

Schadenfreude and the Don Juan Archetype in the
Theatrical Works of Seventeenth-Century Spain

by

Teboho Makalima
B.A., University of British Columbia, 2006

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies

© Teboho Makalima, 2015
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Schadenfreude and the Don Juan Archetype in the
Theatrical Works of Seventeenth-Century Spain

by

Teboho Makalima
B.A., University of British Columbia, 2006

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Pablo Restrepo-Gautier, Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies
Supervisor

Dr. Beatriz de Alba-Koch, Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Pablo Restrepo-Gautier

Supervisor

Dr. Beatriz de Alba-Koch

Departmental Member

This thesis explores the various manners in which *schadenfreude* – taking pleasure in the misfortunes of others – functions in the theatrical works of Golden-Age Spain, specifically in three donjuanesque plays of the seventeenth century. The first chapter of the thesis analyses *schadenfreude* as exercised in Tirso de Molina’s *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*, a play in which Don Juan’s pleasurable deceptions incur the enjoyment of his demise. In the second chapter, a variation on the theme of Don Juan finds playwright Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado applying *schadenfreude* as a literary technique in his play *La venganza en el sepulcro*. Finally, a female representative of the Don Juan archetype is examined in the third chapter, which features María de Zayas y Sotomayor’s only known comedy *La traición en la amistad*.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Acknowledgments	v
Dedication	vi
Introduction	1
i. Defining Schadenfreude.....	5
ii. Schadenfreude and <i>Donjuanismo</i>	7
CHAPTER 1 – <i>El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra</i> (Tirso de Molina) ..	10
1.1. Foundations for Schadenfreude.....	10
1.2. Don Juan’s Active Schadenfreude.....	15
1.3. Humour and the Enjoyment of Misfortune.....	19
1.4. Pleasure, Pain, Punishment.....	27
1.5. Schadenfreude and the Women of Don Juan.....	31
1.6. Other Considerations.....	36
CHAPTER 2 – <i>La venganza en el sepulcro</i> (Alonso de Córdoba)	39
2.1. A New Interpretation of Don Juan Tenorio.....	39
2.2. Deconstruction and Reconstruction.....	42
2.3. The Reader or Viewer as the Writer.....	66
CHAPTER 3 – <i>La traición en la amistad</i> (María de Zayas)	68
3.1. From Don Juan to Doña Juana.....	68
3.2. Men at Court.....	83
3.3. The Ungracious <i>Gracioso</i>	86
3.4. Disparity and Consequence.....	90
Conclusion	94
Bibliography	102

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Pablo Restrepo-Gautier, for his immeasurable support and encouragement throughout my graduate studies, and for all the time he devoted – especially through the process of writing this thesis. His expertise, patient guidance, wisdom and keen sense of humour have proven invaluable, and I thank him for opening doors where I saw no windows. I am also indebted to Dr. Beatriz de Alba-Koch, who has been exceptionally supportive of my academic endeavours and whose thought-provoking instruction, engaging conversation, wit and poise I truly admire. To her I also extend my utmost gratitude for tirelessly advocating intellectual pursuits.

A great many thanks go to Dr. Lloyd Howard and Mrs. Donna Fleming, who welcomed me to the Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies with warmth and compassion in addition to being instrumental in making my graduate studies a seamless and joyful experience. I thank Dr. Gregory Andrachuk and Dr. Dan Russek for imparting insights I carry with me still. Thank you also to Dr. Marina Bettaglio for her interest in, and support of, my work. My appreciation is extended to other members of the Department who have graciously shared with me their space and their knowledge.

The undertaking and completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the generous assistance of the University of Victoria's Graduate Studies Fellowship. I am also grateful to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for approving a Travel Grant that facilitated my presenting a portion of this thesis at a conference in Washington, District of Columbia. Additionally, I extend a very special "Thank You" to Dr. Peter Fothergill-Payne, whose Travelling Scholarships also made it possible for me to present parts of my thesis at conferences in Washington, D.C., and in San Francisco, California.

To my friends and partners in crime Estelle Kurier, María Paz Lundin, Fiorella Moccia, Angie Reamer, and Janice Shewey: thank you for being a source of strength and inspiration. You are beautiful and brilliant!

Dedication

For Sindi, Sabelo, and Khaya:

my heart and soul.

Introduction

Power, pretense, and punishment are the core elements of the classical Don Juan archetype, whose *sui generis* synthesis has come to pervade every corner of the globe. It constitutes one of the most notable and original literary creations of the Spanish Golden Age – which denotes the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and is so named for the explosion of literary and artistic production of the time. Although the archetype is predominantly represented by a male figure, the exclusion of feminine representatives is to the peril of any investigator who aspires to conduct a fair and balanced assessment of it. The three aforementioned traits of the donjuanesque figure, representative of what Don Juan has (power), what he does (pretense), and what is done unto him (punishment) form a basis from which to analyse the manner in which pleasure and pain are manifested as a consequence of his conduct. It is within the realms of joy and pain or, more pointedly, *schadenfreude* – which denotes taking pleasure in the misfortunes of others – that libertinesque tendencies feature. To that end, the purpose of this study is to examine the manner in which the Don Juan archetype in Golden-Age Spanish theatre elicits feelings of pleasure at the misfortunes of others.

