblige me to write them, why then do you feel such troublesome affliction?

Because if, to contradict this opinion, I were to speak as passionately against Your Reverence as Your Reverence does against me, countless actions of yours have displeased me (because, after all, in different matters feeling is a question of one doing it this way, the other that) but I do not condemn them for that but instead revere them for being yours and defend them as though they were my own, and perhaps even those same ones which are directed against me, calling them laudable zeal, supreme affection and other merits which my love and reverence are able to invent when I converse with others.

But I cannot refrain from telling Your Reverence that my heart is bursting with the recriminations which for years I might have uttered and if now I take up the pen to vent them and reply to one I venerate so highly, it is because I can bear no more, for as I am not as submissive as others of your daughters in whom you might better employ your doctrine, [I do it] because I am too deeply affected by this.

And so I beg Your Reverence that if you no longer wish or are disinclined to favor me (for this is voluntary), put me out of your mind, for though I will regret so great a loss, I will have no grounds for complaint, for the God who created and redeemed and bestows so many mercies on me will provide a means whereby my soul, which trusts in His goodness, will not go astray even if it be without Your Reverence's guidance, for Heaven has many keys and is not restricted to one judgment only, but there are many mansions for diverse temperaments and in the world there are many theologians and even if these were lacking, salvation consists more in the desiring than in the knowing and the former depends more on me than on a confessor.

What rule dictates that this salvation of mine must be by means of Your Reverence? Cannot it be someone else? Is God's mercy restricted and limited to one man, even if he be as prudent, as learned and as saintly as Your Reverence?

Surely not, nor have I had up to now particular enlightenment or inspiration of the Lord that He has so ordained and so I will be able to govern myself by the general rules of the Holy Mother Church—as long as the Lord does not enlighten me otherwise—and thus freely choose the spiritual Father I wish, for just as our Lord has disposed Your Reverence to feel such love for me, were He to influence my heart and help me arrive at a firm judgment, I would choose none other than Your Reverence. I beg you not to judge this candor as boldness or lack of respect but as simplicity of heart, as I do not know how to say things other than how I feel them, for which reason I have attempted to speak so that Your Reverence would not have a shred of regret or complaint. Notwithstanding, if in this declaration of my faults there be any word which I have written by inadvertent oversight rather than intentionally and which might be not only offensive but discourteous to Your Reverence's person, consider it retracted and judge it to be ill said and worse written and if I could discern which phrase might cause offense, would immediately expunge it.

I repeat once again that my intention is solely to beg Your Reverence that if you are not pleased to favor me that you put me out of your mind, unless it be to entrust me to the Lord, as I truly believe that in your great charity you will do this most fervently.

I entreat God's Majesty to keep you.

From this my Father St. Jerome's convent in Mexico.

Your
Juana Inés de la Cruz
END NOTES

1. For a detailed study of the “Reply”, see my previous article on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz (Scott, 1985).

2. All of Paz’s references to the letter and the text of the Núñez letter itself come from the third edition of his Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz o Las trampas de la fe, 633–646.

3. She contradicts what she has said here in a later part of the letter in which she thanks Núñez for having provided her with a teacher.

4. Toril Moi expresses a very similar viewpoint: “It is, after all, patriarchy, not feminism, that insists on labelling women as emotional, intuitive and imaginative, while jealously converting reason and rationality into an exclusively male preserve” (1985: 123).

5. There are a number of errors in the text of the letter, caused either by carelessness on Sor Juana’s part, or errors of transcription of the original letter by the amanuensis involved. As Paz (1983: 634) rightly notes, Sor Juana’s intention here is not to suggest that it is her verses which are unfortunate, but her God-given talent for composing them.

6. This is a reference to Fray Payo Enriquez de Rivera, who was first Archbishop of Mexico and subsequently Viceroy from 1674–1680.

7. What she calls “the Arch to the Church” was a poetic allegory on Neptune, composed to accompany a triumphal arch erected to celebrate the arrival in 1680 of the new viceroy, the Marquesses de la Laguna.

8. María Luisa Manrique de Lara y Gonzaga, Countess of Paredes and Vicereine of Mexico, was Sor Juana’s most intimate woman friend and the one who arranged for the publication of the nun’s poetry in Madrid in 1689.

9. The original text here reads somewhat differently: “Las mujeres sienten que las excedan los hombres, que parezca que los iguala,” a syntactically confusing sentence because of the subjunctive form of “parecer”; I agree with the opinion of Marie-Cécile Bénassy-Berling, who believes it should read “Las mujeres sienten que las excedan, los hombres que parezca que los iguala”, which is how I have translated it (Personal letter, February 28, 1987).

10. In the original the verb used is “publicar los estudios públicos,” which in context makes no sense and is in all likelihood an error; I have translated it as “prohibir.”

11. Again the original makes very little sense: “¿Por qué no gozará el privilegio de la ilustración de las letras con ellas?” Bénassy-Berling suggests it should read “como ellos,” which also seems more plausible to me.

12. Sor Juana here refers to St. Catherine of Alexandria (third century), famous for her beauty and learning, who was martyred by the Emperor Maximin II when she refused to become his bride; St. Gertrude “the Great” (13th century) was a Benedictine nun who wrote parts of the “Legatus Divinæ Pietatis,” one of the most important works of German mysticism, and is also the patron saint of the West Indies; St. Paula (5th century) was the wealthy Roman matron who was one of St. Jerome’s most devoted disciples; she named her head of one of the twin monastic communities he founded in Bethlehem. She was the patron saint of Sor Juana’s convent.

13. The original text reads “yo me hice,” which runs counter to the whole thrust of this passage; Tapia Méndez has already corrected this obvious error in his text (1986: 25).

14. People were apparently under the impression that Núñez had procured Sor Juana’s dowry for her and that she was therefore beholden to him. This is one of the most important points of heretofore unknown biographical information which the discovery of this letter has contributed to Sor Juana studies.

15. The original text says “conversación” instead of the more plausible “conversación,” which again appears to be an error of transcription. Tapia Méndez is also persuaded that the correct term should be “conversación” (1986: 25).

16. I wish to express my sincere thanks to David Lagmanovich of the University of Buenos Aires for his help in this translation.
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INVUDACIÓN CASTALIDA
DE
LA VNICA POETISA, MVSA DEZIMA,
SOROR JVANA INES
DE LA CRVZ, RELIGIOSA PROFESSA EN
el Monasterio de San Gerónimo de la Imperial
Ciudad de México.

Q V E
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CON
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UTILES VERSOS:
PARA ENSEÑANZA, RECREO, Y ADNIRACION.
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A LA EXCEL. MA SEÑORA. SEÑOR A D. MARIA
Luísa Gonzaga Manrique de Lara, Condesa de Paredes,
Marquesa de la Laguna,

Y LOS SACA A LVZ
D.JVAN CAMACHIO GAYNA,CAVALLERO DEL ORDEN
de Santiago, Mayordomo, y Cavallerizo que fue de su Excelencia,
Governador actual de la Ciudad del Puerto
de Santa MARIA.

CON PRIVILEGIO.
EN MADRID: POR IVAN GARCIA INFANZON. AÑO DE 1689.
CARTA
ATHENAGORICA
DE LA MADRE
JUVANA YNES
DE LA CRUZ
RELIGIOSA PROFESA DE VELO
y Choro en el muy Religioso Convento de San Geró-
nimo de la Ciudad de Mexico cabeza de la
Nueva España.

QUE IMPRIME Y DEDICA A LA MISMA
SOR, PHYLOTEA DE LA CRUZ
Su estudiosa aficionada en el Convento de la San-
tísima Trinidad de la Puebla
de los Angeles.