Schadenfreude as a whole encompasses various components that may be applied to literary analysis, of which several will be framed in this study. These include *schadenfreude* as it relates to humour, deservingness, and jealousy, all of which are in turn related to morality. The imperative dramaturgical sphere, which dictates action as well as rhetoric, will also be analysed. Additionally, the cathartic effect of *schadenfreude* in donjuanesque plays will be shown to permeate the proverbial fourth wall that separates

the events on stage from the audience in the *corral de comedias*. What I aim to demonstrate in this endeavour is that the Don Juan archetype of the Spanish Golden Age served as a theatrical mechanism for the expression of *schadenfreude*.

Research on Don Juan is extensive, and while studies tend to focus on the pleasure associated with this character or the displeasure associated with his victims, to date, none exist that treat *schadenfreude* as an analytical approach.¹ *Schadenfreude* is a useful and relevant component in the general framework of seventeenth-century *donjuanismo*, but in order to avoid making grand generalisations about the archetype, the behaviours of select *dramatis personae* from three donjuanesque plays take centre stage in the present study. These works are Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra* (c.1630), María de Zayas's *La traición en la amistad* (c.1628-1632), and Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado's *La venganza en el sepulcro* (late 1600s).

Without dwelling upon the history of this literary personage, it is useful to note that the story of Don Juan is said to be loosely based on the existence of one Don Juan Tenorio who belonged to a real family of Tenorios in medieval (fourteenth-century) Seville (Rodríguez 45). Other scholars cite medieval ballads such as “El romance del galán y la calavera” as a source (Díaz-Plaja 13). The most famous representative of the Don Juan legend, however, is the seventeenth-century Spanish play *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*, hereafter *El burlador*. This is in fact one of two extant versions of the play. The other version appears with the title *Tan largo me lo fiáis* and evidently predates *El burlador*, but information on the dates of composition or

¹ Among the most exhaustive efforts on Don Juan, including his pleasures, is Oscar Mandel's *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630-1963*, which gives the historical contexts as well as translated versions of Don Juan plays across Europe. As pertains to his victims' displeasure, Ann Davies discusses negativity towards women in *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan's Women: Early Parity to Late Modern Pathology*.

publication of this play is inconclusive. Authorship of these two works has also been disputed. Some critics suggest that Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681) authored the earlier *Tan largo me lo fiáis*, but again, this claim is unsubstantiated (Sánchez 32). Despite having published an edition in which the words “Atribuida a Tirso de Molina” appear on the cover, Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez seems rather partial to attributing both *Tan largo me lo fiáis* and *El burlador* to Andrés de Claramonte.² Overwhelmingly, however, the debate has rested on *El burlador* being the brainchild of Spanish monk Gabriel Téllez (1584-1648) – most commonly known by the pseudonym Tirso de Molina – who was famous for his highly dramatic language, style, and discourse (Sánchez 33). Tirso’s dramatic works also tended to spark contention. In fact, on 6 March, 1625, Tirso was banished from Madrid, and even from engaging in dramaturgy (Mandrell 51) for a period of ten years following reprimands by the *Real y Supremo Consejo de Castilla* for the controversial nature of his plays, which the *Junta de Reformatión* deemed “[comedias] profanas y de malos incentivos” (quoted in Sánchez 195).

Arguably, the subject matter of the impudent libertine carried a tremendous amount of potential not only to cause controversy but also to entertain Golden-Age theatre audiences. It also served to educate them, thus the application of the medieval concept of “deleitar aprovechando” (Edwards xxiv). The similarly medieval roots of the Don Juan legend – again, ballads as well as the Tenorio family of Seville – had been transposed to the Golden-Age society in which Spanish authors were weaving their own dramatic webs of the myth. Transmission of “delightful instruction” was also aided by the public’s familiarity with the Don Juan archetype, which had come to be represented

² See Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez’s “Introducción” to *El burlador de Sevilla*.

in their contemporary reality.³ Noone at that time could have predicted that this figure, a model not of how to behave but rather how not to behave, was to become a powerful symbol of psychology within and well beyond the boundaries of literature.

Although Golden-Age Spanish theatre is said to centre on action as opposed to the development of its characters (Frenk 480), the psychological implications of Don Juanism in the early modern theatre of Spain are far-reaching. With respect to the present investigation of the figure of Don Juan, the realms of joy and pain, or again, taking joy in another's pain, will be examined from three perspectives: that of the Don Juan figure; that of the audience; and that of the playwright. Furthermore, circumstantial recognition and knowledge of donjuanesque comportment will serve as complements of this study.

The plays have been selected based on their capacity to induce in our sensibilities the raw visceral and psychological reactions associated with donjuanesque misdeeds and the prescribed castigation. Each play has been elected as much for relating to *donjuanismo* as it has for differing from the others in two ways: the first is the type of "love" the Don Juans (or their feminine equivalent) display; the second, the role of deception in pursuing the opposite sex. For instance, Tirso's Don Juan has love for none other than himself, and he deceives in order to besmirch and cause destruction. Córdoba's Don Juan falls in love with Doña Ana exclusively, employing no deceit in courting her. On the contrary, he reveals himself and his life plainly and fully, then calls on legitimate protocol in an attempt to marry Ana. In the case of Zayas's insatiable

³ Alfredo Rodríguez cites seventeenth-century historian José Pellicer de Ossau Salas y Tovar (1602-1679) and his *Avisos históricos* as providing evidence of the "proliferación de *burladores* en aquella sociedad" (57). The *Biblioteca Nacional de España* possesses two of Pellicer's manuscripts, the first dated 3 January, 1640 to 24 December, 1641, and the second dated 7 January, 1642 to 25 October, 1644. Some caution must be practiced with respect to these dates as they reflect near-mid-century events and perhaps attitudes, which may have varied somewhat from the social and political atmosphere earlier in the seventeenth century.

Fenisa, the female representative of the Don Juan archetype, there is a display of genuine affection not just towards one man but rather a great many, but she, too, resorts to deceit for personal gain.⁴ This variety of characters that are related but different offers unique manners of approaching schadenfreude.

i. Defining Schadenfreude

Schadenfreude is not a mere concept but a reality of daily life, whether or not human beings are willing to recognise the fact. At its most basic level, the term “schadenfreude” – coined in nineteenth-century Germany – means taking pleasure in the misfortunes of others. The simplistic nature of this definition becomes problematic, however, when one considers the theoretical distinction between active and passive schadenfreude. Active schadenfreude may be thought of as representing the joy derived from directly causing harm to another individual, while passive schadenfreude is the pleasure derived from simply bearing witness to someone else’s misfortune. Researchers have suggested, however, that the truer form of schadenfreude is of the passive variety. Whereas active schadenfreude constitutes “the more legitimate feelings of pride or gloating in the active defeat of another through direct competition,” the passive enjoyment of a third party’s misfortune is illegitimate, and thus far more troubling (Leach et al. 932). Further to this, one must add that taking pleasure in actively or directly

⁴ It should be noted that one of the objects of Fenisa’s affection, Liseo, is himself a donjuanesque figure. He has more than one lover in the play, having abandoned his first paramour, Laura, in order to enjoy the affections of other women, including Fenisa. When the latter’s deceitful ways come to light, however, Liseo recognises the error of his ways and returns to his beloved Laura.

causing harm to another individual constitutes sadism.⁵ Notwithstanding, in this study I will make a case for the validity of active *schadenfreude* as distinct from sadism.

The processes that govern *schadenfreude* are typically two-fold. It must first be sparked, and this is achieved by such means as feelings of superiority, envy, or the desire for vengeance and perhaps the need for justice.⁶ Secondly, *schadenfreude* must be expressed in some internal or outward fashion. Inward manifestations include the desire to have misfortune befall another person regardless of whether or not that person is known to the *schadenfroh* individual – the individual taking pleasure in the other’s pain – and whether or not the victim of *schadenfreude* deserves that misfortune. Likewise, feelings of joy when misfortune does befall another person represent internalised *schadenfreude*. As pertains to the outward displays, laughter is the single most exemplary feature of *schadenfreude*, followed closely by smiling, cheering, clapping, or behaving in some other celebratory manner. To be sure, *schadenfreude* is also a social phenomenon in which glee stemming from a collective cause or group achievement becomes infectious. The two components of *schadenfreude*, then, typically co-exist. That is, it is commonly not possible to have feelings of envy or superiority without experiencing joy when the individual one envies or has feelings of superiority towards experiences adversity. Similarly, one usually cannot experience pleasure at another person’s downfall without first being envious of, or feeling superior to, that person. This

⁵ Sadism, as will be seen, is exhibited in part by the Don Juans in Tirso’s *El burlador de Sevilla* and Córdoba’s *La venganza en el sepulcro*.

⁶ One must, however, note the crucial distinction between justice and vengeance. Whereas the former indicates a more passive execution of punishment, as dictated by predetermined law, the latter suggests the active (direct) administration of punishment, usually based on personal grievances. For instance, an individual who is wronged in some way may passively rely on legal authorities to apprehend and administer punishment to the wrong-doer. On the other hand, a person who is violated by another might actively take it upon him- or herself to seek the perpetrator out and exact revenge in a direct manner.

is also the case in matters of divine justice in which a wronged party feels joy towards the demise of the wrong-doer, who viewed himself or herself as superior in some way. The superiority complex is an excellent primer for *schadenfreude*, and the figure of Don Juan is one of the best examples of the ways in which impropriety can lead to taking pleasure in misfortune.

ii. **Schadenfreude and *Donjuanismo***

Schadenfreude is an element of psychology. That said, any attempt to create a psychological profile of a fictional character inherently incurs the risk of leading to generalisations, which may or may not be fair assessments of that character. The analysis of fictional characters is a proverbial slippery slope that can either culminate in developments in the understanding of a particular work – its creation, its purpose, the cultural and historical contexts in which it was written, and so forth – or result in contention between scholars and critics. In spite of this, psychological evaluations of Don Juan have, since the early nineteenth century, evolved in such a way that the character has deviated from its literary roots and acquired a humanised dimension (Smeed 116). The archetype has been widely addressed by some of the greatest minds in modern history,⁷ yet interpretations of Don Juan’s emotional sensitivity, particularly in light of his own actions, are vague at best.

⁷ See, for example, Søren Kierkegaard in 1843’s *Enten-Eller* (“*Either/Or*”), Nobel Prize-winning author Albert Camus in *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* (“*The Myth of Sisyphus*”), first published in 1942, neurologist Sigmund Freud, who analyses Don Juanism from an oedipal as well as a paternal perspective, or Gregorio Marañón who views Don Juan as lacking maturity and virility. It is not always clear, however, on which of the many significant literary Don Juans their analyses are based – *Dom Juan* of Molière (Jean-Baptiste Poquelin), Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*, or *Don Juan Tenorio* by José Zorrilla, to name but a few.

Most commonly described by critics as passionate, arrogant, reckless, calculating, monstrous, heroic, dynamic, and a seducer who lives for the “here” and the “now”, the Don Juan of seventeenth-century Spain is unerringly and eternally centred on the “self” – from which he derives pleasure yet which is the cause of much suffering for his victims. Blatant disregard for the “other” is what fuels taking pleasure in this figure’s demise at the conclusions of the plays studied. This pleasure theoretically applies to those offended within the play as well as members of an audience.