Conlicencia en la Puebla de los Angeles en la Imprenta
de Diego Fernandez de Leon. Año de 1690.
SEGUNDO VOLUMEN
DE LAS OBRAS
DE SOROR
JUVANA INES
DE LA CRUZ,
MONJA PROFESA EN EL MONASTERIO
DEL SEÑOR SAN GERÓNIMO
DE LA CIUDAD DE MÉXICO
DEDICADO POR SU MISMA AUTORA
AD. JUAN DE ORUE
Y ARRIETO
HACAVALLERO DE LA ORDEN DE SANTIAGO.
Año 1692.
FAMA Y OBRAS POSTHUMAS
DEL FENIX DE MÉXICO.
DECIMA MUSA, POETISA AMERICANA,
SOR JUANA INES DE LA CRUZ,
RELIGIOSA PROFESSA
EN EL CONVENTO DE SAN JERONIMO
DE LA IMPERIAL CIUDAD DE MÉXICO,
CONSEJERA
A LA MAGESTAD CATHOLICA
DE LA REYNA NUESTRA SEÑORA DOÑA MARÍANA
DE NEOBURG BAVIERA
PALATINA DEL REINO,
POR MANO DE LA EXMA. SEÑORA DOÑA JUANA
DE ARAGÓN Y CORTÉS, DUQUESA DE MONTCELO, Y TERRA NOVA;
MARBELLA DEL VALLE DE GUADALupe, &c.
EL DOCTOR DON JUAN IGNACIO
DE CASTORENA Y VéRESD, CAPELLÁN DE FAVOR DE SU MÁJESTAD,
PROCTORARIO INZ APOLÓGICO POR SU SANTITUD, Y TÉOLOGO,
EXAMINADO EN LA UNIVERSIDAD DE ESPAÑA, PREBENDADO
DE LA SANTA IGLESIA METROPOLITANA
DE MÉXICO,
CON PRIVILEGIO.

En MADRID: En la Imprenta de MARCHA DE MUNGA,
4º de 1750. A la Calle de la Habana. Año de 1750.
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Prelace

This book invites the reader to participate in a tour of six carefully selected organs in North Germany, Denmark, and Sweden. It will be a leisurely trip: we will linger in each place, considering the historical and economic circumstances under which the organ was built, listening to music played on it, and learning how it has fared through the centuries. And we will make some detours as we travel from place to place, pausing for interludes that do not directly correspond to our chosen organs.

The geographical limits of our tour are determined by the fact that this book forms one component of a larger project, "Changing Processes in North European Organ Art, 1600–1970: Integrated Studies in Performance Practice and Instrument Construction," conducted at Göteborg University and Chalmers University of Technology by the Göteborg Organ Art Center (GOArt), with financial support from the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, Dan Branderström, Director. This research project ran concurrently with GOArt’s building of the North German organ in Örgryte New Church, Göteborg, completed in 2000. This instrument was modeled largely on the Arp Schnitger organ in St. Jacob, Hamburg (1693), and thus two of our six organs were selected from the very beginning. The other four, each of intrinsic artistic merit and historical interest in its own right, fill in a chronological span through four centuries and form an intricate web of connections, outlined in Chapter 1. The Compenius organ in Frederiksborg Castle (1610) provides a link back to the Renaissance and serves as our only example of an organ built for strictly secular purposes. The Calman organ at Leufsta Bruk (1728), one of the largest and best-preserved baroque organs in all of Scandinavia, offers a unique example of an elegant instrument built by the owner of an iron mill for the church in his factory town. Because of its isolated location, it is not well known outside of Sweden, and yet Ewert Biggs recorded on it in 1952. Working mainly in Paris, the greatest organ builder of the nineteenth century, Aristide Cavaillé-Coll, built only one organ in Scandinavia, in the Jesus Church in Copenhagen (1890). Finally, the Marcussen organ at Oscar’s Church in Stockholm (1949) well represents the twentieth century by mirroring two rather different trends: the organ reform movement and avant-garde composition for the organ.

The stories that these organs have to tell are related here by many different voices, in varying styles, and they can be read in different ways. The twenty-five chapters of this book can of course be read consecutively from start to finish,
THE ORGAN IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY COSMOLOGY

HANS DAVIDSSON

AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY, THE IDEA THAT THE UNIVERSE worked like a clockwork machine pervaded society. In 1611, when Hermannus Pratetius was teaching on the recently restored organ in St. Jacobi and epilepsy Componens had just finished the organ that now stands in Fredericksburg Castle, a contemporary Scandianavian scientist, Sigismund Forssos, wrote in his encyclopedia work Physicus:

As the almighty creator has made and ordered everything wisely, so has he truly wonderfully arranged the orbits of the heavens and the stars, like an artful clockwork, where one of the gears touches and drives the others and this all with great skillfulness, perfection, harmony, and congruence. Like an artful organ work or a stringed instrument, where the one pipe or string coincides with hidden voices with the other, and makes a lively melody and consonance of thirds fifths octaves etc. In this way there is also a lively harmony and consonance between the heaven and its planets. For that reason the Pythagoreans and Platonists have wondrously said that heavens’ circles various orbits should make a sweet and lively sound among them.¹

This clockwork universe was almost universally called the macrocosm. It encompassed everything outside the human experience, including the planets and the stars, and it surrounded and penetrated the human world, the microcosm. Hovering over both was the unseeable and incalculable presence of God.

The Harmony of the Planets: Kepler and Kircher

At this same time, Johannes Kepler (1571–1630), imperial mathematician to Emperor Rudolph II at his court in Prague, was making great strides in under-

This idea of cosmic harmony was applied by many authors to the study of music, among them the Jesuit writer Athanasius Kircher. The remarkable life of this polymath spans almost the entire seventeenth century. Born in Germany in 1600 or 1601, he had a remarkably long and productive active career as a Jesuit scholar in Rome, a career that produced thirty-two books in forty-six years before his death in 1680. One of his best-known works, the thousand-page Musurgia Universalis, published in Latin in 1650, was disseminated in Germany more widely than usual for such a work because of a partial translation into German by the Lutheran pastor Andreas Hirsch, in 1662. Kircher presented Kepler’s theory of the elliptical orbits of the planets and included tables and diagrams taken directly from Harmonice Mundi; figure 6-1 shows Kepler’s original illustration of the orbits of the planets and figure 6-2 Kircher’s replication of it. Kepler’s system is clearly heliocentric, and on the facing page he writes that “readers should take it as absolutely settled today among all astronomers that all the planets go around the Sun, with the exception of the moon, which alone has the Earth as its center.” As a Jesuit writing in Rome so soon after Galileo had been forced in 1633 to recant his heliocentric views, Kircher could not accept Kepler’s theory. The German version sums up Kircher’s position succinctly: “This is certain: all heavenly bodies were created for the sake of the earth as the center, which the divine Majesty itself has walked with human feet.”

Kepler’s harmonies of all the planets, which he computed both in cantus durus (with B♭ and cantus mollis (with B♭), extend from the Sun to Saturn upward to Mercury, more than six octaves above middle C, in the order of the solar system. In adapting these to the ranges of human voices for the “artificial concert of several voices,” he kept this order, so that Mercury became the soprano, Earth and Venus the alto, Mars the tenor, and Saturn and Jupiter the bass. He even found analogies between the eccentricities of the planets and the character of these vocal parts: “And as the bass makes harmonic leaps, so Saturn and Jupiter

cover harmonic intervals. . . . And as the treble is most free, more than all the rest, and the same is also the fastest, so also Mercury can range over more than a diapason and back again very quickly. \[1\]

Kircher developed his own system for adapting the harmony of the planets to human vocal polyphony. In tune with his geocentric worldview, the earth functions as the bass, the protovokonomos, the lowest pitch in the ancient Greek system of music theory. He orders the traditional seven planets above it, with the soprano and tenor each consisting of groups of three alternating consonant and dissonant planets and the sun between them in the alto, which "directs the other planets, making them lively and sounding with its rays." The dissonant planets Saturn and Mars are mediated in the soprano by the consonant Jupiter; likewise, dissonant Mercury comes between consonant Venus and Moon in the tenor: "So it is with the grim planets Saturn and Mars; what evil would they cause in the lower world with their poisonous conjunction, if the good Jupiter did not stand between them, conciliate, and temper them; what are Mars and Saturn other than dissonances?" \[12\] The musical example that he offers (figure 6.3, example 6.1) indeed consists of an alternation of consonances and suspended dissonances.

The Organ as Allegory

Kircher’s discussion of celestial harmony is embedded in a much larger framework that occupies all of book ten of Musurgia Universalis. It is subtitled Organ...
which can be seen in their allegorical use as a subject for sermons and other writings of the period. We find organ allegories, for example, in a sermon preached in 1662 by Johann Münzermann, the Lutheran superintendent of Halden.