Somewhat removed from the action on stage yet never hidden by the veil of authorship, playwrights are not exempt from experiencing their own sense of joy at the suffering of their characters. Although active in creating *dramatis personae* who stray from morality, dramaturges are permitted the pleasure of also bearing witness as those corrupt characters get their comeuppance. There is a distancing here between creator and the created, for although the writer subjects Don Juan or his victims to misfortune, more often than not the punishment meets the crime, thus allowing for the enjoyment of any penalty administered. Ultimately, diversities in plot structure among the dramatic works do little to assuage the need for misconduct, which paves the way for character development.

In spite of variations in the story of Don Juan, his behaviours as well as the objects of his “affection”, Fernando Díaz-Plaja has delineated several traits that are common in most characterisations of this archetype. These are: 1) social status and access to wealth, which foster a sense of entitlement; 2) tireless commitment to his trade; 3) an obsession with fame and popularity; 4) his religious beliefs, which exist despite all appearances to the contrary and are insisted upon by the playwrights and the strictly

Catholic climate of seventeenth-century Spain; 5) a sense of chivalry which obligates him to face danger with the kind of nobility not possessed by the common man; 6) the tendencies of an indiscriminate collector (a hoarder, so-to-speak), because the more the merrier – that is, the more victims there are, the merrier Don Juan will be; 7) a sexual instinct; 8) a criminal instinct; and 9) education and a cultured nature that allows for his creative use of language, as well as the ability to philosophise or justify his behaviour (10-12). While these features are collectively present in the plays studied, the two that are common amongst all of the protagonists are the sexual drive and an inclination to court many a lover. Tirso's Don Juan fits Díaz-Plaja's traits perfectly, while Córdoba's Don Juan lacks a sense of religion and success at courtship. Fenisa, Zayas's female Don Juan, is neither chivalrous nor criminally inclined, but an almost pathological need to possess many men dominates her. Additionally, although her ego is certainly fed by being popular, there is some doubt as to her need for fame, due in large part to her illicit *modus operandi* in wooing suitors. For her, there is shame in deceiving and betraying publicly as well as privately. In any case, each of Díaz-Plaja's traits plays a fundamental role in defining the source of pleasure and pain for each of the protagonists (or antagonists depending upon one's perspective) as well as the auxiliary players in the said dramatic works.

Much like the enjoyment of horror tragedies in the English Restoration era, there is something in deceit and treachery that satisfies the human appetite. In the pages that follow, *schadenfreude* lends itself as a means of addressing this enjoyment from the perspectives of the donjuanesque figures represented, the characters in their *environs*, the audience (as much as is credible and relevant), as well as the playwrights.

CHAPTER 1 – *El burlador de Sevilla*

1.1. Foundations for Schadenfreude

Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra* (1630) follows Don Juan Tenorio from the moment he assumes the identity of Don Octavio, under the cover of darkness, in order to deceive his way into enjoying the company of Octavio's noblewoman Isabela at the Palace of the King in Naples. She then discovers her error in having entertained the wrong man when she reaches for a candle and finds Don Juan in her lover's stead. Her screams alert the king of Naples and his retinue. Fortunately for Don Juan, his uncle Don Pedro is among the king's men and secretly allows Juan to flee to his native Spain. A shipwreck finds Juan and his *criado* Catalinón on the shores of Tarragona, where he seduces a fishergirl, Tisbea, and again absconds having had his way with her. Once in Seville, Don Juan reunites with this friend and cohort the Marquis de la Mota, whose identity he also assumes by wearing Mota's cloak one night in order to surreptitiously seduce Mota's beloved, Doña Ana de Ulloa. The attempt goes awry as she quickly uncovers the deceit and calls for help, at which point her father, Don Gonzalo de Ulloa, intervenes. A confrontation with Don Juan leads to Gonzalo's murder and his killer's subsequent flight from the scene and from Seville. The accusation of guilt falls onto the Marquis who is once again found wearing the cloak Juan had borrowed. He is immediately apprehended. Meanwhile, in a village on the outskirts of Seville, Don Juan launches yet another *burla* and intercepts the proceedings of a wedding. Much to the groom Batricio's dismay, he convinces the bride, Aminta, of her new husband's

disinterest in the marriage and his own interest in taking Batricio's place as her spouse. Yet again, Don Juan takes advantage of her and later abandons her. Following his return to Seville, Don Juan encounters the tomb and statue of Don Gonzalo. Juan mockingly invites the deceased, or *convidado de piedra*, to sup with him. Gonzalo's statue accepts and later visits Juan, but only to invite the young man back to his tombstone for a dinner of his own the following night. This constitutes what is known in Don Juan studies as the "double invitation." Don Juan likewise accepts and attends. At this second supper Gonzalo's ghost takes hold of Don Juan's hand, threatening to exact divine justice. When Juan makes an eleventh-hour decision to repent he is informed that the time for repentance has passed. The stone ghost then drags Don Juan down into the fiery pit of hell.

El burlador de Sevilla is certainly an action-packed play – covert entry to homes, leaping from a balcony, a water rescue, the exchanging of identities, and duels are the fare. Don Juan is by far the most active character in the play, yet in spite of his force of activity there exists a level of psychopathy in him that is largely exemplified by the treachery and betrayal in which he engages and from which he derives pleasure. This is not to say that Don Juan suffers from a clinical illness and should therefore be acquitted of the treachery and immorality with which he is charged. Instead, his behaviour inspires interest as well as concern. As such, it is difficult to address *donjuanismo* without considering his thought processes and motivations. Two of the most fundamental motivators for Don Juan are joy and pain – his joy, and others' pain. These constitute a basis from which schadenfreude in *El burlador de Sevilla*, henceforth *El burlador*, can be studied.