We may model ourselves into living, spiritual, sensible, and steadfast organs. Our body shall be the Corpus of such as organs, our mouth shall be its pipes and our tongue the little tongue of the pipe; the breath or wind that is blown into it shall be the word of God; the keyboard and pedal of this our spiritual organ shall be our heart; its stops shall be the affections and desires of the emotions of our heart; the organist is the Holy Spirit, who is there with his sevenfold gifts, and the finger in God’s right hand... shall play the keyboard of our heart with his godly and powerful fingers.

Such writings, in which the instrumentalist is likened to an image of the Heavenly Organist, must have provided an inspiring metaphor for church organists of the time. Indeed, the organist’s role within the service was often larger than it is today. Between the two musical pillars of the prelude and the postlude, the organist frequently played solo variations in alternation with the choir and provided short interludes between sections of the liturgy and introits to mark musically otherwise silent liturgical movements. When the choir was not present, the organist replaced it entirely with embellished motets. The organ thus continued to take the role of the heavenly commentator in a dialogue with the human act of the liturgy (see chapter 5).

The intention during this period was not to showcase the organist as a performer but to create the illusion that the organ was playing itself. The organist was hidden behind the ornamented façade of the Rückpositiv, completing the illusion that the instrument spoke in the allegorical voice of the Creator himself. It played solo pieces that polyphonically surrounded and elaborated the plainsong melody notes in extremely long note values. Using his art in registration, the organist made the solo notes, the cantus firmus, shine out from the polyphonic texture. He played with his hands on different keyboards and often played the cantus firmus with his feet, using, for example, a solo trumpet stop in the pedal. The style of these compositions set into motion tenors and counter tenors and also quicker divisi, circling around a tone or another like planets at stately predetermined speeds in proportional relationships, reflecting in music the turning gears of Fauré’s clockwork universe.

new and transparent combination of sounds, reflecting the new orchestral ideals emerging from the instrumental sonata tradition that combined strings with trumpets and drums. Fritzschke also added a completely new Blockwerk division that included the delicate sounds and novelties of the world of the Compenius organ—for example, the Holz Principal.

Arp Schnitger in St. Jacobi

Despite the fact that St. Jacobi was the poorest of the main congregations in Hamburg (see chapter 3), they managed to finance a truly monumental new instrument by Arp Schnitger, completed in 1693. It must have been the head pastor at the time, Johann Friedrich Mayer, who managed to raise the funds to have the organ built for St. Jacobi, despite the restrictive economic situation and the rising wave of Pietism against church music and large organs. Yet the sculptures and woodcarvings were never completed. There were not even any carved pipe flats in the pedal tower, from the beginning they were only painted. It may have been that the Jacobi congregation was too poor to consider such luxurious decoration, but a dispute between the two woodcarvers is also recorded. In this sense St. Jacobi is not a representative example of the normal Schnitger façade, but a mirror of the very particular situation of the local congregation. Schnitger’s Lübeck Cathedral organ, completed with all its carvings in 1699 (figure 1-4), is more typical as a representative of the North German seventeenth-century city organ.

The angels and the statue of King David on the Lübeck Cathedral organ as well as the elaborately carved wings on the sides of the pedal tower and the Rückpositiv create the fully realized illusion that the organ is a baroque stage set, extending the instrument out into the space of the church beyond the confines of the instrument case. The decoration is also clearly a way of drawing the eyes to the geometrical proportions of the large parts of the case as they relate to one another. The main thing is not the details, but the heavenly proportions, emphasized by the four magnificent angels and King David at the top of the main organ case, two angels on the wings peeping out from either side of each pedal tower, and one large angel below the Rückpositiv.

The Compenius Organ in Frederiksborg Castle

The organ built by Eiasus Compenius in 1610 brings us to the other end of the spectrum of seventeenth-century organ building. Unlike the Blockwerk organ in northern Europe before Compenius, with its grandiose physical and musical proportions, this little experimental organ has nothing but wooden pipes and is soft enough to be listened to and appreciated by someone standing right next to it. With its incredibly refined and luxurious case, it invites the listeners and the player alike to approach. The front pipes are inlaid with ivory; the stop knobs are tiny, incredibly detailed figural heads cast in silver, and the instrument has other ingenious mechanical details to enjoy close up, such as a pedal board that can be slid into the front of the case and completely hidden from view.

The Compenius organ is the best-preserved example of a wider trend toward introducing new musical sounds and intimate acoustic environments to the organs of northern Europe. This organo di legno represents a new kind of organ and organ repertoire on a human scale, unlike the architectural stage set of the large Hanseatic organ that seems to play itself. Like the new opera singers in Italy at the dawn of the seventeenth century, the performer at the Compenius organ is a visible individual musician. According to an inscription once found inside the organ, it was built according to the design (invenit) of Duke Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1594–1613). What “invenit” means in this context could be debated, but it certainly suggests that Heinrich Julius was personally involved in the concept of the instrument.

Heinrich Julius (figure 6-4) was an unrival and colorful figure, one of the first German baroque princes. His interests were extremely broad, although he never seems to have concentrated on any one of them for long. For instance, in 1598, while courting his second wife, Elizabeth, sister to King Christian IV of Denmark, he saw his first troops of professional actors from England, who were then visiting the Danish court. He went home with his new bride, installed Europe’s first permanent troupe of English actors at his own court, and became the first serious German dramatic poet, producing eleven plays in only two years and then never writing again. Like his brother-in-law James I of England, he burned witches at the stake, but he also seems to have dabbled in alchemy himself, a trait that may have stood him in good stead at the alchemy-obsessed court of Emperor Rudolph II in Prague, where he spent much of his time during the latter part of his reign.

Unlike the Grüningen organ that Heinrich Julius also commissioned (see chapter 7), which truly expressed the macrocosm in organ sound, the Compenius organ represented the microcosm. Its decoration too, was secular rather than sacred. The sculptures in the upper right- and left-hand corners of its façade

have drawn a good deal of attention in the most recent literature. In the upper left-hand corner, a male figure with a winged cap, generally accepted as Mercury, plays a cornet. The figures in the upper right-hand corner were intended in the seventeenth century as an old man leaning over the woman in the foreground; however, the small figure is clearly a child, making the most likely reading Versus and Amor, although Amor does not have his characteristic bow. Other depictions of Venus, Mercury, and Amor together include one with a musical theme. Could the figures of Mercury and Venus refer to Duke Heinrich Julius and his new wife, Elisabeth, and their love for one another?

But there is an iconographical puzzle, too. Mercury’s relationship to music is normally associated with the lyre, not the pipe or flute. Michael Praetorius himself writes about Mercury, but only in conjunction with the lyre and the cithara. The Compenius organ provides a very unusual instance of a coupling of Mercury as a pipe with Versus and Amor. Not only do the images of the pagan gods lead us firmly into the realm of the secular, but Mercury playing a pipe is always associated in the seventeenth century with the slaying of the giant Argos, an allegory for the alchemical process, and it is possible that Heinrich Julius’s invention for the organ included a detailed plan for the design of the façade to reflect his interest in alchemy. At the very least, the figures create a personal frame around music that focuses not on the public arena of the church but on the private sphere of human emotions. This instrument surely was meant to function as a symbol of the pinnacle of good taste and refinement achieved by the duke’s court: a political and worldly microcosm, not the macrocosm of the church’s heavenly choirs.

In designing an organ that would produce as many sounds as possible from wooden pipes, Eusebius Compenius stretched the limits of the organ of legno tradition in what can only be described as a scientific experiment in collaboration with Michael Praetorius. If Praetorius is taken at face value, they began this project with the ambition of trying to imitate all other instruments. This vision led to the invention of completely new stops as well as the reinventing of tra-
ditional steps in a new acoustical environment and a new material: wood. Radically new registration ideas also emerged, as well as evolutionary ideas that are taken, in this instrument, to a radical extreme, and described with utmost care by Praetorius in *De Organographia* (see chapter 4). The reed instruments, which were popular, even dominant, during the first half of the seventeenth century, were well represented, and the "strange and soft, subtle sound" of the wooden flue stops might have been an attempt to imitate the gamba consort sound beloved in England and Germany.

The instrument must have primarily been used to play dance music for entertainment (CD tracks 1-6). This is not the music of the spheres; rather, it is full of all-time-shifting rhythmical meters. There were also sets of variations on well-known tunes that would be embellished by diminutions (faster and faster figuration in the same amount of time) and rhetorical gestures, creating small-scale emotional vignettes of everyday secular life in the microcosm.

The Two Organs Compared

We have focused here on two of the most important organs of northern Europe that have been preserved from the seventeenth century: the colossal organ in Hamburg, St. Jacobi, built in the last decade of the century, and the intimate decal court organ by Eissel Compenius built in its first. St. Jacobi's organ, with 60 stops on four manuals and pedal, is the largest surviving organ of Ad Spie- 
ger and was the second largest organ he ever built (after the one in Hamburg's St. Nicolai, which was destroyed in the great fire of 5 May 1842). Schnitger's organ for Hamburg St. Jacobi in fact contains some pipework from two previous generations of the best Hamburg organ builders, as was fairly common in large church organs, while the Compenius organ was the product of a single person's patronage and a single builder's construction.

These two instruments represent two very distinct building traditions that correspond to seventeenth-century northern European concepts of the sacred and the secular, the macrocosm and the microcosm. And yet, in Ad Spiegler's organs these two worlds do come together to a certain extent. The development from macro- to microcosm, the shift from purely theoretical to more practical concepts that are also reflected in literary sources, art, and architecture, seem toward the turn of the century to reach a certain degree of balance, an integration of new and old perspectives, such as we also see in the juxtaposition of free and fugal sections in the North German toccata and prelude. Ad Spiegler also finally integrated in the tonal design of his instruments powerful fundamental reeds for the bass and the large, brilliant mixtures required for the accompaniment of congregational singing. In the examination report of the Jacobi organ, three well-known organists—Vincent Lübeck, Christian Flor, and Andreas

Kraemer—praised Schnitger for his excellent work and are careful to mention how absolutely necessary the Posament 32', Principal 32', and Octave 16' of the Werk and Pedal were for a congregation so rich in inhabitants.24 This di-
mension of Schnitger's concept, then, is a response to the higher level of inte-
gration of all members of the church within the liturgy. It mirrors the political development from feudal to more democratic structures in which more and more power was transferred from the courts to the city, and to some extent from the noble class to the merchants and tradespeople. Now all voices of the citizens were not only able but expected to sing with the choirs, musicians, and heavenly choirs in hymns and songs in their own native language. This development al-
lowed and perhaps even became the catalyst for the building of large-scale, late-
baroque organs by Ad Spiegler and his contemporaries, monuments that wit-
tnessed the culmination of a new, dynamic, and somewhat mannered style. This was to be followed by the galant style, which marked the final emancipation from medieval to modern concepts generated by the Enlightenment.
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ponte de contarse en la gran secuencia irlandesa de comedílogros despreocupados
ya por el didactismo ya por la glosatoría, la cual mide desde Richard Steele,
pasando por Goldsmith, Sheridan y Boswell (El descubri londinense, London
Assurance, es de 1841) hasta llegar a Oscar Wilde.

Se da la posibilidad, sin embargo, de que la frase de Tony Lumpkin, gracioso-
beloso-mímado y al final cochorro de Vencedora por haberse humillado: No hay ni un
estanque ni un pantano dentro de cinco millas del cañal [mis penachos] no conocen
ya el sabor sea un tributo por parte de Goldsmith a su anterior amigo, cuyo cochorro
lo había expresado como No se sabe de lo que se está mojando en todo el día junto,
a no ser justo ahora y contrar mi voluntad, un poco del agua del arroyo (6).

Menos mal que no se peor pasó a otra vida en 1788 al arreglarlo John Kemble
como pieza de tres actos, eliminando gran parte de la acción tocante a la gente de
calidad, y representando el resto como una serie de escenas de sainete. Esta obra, El
tabique (The Pannel) fue representada hasta mediados del siglo XIX, siempre
organizada alrededor de alguna personalidad histórica de fama, empezando con
Dorothea Jordan, amante del después rey Guillermo IV. Habrá quien insista en que
el éxito de las escenas en que Muskate viste y comenta el traje femenino contribuyó
no poco a determinar la afluencia del público de Londres a los disfrutados de mujer,
hasta el drama La tía de Carlitos (Charley’s Aunt, 1891) de Brandon Thomas, y
más allá. A todo esto – o a este poco – condujo una lectura al fin equivocada de
El escándalo y la tapada por parte de Isaac Bickerstaff.

EL RELOJ DESCUMPUESTO DE BASTA CALLAR:
EL TIEMPO EN LOS CONFLICTOS DRAMÁTICOS CALDERONIANOS
Por Margaret Rich Greer

Hoy, quisiera hacer evidente algo que nos apremia, generalmente de forma invisí-
ble, a todos: el tiempo. Para funcionar con eficacia en una cultura moderna, todos
sabemos que tenemos que acatar las reglas impuestas por los que controlan el
tiempo – por ejemplo, la disposición que en este congreso nos exige “limitar el
tiempo reservado a cada ponencia a estrictamente 30 minutos”. Pero somos sacar
da la luz las reglas del tiempo sólo cuando nos proporcionan un dilema irresoluble –
cómo el de tener sólo un minuto para leer las tres páginas que faltan todavía. Las
leyes del tiempo rigen también el género dramático,1 lo cual reconoce tácitamente
Bancoz Candamo en su Teatro de los teatro en el comprender que la comedia bien hecha
con el movimiento ordenado de un reloj. El reloj es, dice él, una invención
admirable que “hizo al tiempo no sólo visible sino visible y conversable a los
hombres, dándole cuerpo, voz y mano de metal con que nos asemeje, grite y señale los
minutos que vistimos, repartiéndonos la vida a nuestro prezosos ministerios”.2

En la misma época en la cual se fabricó el bello reloj de esmalte adornado con
los retratos de Felipe IV y Mariana de Austria que se ve ilustrado aquí,3 Calderón
escribió Basta callar, una comedia palaciega en la cual buena parte de la acción
cómica se centra en las confusiones creadas por una joya parecida. Es una obra
poco leída – tal vez porque no tenemos de ella todavía una edición completa. La
versión conocida, que desciende de la edición princep de la Verdad en que
parte publicada por vest Tassini en 1662, es un texto truncado de tal forma que
parece una obra trivial, cuando no incoherente, como resultado de la inspiración que ha
sufrado.4 La trama tenía cierta fascinación para Calderón, sin embargo. Escribió una

1 La representación de un evento significativo en un tiempo limitado impone la necesidad de
cortar o condensar según convenciones que reflejan valores culturales importantes y varia-
tes, pero la relación entre el drama y el desarrollo de los conceptos de la inmaterialidad puede
ser más profundo todavía. Janette de Romey ha sugerido que no en una coincidencia que
sino la trágica gracia que la historiografía emergente en el siglo siglo AC, donde
dependen de un concepto claro del tiempo pasado y presente, antes y después, y de
los efectos del pasado sobre el presente. G. J. Winchow, Time in History: View of time from
prehistoric to the present day (Oxford, 1989), pp. 44–45.

2 Francisco Bancoz Candamo, Teatro de los teatro de los palacios y presentes siglas, ed.

3 Reproducido en David S. Landes, Revolution in Time: Clocks and the Making of the Modern

4 Esta es la versión citada en uno de los pocos artículos críticos dedicados a la obra. “La
retórica del silencio de la comedia Basta callar” por Nicolás María en Ascaso de nevas.
una edición del texto completo, creo que María no habría llegado al juicio serio de que la
comedia es “un mundo suel y brillantemente artificioso; pero como mundo de ideas, como vida,
primeras y más sencillas versiones, del mismo conflicto entre amistad, amor y poder en la comedia temprana, Nadie fie su secret, en la cual un príncipe interviene entre dos amigos y entre su secretario y la amada de éste, a quien a su vez desea el príncipe. Luego escribió dos versiones de Basta callar, la primera probablemente entre 1635 y 1640, y la segunda unos veinte años más tarde, multiplicando las complejidades de la trama y añadiendo el motivo cómico del reloj.