The correlation between Don Juan and *schadenfreude* is aided in part by working under the assumption that human beings, left to their devices, typically engage in behaviours that provide some sort of a reward or a sense of satisfaction, avoiding those behaviours which they perceive as disagreeable or lacking a benefit. For Don Juan, the rewards issue from such activities as deceiving women, challenging authority, and even manslaughter, whether committed offensively or in self-defence. These are behaviours that mark a manner of conduct fed by testing the limits of society and justice. Because Don Juan is directly and actively responsible for the misfortunes of those around him – men and women alike – the third-party enjoyment of misfortune that experts associate with *schadenfreude* is technically inapplicable to his character.⁸ Based on their definition of *schadenfreude* as being limited to the passive or observational experience of another person's suffering, the implication is that only the members of an audience can truly represent *schadenfroh* individuals, while Tirso and Don Juan embody the active enjoyment of misfortune as author and perpetrator. Nevertheless, I would argue that being highly active and taking pleasure in the misfortunes of others need not be mutually exclusive – nor suggest sadism, which will be addressed later. Specifically, with respect to Tirso de Molina and his character Don Juan there are instances in which *schadenfreude* acquires a distinctly active nature whereby misfortune is facilitated. *Schadenfreude* is evident in the moments of Don Juan's retrospection on a character's misfortune rather than in the moments that suffering is brought about. That is, he enjoys *a posteriori* the suffering that he casts upon his victims. It is the distancing of himself from the misdeeds, and the recollection of them, that stimulate Don Juan's experience of *schadenfreude*.

⁸ See Colin Leach et al., "Malicious Pleasure: *Schadenfreude* at the Suffering of Another Group," p.932.

Don Juan Tenorio's active role in causing his victims to suffer implies sadistic activity as opposed to *schadenfreude*, which is linked to passivity. Indeed, there are features of sadism that fall into alignment with the trickster's conduct. These include direct participation in the misfortune, the serious nature of the misfortune caused, and the lack of deservingness for that misfortune on the part of the victim (Ben-Ze'ev 86-87). Nevertheless, the correlation between Don Juan's actions and sadistic pleasure is questionable. This is primarily because although he relishes deceiving his victims, his motivation is not to inflict pain upon them. The excitement of the conquest and the satisfaction of his appetite for trickery are what drive him, and never do phrases such as "*he de dañarla*" or "*he de ofenderla*" emerge from his vernacular. His focus is instead on *engañar* or *burlar* and *gozar* as well as *escapar*, all of which are centred on himself and what he can accomplish or get away with. Don Juan is indiscriminate with the choice of victim – which is another feature of sadism – but his victims experience no pain during their interactions with him. As Daniel Rogers points out: "The very nature of the *burla* depends on trust being established" (68). The women he tricks, with the exception of Doña Ana, quickly acquiesce to his advances, and for this reason the argument for sadism loses strength. It is in the moments following the *burlas* that Juan's women suffer, while he celebrates another victory. Indeed, Don Juan is quite indifferent to the psychological or social toll that his actions take on his victims, and it is this indifference, this lack of concern or feeling, that becomes a source of pleasure. Although he is aware that he is the cause of their misery – the humiliation of having surrendered to him their "honour", typically a euphemism for virginity –, his indifference to the effects of his behaviour

demonstrates the pleasure he derives from their pain.⁹ Ultimately, Don Juan's active involvement in causing others' misfortune and the detachment associated with the pleasures of absconding following misdeeds must somehow be reconciled. One can therefore make a case for active *schadenfreude* within the context and circumstances of the play.

Beyond the stage, however, the enjoyment of others' misfortunes is embodied by the author as well as the audience. In the same way that Don Juan's delights do not express sadism, Tirso's enthusiasm for administering pain and humiliation is not founded in cruelty. On the contrary, the playwright engages in the thwarting of such inhumanity by actively (through dramaturgy) creating characters that misbehave in order to then create the circumstances in which punitive measures must be taken against those offenders. In this way the author is able to derive satisfaction (or pleasure) from having his errant *dramatis personae* meet with disaster (or misfortune). Strictly speaking, literary *schadenfreude* does not invalidate the experience or legitimacy of *schadenfreude* but rather acts as an authoritative literary technique. Additionally, a writer writes for an audience, which represents the passive and purportedly the most insidious form of *schadenfreude*. It is difficult to accurately assess and describe the manner in which an audience in seventeenth-century Spain would have responded to a theatrical production of *El burlador*. We do have a sense, however, of the overall environment in which

⁹ For illustrative purposes I borrow from Henri Bergson's *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*, in which he posits the following: "Here I would point out, as a symptom equally worthy of notice, the absence of feeling which usually accompanies laughter. It seems as though the comic could not produce its disturbing effect unless it fell, so to say, on the surface of a soul that is thoroughly calm and unruffled. Indifference is its natural environment, for laughter has no greater foe than emotion. [...] To produce the whole of its effect, then, the comic demands something like a momentary anesthesia of the heart" (pp.4-5). In making a case for Don Juan's pleasurable indifference, one might substitute laughter for pleasure and arrive at the conclusion that indifference, or the absence of feeling, produces pleasure due to the lack of emotion that the unruffled trickster displays.