El uso del reloj que me cautivó cuando por primera vez leí Basta Callar, y la pregunta que quiero plantear hoy es, ¿por qué nuestro dramaturgo le da un papel tan importante en su obra?, pues sabemos que un motivo así elaborado nunca es un espacio vacío, de frivaldad absoluta ... [en la cual] no sólo falta la verdad psicológica, sino también ideas, temas vivos, peleles conflictos. Salvando alusiones al honor o los deberes de clase o sexo, estos hombres y mujeres corren de problemas? (p. 105).


6 La primera tiene que ser antes de 1648, y la segunda después de 1652. Se cita la obra en el entremés del Doctor Carlión representado en Granada en 1648, y Trévoli, por las referencias en el texto al estatuto en los jardines del Buen Retiro, sugiere que es de los años 1653 a 1640, época en la cual se representaron otras obras cerca del estanque en el jardín de su centro. La segunda versión, conservada en el manuscrito parcialmente autografiado en la Biblioteca Nacional, incorpora una referencia a la victoria de don Juan José de Austria y la rendición de Barcelona en 1652. Bañándose en una línea parcial de los actores incluida en el manuscrito, Treviño sugiere una fecha de 1657. S. N. Treviño, “Nuevos datos acerca de la fecha de Basta Callar” Hispanic Review 4-4 (1936): 333-341.

7 Calderón también emplea el reloj en De un cuarto tres venganzas, un drama de privanza vinculado tempranamente a la trama de Basta Callar. En De un cuarto, el guión Federico emplea la figura del reloj para indicar que su amante es “el insensible real” de su ama: “...No ha visto un reloj que tiene en su corazón pañal...”

8 un volumen que se llama un escrito de los que escribía, y aunque el volumen quiera o camino, luego obedezca al artificio que le mande por derecho... Así soy, aunque quiero ir por otro rumbo, no puedo; que le sucede al escrito del artificio del pecado...” (p. 333).

9 Este uso metafórico forma parte de una tradición poética que empezó poco después de la invención del reloj mecánico, con un poema de Jean Froissart, Le corps amoureux (c. 1380), una alegoría del amor correlacionada con las partes del reloj, Ver Otto May, “A Mechanical Under for an Authoritarian World”, en Klaus Maurice y Oyri Mayer, The Clockwork Universe: German Clocks and Automata, 1500-1650, (New, York 1989), p. 2.

meramente cómico en Calderón. ¿Por qué quería hacer “visible y conversable” el tiempo? ¿Cómo se relaciona la problematización del tiempo en esta obra con la filosofía del tiempo en otras obras calderonianas, y cuál es su valor temático en esta obra palaciega en particular?

En la primera redacción de Basta Callar, Margarita, princesa de Bearn, le da el reloj al gracioso Capricho para premiarle el haber revelado parte del secreto de su mismísimo amo, César (o Ludovico) de quien se ha enamorado ella. Al recibir esta joya, Capricho se felicita de ser “El primer lacayo que ay ha visto el mundo hasta yo ...” con relos de porcelana! a quien diamantes adornan y tulipanes esmalte” (p. 31). Los manos del lacayo, se para el reloj y luego se rompe porque este ríosico no comprende su mecanismo. Las confesiones y las citas amorosas fallidas como consecuencia de esto revelan la existencia y la incompatibilidad fundamental de dos conceptos de tiempo: 1) el tiempo del campo, de las pasiones humanas y de la naturaleza, medido por los ciclos del sol; y 2) el tiempo urbano, el del reloj y la corte, medido por relojes que deben sincronizarse con el reloj del palacio.

Los relojes ejercían una fascinación no sólo en “Bearn” o Madrid, sino en todas las cortes de Europa en los siglos XVI y XVII, y Calderón se burla de esta fascinación en diversas obras suyas. Capricho alude a la abundancia de relojes, al decir que no revelaría cierto secreto por todos los relojes en el Palacio:

…………………No me apures, que si te diéras más relojes que ay en todo Palacio, en torres, en mesas, en escaparates, muebles, cassabillos, y faldíferas, y estos, en vez de dar quarto, dieran reales, no dijeras que Serrafina es la causa ... (BN Ms. Res. II, f.10)

Velázquez no dejó otro testimonio de su popularidad, en retratos de la reina Mariana y de la princesa Margarita María que, como el reloj de Bruselas, son contemporáneas con la segunda versión de Basta Callar.10 Aunque Maravall consideró esta fascinación con los relojes evidencia de la superficialidad del interés...
científico en la España del XVII, Madrid no parece diferenciarse en esto de otras cortes europeas de la época; en todas, los reyes servían como regios de estado y como juguetes o adornos ostensibles de los ricos y poderosos. Al colocar este artefacto lujoso en manos de un laoco que no lo comprende, Calderón inventó un motivo cómico con implicaciones muy profundas, porque como dice David Landes, fue el reloj mecánico el que produjo una "revolución en el tiempo". En la vida rural y la sociedad tradicional, el tiempo es de la naturaleza - uno se levanta con el sol, se trabaja de acuerdo con las exigencias de los animales y de la producción agrícola, y se acuesta cuando se pone el sol. Como consecuencia, no hay necesidad de medir con exactitud las horas. En la vida urbana, en cambio, el ritmo del trabajo - o de no trabajar, para los ricos - es más o menos arbitrario. El trabajo en sí no impone un horario, sino que es el hombre el que impone el horario al trabajo. El que sigue un horario arbitrario, del reloj, adaptándose a un tiempo laboral y un tiempo social impuesto por otros seres humanos, tiene que aprender una disciplina temporal interna, distinta del acostumbramiento de un tiempo "natural" externo a él. Fue el reloj mecánico el que hizo posible que el tiempo se divierta de los eventos humanos y de la naturaleza. Lienoarizado, opuesto, el reloj mecánico produjo, a lo largo, una disciplina temporal internalizada que sería un factor crucial en el desarrollo de las economías y sociedades complejas de la Europa moderna. El Capricho de Basta callar, sin embargo, está muy lejos de haber incorporado tal disciplina. 

Aunque el reloj fue uno de los inventos clave en una transformación secular, el primer estímulo para su desarrollo vino de una devoción religiosa, del deseo de mejorar el conocimiento astronómico y astronómico para saber regularmente de acuerdo con el movimiento de los cielos. En el oeste, el impetu más importante se centró en las comunidades monásticas. Por su énfasis en la disciplina del cuerpo y el espíritu, y por la creencia en la oración a horas precisas y en común, se buscaba una manera de medir con más precisión el tiempo, de marcar sus divisiones más finamente y de llamar a todos a rezar. Otro factor fue la conciencia de la amenaza omnipresente de la muerte, y de la necesidad de vivir y prepararse para la muerte en el tiempo

11 Ver José Antonio Marquíl, La cultura del barroco (Barcelona, 1989), p. 470 y "The Court: Source of Support and Challenge" en Maurice y Mayr, pp. 212-213. De hecho, el descubrimiento de Anabà y los largos viajes transcontinentales generaron la necesidad urgente de un cronometro muy preciso que permitiera la determinación de la longitud, y Felipe II en 1598 ofreció un premio de 1,000 ducados y pensiones de por vida para quien inventara tal aparato. Pero es cierto que no existía en España los elementos materiales y las estructuras sociales que facilitaran los avances en la trigonometría, hasta la Guerra de los Treinta Años, y luego en Inglaterra, Ver Landes, 103-113 y Silvio A. Bedini, "The Mechanicacl Clock and the Scientific Revolution" en Maurice y Mayr, pp. 19-26.


13 Aunque puede ser la hora del reloj, no existe relación con el tiempo, según estudios que describen Whitrow, pp. 6-7.


16 Maurice y Mayr, p. viii.

17 Ver, por ejemplo, Fray Luis de Granada, Introducción al Síntagma de la Fe, BAE VI (Madrid, 1856), pp. 244, 265 y Calderón, De un castigo tres veces, SEG, nota 7.