audiences, composed of both the aristocratic and marginalised classes, participated in the life of the theatre. The *corrales* of the Spanish Golden Age were dominated by *mosqueteros*, the boisterous crowds in the pit who were unruly, noisy, often unjust, very hard to please, and also feared by authors as well as actors – who were fully aware that the success or failure of the plays depended on the dispositions of audiences (Rennert 117). The antithesis of the mannerly, polite theatre audiences of today, one can simply imagine the clamorous reception of *El burlador* with all its humour, sexual drive, deceit, betrayal, and death. By merely bearing witness to the events on stage the public was conceivably entertained by Don Juan’s deceptions – which were in turn his victims’ misfortunes – as well as the climactic, tragicomic conclusion. Their pleasure in the stage characters’ pain is another example of *schadenfreude* as evoked in the realm of fiction. This makes Don Juan the principal representative of *schadenfreude* within the stage world of *El burlador*.

1.2. Don Juan’s Active Schadenfreude

The task of analysing *schadenfreude* in Tirso’s play partly involves venturing to determine the source of Don Juan’s pleasure – whether it is aroused by carnality or by deception. One school of thought views Don Juan’s antics as stemming from a highly sexual drive, his purpose being to seduce and take advantage of every woman with whom he comes into contact.¹⁰ Leo Weinstein, meanwhile, asserts that “[it is not] that [Don Juan] lacks strong sexual urges; quite on the contrary, they seem to be so impetuous that

¹⁰ See, for example: Leo Weinstein’s *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan*; Oscar Mandel’s “The Legend of Don Juan” (pp.3-33) in his collection of plays, *The Theatre of Don Juan*; and Nicholas G. Round’s article “Sex, Lies, and Dinner with the Dead” in *Selected Interdisciplinary Essays on the Representation of the Don Juan Archetype in Myth and Culture*, pp.9-34.

he looks for the quickest satisfaction of them,” yet he views the typical seducer as a ladies’ man who is capable of eventually settling down (13), which Don Juan is clearly unable to do. Sex and seduction, then, are at odds with respect to Don Juan. Conversely, Mercedes Sánchez argues that Don Juan’s capers are not of a seductive nature:

Don Juan tiene un compromiso personal con la burla; es el burlador de Sevilla, y no un seductor de mujeres, porque realmente no seduce a ninguna en la obra (dos creen estar en brazos de otro hombre y las otras dos se dejan deslumbrar por la alta condición social del caballero). No es tampoco un libertino sexual, sino un burlador profesional. [...] Es un joven temerario que no escucha las advertencias de los otros personajes, ni siquiera teme la cena macabra con don Gonzalo porque confunde el valor con la temeridad. No quiere entender, no cree en el futuro, sólo en el aquí y en el ahora, y será castigado porque así lo exige la ideología del siglo XVII. (*Introducción* 35-36)

This judgement, in my view, gives the sense of having been arrived at through a limited scope of Don Juan, because while it is true that he identifies himself as a *burlador* rather than a *seductor*, he in fact relies on seduction to bring about trickery.¹¹ Oddly, although Weinstein acknowledges Juan’s sexual urges and Sánchez deemphasises them, both arrive at the same conclusion regarding Don Juan’s reputation as a Casanova: that he displays no traits of a seducer. The fact of the matter, however, is that it is not simply by fate that the women find themselves in the arms of a man they believe is someone else, nor is it by fate that they allow themselves to be impressed by Don Juan’s appearance and social status. It is instead his ability to seduce or to trick that leads them to commit to him – or to other men he has supplanted without their knowledge –, and it is the pleasure he derives from seducing that facilitates his level of skill. Therefore, the source of Don Juan’s pleasure, his intention, is to deceive, but he employs seduction or sensuality as well as trickery in the attainment of that deception, which is at the cost of his victims’

¹¹ The exceptions are the Duchess Isabela and Doña Ana de Ulloa who are deceived but not seduced. Isabela voluntarily gives herself to Don Octavio, and it is he with whom she believes she is engaging. Doña Ana is neither seduced nor deceived by Don Juan. She quickly recognises Don Juan as an imposter and immediately calls for assistance.

honour. Don Juan accomplishes his goals not only because his nobility enthralls women but also because he uses language seductively.

Evidence of seduction lies partially in Juan's use of the word *gozar*, which Covarrubias defines thus: "*Gozar una cosa*, poseerla y disfrutarla" (900). To be sure, Don Juan is a professional *burlador* – not a *gozador* – yet the frequency with which he uses this term, and with erotic connotations, further casts doubt on the denial of his seductive ways. Seduction in *El burlador* is important because it sets Juan's active *schadenfreude* in motion. The women he seduces – namely Tisbea and Aminta – at first agree to form relationships with him. Their suffering occurs in the moments following his abandonment of them, the very moments he celebrates most. Because trickery is deception, one must keep in mind the relationship between *burlar* and *engañar*, which are in fact synonyms and can be used interchangeably in the play. The following excerpt provides a means of clarifying the distinction between enjoying and deceiving, and consequently the crucial role of seduction in Don Juan's profession:

Tío y señor,
 mozo soy y mozo fuiste;
 y pues que de amor supiste
 tenga disculpa mi amor.
 Y pues a decir me obligas
 la verdad, oye y diréla:
 yo engañe y gocé a Isabela,
 la duquesa. (vv.61-68)

Don Juan admits to deceit and enjoyment: "[Y]o engañé y gocé a Isabela," and so the use of both words implies that they ought to be understood as having distinct and specific meanings. That is to say that with *engañar* he conveys the ruse, the *burla*. By then adding *gozar* he moves beyond deception and enters sexual territory. The word reappears in sexually suggestive phrases in other parts of the play: "[E]sta noche he de gozalla"