18 Influenció en la detección de este imaginario el libro de Antonino de Guevara, Nuevas Aventuras con el Reloj de reyes cuyo Prólogo general citábamos con la noticia: "Este reloj de reyes no es de arena ni de sedo ni de hora ni de agua, sino es reloj de vida. Porque los otros reyes sirven para saber qué hora es de noche y qué hora es de día, mas éstos son estables cómo nos hemos de ocupar cada hora y cómo hemos de ordenar la vida. El fin de tener reyes es por ordenar las repúblicas, mas este reloj de reyes emitenos a mejorar las vidas, porque muy poco aprovecha que estén muy concertados los reyes y que anden en vanidos e dimensiones los vecinos" (Segovia, 1532), f. vi.
repasar rápidamente la presentación del tiempo – explícito o implícito – en los diversos géneros dramáticos cultivados por él. Calderón no emplea, que yo sepa, la imagen de Dios como relojero divino, una metáfora cósmica tal vez peligrosamente mecanicista. Temprano son frecuentes en los autos otras referencias al reloj, aunque las referencias al tiempo abundan. En la cosmología de sus autos sacramentales, el tiempo es absoluto, en el sentido de que el transcurso del tiempo humano se subsume en el eterno presente de la mente de Dios. En otro sentido, el tiempo en el auto se hace fundamentalmente teológico: la historia sagrada es estructurada en, y por, tres eventos, la creación divina del universo, la encarnación de Cristo, y el cumplimiento anticipado de la historia en la segunda venida de Cristo y el juicio final. Además, la alegoría de numerosos autos se basa en una tipología secularizada, una dramatización analógica de eventos de la historia sagrada y la historia secular. Esta dramatización figural del tiempo tiene su paralelo en algunos relojes mecánicos monumentales con autómata, uno de los más famosos siendo el reloj construido para la Catedral de Strasbourg en el siglo XIV. En estos mecanismos, mientras el cronómetro contaba el transcurso temporal de los minutos, los autómatas representaban diariamente algunos eventos sagrados. “La escena sagrada autómata de esta forma servía como recordatorio continuo de que la temporalidad cansaba dentro del plan eterno de la salvación del hombre. La figura central que revelaba el significado de todas las anteriores y prefiguraba todas las venideras era, por supuesto, Cristo”.20

Cuando se evoca la imagen del reloj en los autos, es el reloj momento morti, un aviso al hombre que ignora a su peligro. En La nave del mercader, la figura alegórica del tiempo es convocada con la llamada, “Oh tú, succeso / reloj de la vida!” El Tiempo sirve de testigo a la entrega de los cinco senados prestados al Hombre, y a su promesa de volverlos debidamente, y sirve de executor cuando éste no puede pagar a su plazo cumplido.21 Con cierta frecuencia, son los graciosos de los autos los que se refieren a los relojes para burlarse de los que se rigen por un instrumento mecánico en vez de por sus necesidades corporales. Cuando en Suesos hay que verdad son, un computo le critica al Panadero encarcelado con José por echarse a dormir de día, él responde:

Eso es lo mismo que comer, porque el reloj da cuando gana no tengo, y cuando tengo la gana esperas a que dé; necios, comet cuando hubiere hambre, dormid cuando hubiere sueño, que no han de ser nuestras tripas las cuerdas de su instrumento.22

20 Francis C. Haver, “The Clock as Intellectual Artifact” en Munich y Mayr, pp. 15–16.
22 Calderón, Autos, p. 1216. Referencias similares al reloj ocurren en Música y Realidad

El reloj descompuesto de Basta Callar

El Panadero es condenado a muerte; en el auto, el tiempo es prestado al hombre por Dios, no para satisfacer sus deseos corporales, sino para ganar la salvación de su alma.

Fuerza del espacio sagrado del auto, la presentación calderoniana del tiempo es igualmente compleja, y mucho más ambigua. En las obras espectaculares de corte, Calderón celebra y apoya el poder de los monarcas Habsburgo a la vez que critica discretamente su conducta política. La conjunción de estos dos mensajes aparentemente incompatibles se teje a veces alrededor de la tensión entre dos modelos del tiempo. Eco y Narciso y Hades y divina de León y María, por ejemplo, se sitúan aparentemente fuera del tiempo en el reino de los dioses míticos y en el de las novelas de caballería, pero Calderón socava esta atmósfera de inmutable temporalidad con toques sutiles que vinculan a los protagonistas con los espectadores reales y les recuerdan que ellos también están sujetos a los efectos inequívocos y destructivos del tiempo.25

Si las tensiones y ambigüedades en el modelo del tiempo que subyace el auto y la comedia mitológica quedan generalmente implícitas, en Basta Callar Calderón las hace centrales y explícitas con el motivo del reloj: y, a quie no viene perfectamente la expresión (para revelar un secreto), las “hace palacio”. Todos los personajes principales están atrapados entre el tiempo natural y el tiempo urbano, del palacio; se sienten escindidos por los reclamos irreconciliables entre el deber y el deseo: la princesa Margarita ha sido prometida al conde de Montpellier por el Duque de...
Beaune, su hermano, pero está enamorada de César; César debe su lealtad y agradecimiento a Margarita y al Duque que le han salvado del fuego del Conde de Mompellier, y no puede compensar este deber con su amor por Serafina. Carlos está dividido por su lealtad al Duque y a su amigo César; y el Duque y el Conde están enamorados de Serafina, la amada de su sobrino César. La crisis se desarrolla cuando César, queriendo saber cuánto tiempo queda antes de unas citas con Serafina y Margarita, depende no del sol sino del reloj de Capricho, quien no ha sabido darle cuerda. Creyendo tener tiempo de sobra, acude al palacio para satisfacer su deuda de lealtad con el Duque, quien le obliga a rondar de noche con él para que no vaya a ver a Serafina.24

El tiempo del cortesano, como aprende César, no es el suyo, sino el del príncipe. Aun Capricho reconoce esto cuando dice que debe poner su reloj con el del palacio.25 La primacía del reloj de palacio era una realidad pragmática además de un simbolo político importante en estos siglos de monarquía absoluta y de cronómetros imprescindibles. El rey Carlos V de Francia instaló un reloj en su palacio de la Isla de la Cité y declaró en 1730 que todos los relojes de la ciudad debían regularse de acuerdo con él. Como dice Landes, "Así afirmó la primacía del poder real", aunque sin resolver el problema continuo de sincronización de relojes para un público que no podía hacer otra cosa que encogerse de hombros y comentar, "C'est l'horloge du Palais; / Elle va comme ça lui plait."26

Pero este reloj, por imperfecto que fuera en realidad, constituía el modelo del estado ideal, como veremos en unos emblemas de Covarrubias y de Savedra Fajardo.27 El emblema 57 de Savedra muestra un reloj de mesa con una sola mano (la norma para relojes de la época), bajo el lema "Vae reddarri". En su texto, refleja el precepto central en la filosofía política absolutista de la época, que el estado

24 El problema de los horarios también se presenta con un uso cómico-dramático del espacio, cuando para atraer a César, se curta la misma canción simultáneamente desde los balcones de Serafina y Margarita, situados en los espacios opuestos del tablero.

25 Justo cuando César empieza a recitar su historia y su dilema, Capricho le interrumpe de forma cómica, pero también significativa, para sincronizar su reloj, "César, de muerte... / Capricho: Un tanto apurado, que da el reloj de palacio; / ponte del conde de Mompellier, en bengala / de aquel tránsito en que podrás con Serafina esperar, / patrón, honra, vida, y... "—(RR Ms. Rey 1 f. 13).

26 Landes, p. 75 y Whitrow, p. 121. En España también proliferaron versos satíricos sobre la poca fiabilidad de los relojes mecánicos instalados en las torres de algunos partidos españoles desde finales del siglo XIV. Ver Miguel Herrera García, El reloj en la vida española, (Madrid, 1955), pp. 7, 10-17. Según Landes, Carlos I de España se dedicó en los últimos aforatos de su vida a hacer sonar simultáneamente todos los relojes reales, pero nunca lo logró.