(v.686); “Gozaréla, vive Dios” (v.1342); “[A] Aminta el alma le di, / y he gozado [su honor]” (vv.1873-1874); and “Bien lo supe negociar; / gozarla esta noche espero” (vv.1924-1925). Don Juan’s pleasure is underlined by his desire to possess and enjoy in order to victimise and evade. This *gozo* is additionally highlighted when his uncle Don Pedro decides to dispatch him to Sicily or Milan in an attempt to quell a potential family scandal, nepotism coming to Juan’s aid:

DON PEDRO: Mis cartas te avisarán
 en qué para este suceso
 triste, que causado has.
 DON JUAN: [Aparte]
 (Para mí alegre, dirás.)
 Que tuve culpa, confieso.
 DON PEDRO: Esa mocedad te engaña.
 Baja, pues, ese balcón.
 DON JUAN: [Aparte]
 (Con tan justa pretensión
 gozoso me parto a España.) (vv.112-120)

Playing on the words *triste* and *alegre*, Tirso expresses Don Juan’s happiness with his deceits in addition to his indifference – again, the absence of feeling – to his uncle’s dismay in light of the circumstances. Instead of evoking a sense of guilt in him, Don Juan’s active *schadenfreude* surfaces, his deceitful actions arousing the immense pleasure first of having been given a chance to escape, and secondly the pleasure of subsequently being given the opportunity to perpetuate his treacherous enterprises. Knowledge of having been caught does little to affect his lax attitude towards moral rectitude, which is overridden by gross depravity. The essence of Tirso’s Don Juan is cemented when he announces:

Sevilla a voces me llama
 el Burlador, y el mayor
 gusto que en mí puede haber
 es burlar una mujer,
 y dejalla sin honor. (vv.1309-1313)

Once again, the aim is to leave a woman disgraced socially, and marred psychologically. The women are tricked into succumbing to his advances and yield to him their honour. Thus his proficiency at duplicity.

Pleasure for Don Juan appears to be represented not only by the misfortunes he is responsible for but also by an appetite for defiance – breaking the rules, shattering the norms of conformity, and evading capture, all the while anticipating a deferment of punishment or divine justice for the same. At the core of his brand of *schadenfreude* is defamation and challenging authority. The misfortunes of his victims are simultaneously a by-product as well as the motivating force for his pleasure, which eventually incurs a calamitous end of its own for Don Juan.

1.3. Humour and the Enjoyment of Misfortune

A climate of censorship and heightened sensitivity regarding matters of religion and morality did not restrain the sensibilities of early modern Spanish playwrights, including Tirso de Molina, who often dared to set political correctness and prudishness aside for the good of entertaining their audiences while also being critical of them and perhaps attempting to educate them. Although it serves to amuse, humour in the donjuanesque plays of seventeenth-century Spain is somewhat disconcerting in that it often involves vulgarity and the displeasure, or even the misfortune, of certain *dramatis personae* – namely the women and the servants, who tend to be the principal targets of obscenity. Indeed, there is little that is “appropriate” about laughing at the discontentment of others, yet in no way is the prevalence of such humour hindered or diminished with respect to *El burlador*.

toda esta corte mudada.
 DON JUAN: ¿Mujeres?
 MOTA: Cosa juzgada.
 DON JUAN: ¿Inés?
 MOTA: A Vejel se va.
 DON JUAN: Buen lugar para vivir
 la que tan dama nació.
 MOTA: El tiempo la desterró
 a Vejel.¹²
 DON JUAN: Irá a morir.
 ¿Costanza?
 MOTA: Es lástima vella
 lampiña de frente y ceja.
 Llámale el portugués vieja,
 y ella imagina que bella.
 DON JUAN: Sí, que *vella* en portugués
 suena vieja en castellano.
 ¿Y Teodora?
 MARQUIS: Este verano
 se escapó del mal francés
 [por un río de sudores],
 y está tan tierna y reciente
 que anteayer me arrojó un diente.
 envuelto entre muchas flores.
 DON JUAN: ¿Julia, la del Candilejo?
 MARQUIS: Ya con sus afeites lucha.
 DON JUAN: ¿Véndese siempre por trucha?
 MARQUIS: Ya se da por abadejo.
 DON JUAN: El barrio de Cantarranas
 ¿tiene buena población?
 MARQUIS: Ranas las más dellas son. (vv.1210-1236)

Mockery in these remarks indicates levity along with an extreme air of superiority that both Don Juan and Mota possess. The two men then proceed to plan an evening of gallivanting and deception. The Marquis says, “Yo a don Pedro de Esquivel / dimos anoche un cruel, / y esta noche tengo ciertos / otros dos,” to which Don Juan responds, “Iré con vos, / que también recorreré / cierto nido que dejé / en güevos para los dos” (vv.1251-1257).¹³ In the midst of derogatory comments about ladies’ perhaps

¹² This reference to the town of Vejer de la Frontera is a play on the word *vejez*.

¹³ According to Mercedes Sánchez, “la crítica ha visto en la presencia de este [Pedro de Esquivel] una alusión a una persona concreta y conocida en la época, don Pedro de Esquivel y Ugalde.” See note 55 on p.109 in her edition of *El burlador*.

unfortunate appearance, their age, physical health, et cetera, exists the simultaneous desire to gladly deceive and desert these women. There is also a duplicitous and hypocritical awareness of standards here – not to be confused with status. Specifically, while the standards for appearance, age and physical health appear to be high, a woman's socio-cultural status is of no real consequence. As such, a beautiful, young and healthy woman from any and all social classes will do. Humour as it relates to *schadenfreude* in this scene targets those women who are marginalised but also ageing and sickly as a result of overuse by men like Don Juan and the Marquis. This is base humour, but humour nonetheless, and it is presumably fodder for the members of the Spanish audience.