27 Procediendo a la inversión, la equiparación de cronómetro e imperio ordenó sustituir el diseño de un reloj a mano de los relojes hechos para Carlos V y reservado solo para el emperador, bajo la figura de César con este impuesto, "[que] recibe la mano derecha, con la que empuja el corno, al sonar las horas. En el título, ofreciendo la cara, se encuentran los escudos, en rojo, de los reinos pertenecientes de hecho y de derecho a la Corona española: Castilla, León, Toledo, Aragón, Cataluña, Navarra, Granada, Dos Sicilias, Sicilia antigua, Crónica y Aragonés", Sociedad Española de Antiguos del Arte, El reloj en el arte. Exposición. Castellano, (Madrid, 1965), p. 12.
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... armónico tiene que ser mandado por un solo individuo: "Así no solamente a desempeñar el Príncipe mano en el reloj del gobierno, sino también volante, que dió el tiempo al movimiento de las ruedas, dependiendo del todo el arteficio de los negocios". No puede compartir el mundo con ministros, aunque sus labores y consejos sean las ruedas silenciosas de la máquina, ni puede dejar el poder en manos de un privado. Muchos dramas de privanza de las primeras décadas del siglo XVII reflejan la incongruencia que introducen los privados en la máquina del estado, y entre ellos podemos incluir De un castigo tres venganzas, una comedia temprana cuya trama anticipa la de Bauta Callar. En De un castigo, la metáfora del reloj señala la atracción del galán hacia su dama, aun cuando el Duque de Borgoña le ha exiliado del reino y el válido trascienro del Duque intenta materiarlo. Pero el modelo del reloj bajo un solo mando no soluciona el problema político de la regulación del mundo en sí. El emblema 42 de Covarrubias representa esta cuestión gráficamente en la figura de un reloj de pesas con alas. El reloj lleva el lema "Pondere levio", y el texto explica la función de las pesas en la regulación del ritmo del reloj a la conducta del gobernador, quien debe andar con "sosiego y quietud del alma, concertado como relojes, caminando igualmente". Tanto en la comedia temprana Nadie fue su secreto como en Bauta Callar, el príncipe anda fuera de compás, impelido por el deseo de una dama que ama y es amada por su secretario. Se ve en estas comedias que no sólo el tiempo es del príncipe, quien puede disponer de sus subditos como quiera para extender sus reuniones, sino también el lenguaje, en una sociedad cortesana donde no se puede guardar un secreto. Todos los secretos son como el reloj que quiere escuchar Ceprice - se quedan con la llave fuera, y el poder del príncipe es la llave que abre todo. Nadie fue es una comedia sensilla y atractiva, que se resuelve cuando César, habiendo aprendido de su lacayo Lázaro a descifrar de su amigo trascienro Arias, se confiesa directamente al Duque Alejandro y éste logra dominar su propia pasión.

A pesar de la comodidad centrada en el reloj y la acumulación cómica de los encuentros fallidos de los amantes, la atmósfera en Bauta Callar es mucho más sombría. Es una obra que en el corpus shakespeariano seguramente se clasificaría de "dark comedy", y que a falta de mejor término, yo llamaría una "comedia de..."

30 Es también una obra muy cómica, gracias principalmente a Lázaro, un lacayo gracioso con la versatilidad, la agilidad lingüística, y la fidelidad imaginativa del don García de La verdad sospechosa. Los juegos cómicos más elaborados no tienen que ver con el tiempo y el reloj sino con los juegos de naves y una especie de madera que lleva Lázaro. Ver los comentarios acerca sobre él en la introducción a la obra en la edición de Valbuena Briones, Calderón, Otros II, pp. 88-125. Aunque el Duque aparece como personaje simpático, sus defectos como príncipe son múltiples - no sólo se agotaba indudablemente, sino que deja mucho poder en manos de su secretario, y divirtió a éste obligándole a acompanarlo a mendigar las calles de la ciudad en busca de mujeres y otros placeres que el Duque no puede conseguir a la luz del día. Así el espectador está preparado para la frustración final y la aprobación.
Margaret Rich-Greer

frustración". La frustración de la comunicación siempre cortada entre los amantes se acrecenta, alcanzando una exageración mecánica que produce incomodidad además de tensión dramática. Calderón ha aumentado la presión sobre el pobre secretario César, duplicando el papel del Duque, y haciendo al segundo, el Conde de Montpellier, un hombre violento y traicionero. Primero soborna éste a una criada para entrar en casa de Serafina, quien ha rechazado sus cortesanos, luego cuando César cree de una competencia peligrosa, envía unos criados a matarlo a tiros en una emboscada, y después lleva de inquisición a Bearn, supuestamente para ver de secreto a su prometida, la princesa Margarita, pero en realidad para seguir pensando a Serafina. Otra añadidura importante es la contraparte femenina del Duque, la princesa Margarita, por quien Calderón fomenta una gran simpatía. Ella abre la comedia con un largo parlamento que habrá dado a una buena actriz la oportunidad de demostrar su talento lírico. Empieza con el disco más escalador que se ha encontrado en Calderón en contra del tratamiento injusto de la mujer, y luego, junto con vividas imágenes una escena de caza, y su hallazgo y examenamiento del galán que ella ha encontrado desgarrado en el espolón de los bosque donde los hombres del Conde le han dejado, creyéndole muerto. Pero al final de la comedia, esta princesa queda cañada con el malo de la obra, el conde, quien la no ama. Los deseos del Duque también quedan frustrados al final, aunque es un príncipe menos desenfado que el de Nadie fie su secreto. 32

Mientras que Calderón complica la trama de Basta Callar, reduce la comodidad múltiple de Nadie fie a un solo juego sobre el tiempo, hecho visual con el reloj. El lacayo que antes perdía en los salones y sólo ensayaba verbalmente su espada ahora posee un reloj que tampoco sabe manipular. ¿Por qué? Sea un reflejo del desengaño característico del barroco, sea por los años suyos o los de su espectador real, Felipe IV, o por la crisis política ya casi endémica, creo que con el tiempo, Calderón modificó esta trama para enfocar en el tiempo mismo la ansiedad de la época, la percepción de la vulnerabilidad del ser humano y su incapacidad de alcanzar la felicidad, por elevada que fuera su posición. Margarita y César también expresan, a través de referencias al "Galateo" 34 al código simbólico que se condensa en los

31 El discurso culmina en una queja realmente gáctica contra un sistema que deja a la mujer "sin el libro y sin la espada / y sin el mundo, a ser sólo / la más yulid aljed de sus familia, y tanto / que el padre que más vieja, / con cierto padre, no ve / la era de ochenta de casa". Muchos de los juicios de la princesa aparecen también en la defensa de la mujer en el prólogo "Al lector" de María de Zayas y Sorremayor, Novelas amorosas y ejemplares, Ed. Agustín G. de Ameñara y Mayos. (Madrid, 1943). Para un poético de 1657, esta queja habrá tenido también cierta conciencia tópica, porque la princesa Margarita María, primera hija de Felipe IV y Marta (y única hija sobreviviente hasta el nacimiento de Carlos II en 1661) fue prometida desde su nacimiento en 1651 a su primo Leopoldo de Austria. El matrimonio tuvo lugar en 1666, cuando ella tenía 15 años. Jonathan Brown, Fieldspece (New Haven, 1981), p. 222.

32 Su único defecto es de haberse enamorado de Serafina, su amiga de infancia recién recobrada, sin saber que César ya la ama y que la corresponde; el intenso enfrase en cuanto se entera de esto.

33 Queda también la comodidad de las citas anteriores interrumpidas, pero un uso también contribuye a la importancia que tiene el tiempo en la obra.

34 Lo cual podría ser el libro italiano de Giovanni Della Casa publicado en 1558 que circulaba
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emblemas, la presión que ejercen sobre ellos los códigos cortesanos de conducta. Pero es en el conflicto de los dos conceptos del tiempo, el tiempo "nacional" y el cortesano que mejore se enfoca la frustración y el silenciamiento casi inevitable de la voz del deseo en una sociedad cortesana.

Este enfoque en conflictos temporales es un acierto psicológico en la representación de conflictos de ideología imposibles. En el sentido más inmediato, todos sabemos que no se puede estar en dos lugares al mismo tiempo y que las decisiones más penosas que confrontamos son los que nos obligan a elegir, como César, entre una cita con el amor y una cita con el deber. El tiempo, entonces, sirve para representar el conflicto por la ley y el deseo. El reloj puede servir emblemáticamente para representar el estado ideal, absoluto, al alma concerdada; pero alguien tiene que darle cuerda al reloj, y como se queja Capricho, el que aprende a hacer esto llega a sentirse preso en una trampa, atentó al tic-tac que señala "los plazos de su cordel".

La eficacia con la que el tiempo representa el dilema humano se debe a la profunda ambivalencia hacia el tiempo del sujeto escindido descrito por Jacques Lacan. Como lo resume Eille Ragland-Sullivan: "Adult time and space are structured by clocks, chronologies, contracts – Oedipal signifiers. But the child’s time and space remain active within the adult as the source of Desire, individuality, repetitive patterns, and symptoms." 36 El que se juzga a la disciplina temporal de una cultura compleja, entonces, no puede eliminar el tiempo y el espacio inconsciente del cual nace el deseo, pero tampoco puede vivir dentro de su eterno presente. En tal caso, como dice el reloj de la obra, repetido por todos al final: "Quien por cobardes respetos / no se atreve a declarar, / Basta Callar".

En tal callejón sin salida, ¿cómo se puede encontrar el final feliz – o por lo menos semi-feliz – que era casi obligatorio para una comedia palaciegas? Cuando Margarita le da el reloj a Capricho, éste expresa en términos cómicos su miedo de que haga el despertador el reloj que era en ella "de muestra" (paso "show"). Y a lo largo, resulta ser el de verdad el despertador, el que encuentra la salida de la caótico en que están metidas él y César físicamente, y metafóricamente todos los nobles enamorados. Aunque no entiende el reloj, comprende muy bien las motivaciones humanas y emplea su comprensión del malo supersticioso de la criada de Serafina para obligarle a declarar la verdad que empieza a desencadenar a César y Serafina, por lo menos. Como en tantas comedias del Siglo de Oro, son las figuras marginales de esta sociedad patriarcal – los lacayos y/o las mujeres – no del todo paralizadas con el título del Galateo o el Galateo español de Lucas Creación Dantiscus. No ha podido encontrar ni en el original italiano ni en el versión española el tema parcial que discuten ellos – la manera de traer una carta que uno mebe fijada – pero esto no altera el valor simbólico de la referencia.


37 Jornada I, f. 7.
por sus códigos de conducta, las que encuentras en el escenario que permite una satisfacción por lo menos parcial.

Pero en esta comedia, el final feliz no provee más que una felicidad a medias. El duque, Margaretta y el Conde aceptan la frustración del deseo, acordando a la prioridad del deber. Regula Rohland de Langbein, siguiendo la esquema de Nathaniel Frye, dice que los tres funcionan como "chivos expiatorios" al recibir un castigo merecido por su extralimitación de las normas sociales. 38 En una lectura válida, por lo menos en el caso de los hombres; pero no de la que serio el que Calderón haya escrito una comedia para la diversión de Felipe IV y Mariana en la cual sus contrapartes dramáticas sirvan de "pharmakon". Para todo espectador o lector, sea de sangre real o plebea, Calderón ha forjado en este drama un ejercicio de frustración. Al fomentar inicialmente tanta simplicidad por Margaretta, crea una esperanza imposible de que tanto ella como César y Seraphín se satisfagan al final. Contra esa tensión conflictiva con el costo emocional que cobra en la vida interna el orden simbólico, la ley cultural. 39 Todos quedamos un poco como Caspí, con el relajo todavía roto, "con mi relajo mal", en posesión de una joya preciosa, pero que no funciona a manera estera satisfacción.

Resumiendo brevemente, entonces (con un ojo en el relajo anglo-germano) podemos decir que un conflicto temporal subyace a todos los géneros dramáticos Calderonianos, con la posible excepción de las obras burlescas. 40 Pero en Busto carnal, el conflicto se hace explícito. El relajo que en la época debía figurarse en el estado idealmente ordenado o el alma racionalmente concordada con la voluntad divina se quiebra en el interno frustrado de acordar el tiempo "natural" del deseo humano con el tiempo operativo del orden social.


39 Demuestra el estudio de la ley sobre el Deseo en Calderón, y el "momento revolucionario" de este dramaturgo conservador, como señala Henry Sullivan: "El orden simbólico parece permanecer precisamente ahora al orden, la armónica, un ideal coletivo. El aspecto revolucionario del mensaje de Calderón es mostrar no solamente el poder transcendental del simbólico, sino su interés como emocional. Colectiva e individualmente pagan un precio temiendo en la vida inexistente, en el autoacrítica de nuestro Deseo, para mantener esa armónica pública. Un ejemplo entre muchos... en el sacrifício de Segismundo cuando, para el mayor bien de la estabilidad política en Polonia se casa con Estrella en vez de con Rosaura. Este final choca en cada representación de la obra, porque niega las expectativas generales del público de que uno amante verdadero al triunfo de las bodas y uzados - lo que se dice --, reemplazando el esperado desenlace romántico por la seguridad simbólica - lo que la ley o razón de estado exige. "La razón de las alabanzas en la reputación pública de Calderón" en Archivos Calderonianos. Hacia Calderón. 7. Coloquio Anglgermano, Cambridge, 1986, ed. Hans Flascke (Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 204-211.

40 En ellas, perduraba el tiempo "natural" del mismo de los dos corpus: pero se alineaban en una tensión implícita con el código operante en las comedia y autos con los cuales se representaban.

IMPACTO DE EL PRÍNCIPE CONSTANTE
EN LA CRÍTICA HISPÁNICA (1972-92)

Por Alberto Puigueras-Mayor

En octubre de 1973 fechaba la conclusión de un estudio preliminar a El Príncipe Constante. Introducía así mi edición de "Clásicos Castellanos" que vio la luz en 1975 y se encuentra ya agotada. Entre 1973 y 1975 se publicaron algunos trabajos que pulse recoger en notas y que ahora enjuicio por primera vez. Todos ellos enfocan aspectos internos de la obra, y les habría sido imposible a sus autores, por pura lógica cronológica, conocer y usar mi edición. Lo curioso es que gran parte de la crítica británica sigue usando —supongo que por inercia— la antigua edición —más bien deficiente— del benemérito y admirado Alexander A. Parker, uno de los mejores calderonistas de este siglo. En 1938, fecha de su edición, todavía no existía la crítica textual, sea dicho en su descargo. Dividiré este panorama informativo en diversas secciones.

1. GENERALIDADES

En muchos trabajos agrupables en esta sección abunda lo obvio y se hacen reiteraciones: la contraposición de valores cristianos y musulmanes; la ejemplificación de ellos en la constancia y santidad de Fernando en contraposición de la superficial belleza de Fénix; el curio político de la obra; el tema del gran teatro del mundo, el estacionano presente en la actuación de Fernando. Veamos brevemente las diversas aportaciones concretas de este grupo. 1

Jack Sage (1972) destaca el tema juvenil de la obra, el carácter de Iírico político de los protagonistas más jóvenes. Resulta, además, la ironía de la obra en el sentido de que el pobre Fénix, ya que el verdadero Fénix que renace es Fernando y no la protagonista femenina. Recuerda algunas correcciones propuestas a un verso en boca de Alfonso: "más seré el honor, más la gloria", pero parece desconocer el hecho importante en la transmisión textual, a saber, que estas mismas palabras aparecen en todas las ediciones del siglo XVII. Una variante importante, que obviamente desconoce también, es la

1 Ya señalé algunos serios errores en mi edición, que me ratificó en carta personal el otro gran calderonista británico Edward W. Wilson. También la edición de Ángel Valbuena Buces de la Primera parte el teatro de Calderón (Madrid, O.L.M., 1975) supe, por lo que respecta a El Príncipe Constante, la antigua edición de Parker que no comprobé variante si así es un importante manuscrito del siglo XVII que recupera fragmentos perdidos o adulterados en las ediciones impresas.

2 En esta y en las demás secciones, se indican las referencias por orden de aparición en mi trabajo expulsivo.