Don Juan's superiority is expressed in more explicit terms when he makes reference to his own laughter, which also exhibits his active *schadenfreude*. During the aforementioned discourse, the Marquis reveals to Juan plans for an evening with his beloved Doña Ana, after which he excuses himself. Just then, Don Juan receives a note from a mysterious woman who asks that the note be forwarded to Mota. The unscrupulous Juan reads the note, discovering that it is from Ana and is an invitation for Mota to enjoy her favours one last time before she marries another man at her father's behest. The trickster resolves to hijack the rendezvous and take advantage of Ana's favours in the Marquis's stead, saying, "Ya de la burla me río" (v.1341). With this decision Don Juan places himself above the Marquis. Thanks to the intervention of the mystery woman, Juan's pleasure is now the Marquis's displeasure. During the fateful attempt at dishonouring Ana, Juan is confronted by her father, Don Gonzalo, whom he then kills in a duel. The *burlador* and his servant Catalinón later stumble upon Gonzalo's

tombstone and see an epitaph which reads, “Aquí aguarda del Señor, / el más leal caballero, / la venganza de un traidor” (vv.2261-2263). At this, Don Juan quips, “Del mote reírme quiero” (v.2264). While the verb “quiero” indicates that Don Juan may not in fact be laughing but merely reporting a desire to do so, the statement is illustrative of the power of humour as an instrument of superiority. Later, during the first supper with the deceased Gonzalo, a song about a wronged woman is sung. Catalinón then asks of his master the number of deceived women this song is referring to, and to this enquiry Juan answers, “De todas me río, / amigo, en esta ocasión” (vv.2415-2416). The actively *schadenfroh* Don Juan’s laughter at his victims’ unfortunate circumstances makes him decidedly cavalier, for in his view, the disadvantaged are inherently inferior.

Additionally, by participating through laughter, spectators likewise permit themselves a license to take full comedic advantage of Don Juan’s indecency, a point that also marks a form of superiority on their part. Not partaking of the merriment in this scene is Catalinón, whose brand of humour as the helper takes other forms, as will be discussed later.

In addition to overtly displaying his sense of humour Don Juan is capable of tapping into his covertly underhanded whimsy. This is the case with another of his female victims, Aminta, whom he usurps at her wedding and in the presence of all who are in attendance, including her newly-avowed husband Batricio. Comic relief emerges in the form of an exchange between Juan and Aminta in which he attempts to seduce her:

AMINTA:	Vete, que vendrá mi esposo.
DON JUAN:	Yo lo soy. ¿De qué te admiras?
AMINTA:	¿Desde cuando?
DON JUAN:	Desde agora.
AMINTA:	¿Quién lo ha tratado?
DON JUAN:	Mi dicha.

AMINTA: ¿Y quién nos casó?
 DON JUAN: Tus ojos.
 AMINTA: ¿Con qué poder?
 DON JUAN: Con la vista.
 AMINTA: ¿Sábelo Batricio?
 DON JUAN: Sí,
 que te olvida.
 AMINTA: ¿Que me olvida?
 DON JUAN: Sí; que yo te adoro.
 AMINTA: ¿Cómo?
 DON JUAN: Con mis dos brazos.
 AMINTA: Desvíá.
 DON JUAN: ¿Cómo puedo, si es verdad
 que muero?
 AMINTA: ¡Qué gran mentira!

With that, Don Juan proceeds to apprise Aminta of the fabricated developments in her relationship with Batricio, which, according to Juan, has apparently ceased to exist based on the couple's failure to have consummated their marriage. This rapid-fire repartee serves to augment a farcical tone that underlies Don Juan's insolence. To her legitimate questions regarding the manner in which he has come to be her husband – and with whose authority her marriage to Batricio has been annulled – Juan replies with short, pointed, and quite nonsensical ad hoc statements. Juan's pleasure in this scene is evident; Aminta's pleasure is not, yet she soon concedes and agrees to marry him, thereby confirming her position as another of his puppets and reaffirming his superior role as a puppet master. Don Juan clearly enjoys her gullibility, which is her downfall. Her displeasure when he abandons her is foreseeable, but this misfortune directly feeds schadenfreude associated not only with Don Juan's inevitable enjoyment of having divided and conquered but also with the audience's pleasurable reproof of her naïveté and fickleness, both punishable by ridicule.

Schadenfreude in this play may also be expressed through physical humour, which can be decidedly more crude when the objects of that humour are women. In the

first act of *El burlador* a servant named Ripio fails to comprehend his master Don Octavio's lamentation over requited love and is puzzled by the secrecy surrounding it. Octavio is Isabela's rightful suitor, but decorum prohibits the public declaration of their relationship. Reprimanding his servant's enquiry as to why they cannot wed, Octavio explains, "Eso fuera, necio, a ser / de lacayo o lavandera / la boda" (vv.231-233). To this Ripio responds thus:

Pues, ¿es quienquiera
 una lavandriz mujer,
 lavando y fregatrizando,
 defendiendo y ofendiendo,
 los paños suyos tendiendo,
 regalando y remendando?
 Dando dije, porque al dar
 no hay cosa que se le iguale;
 y si no, a Isabela dale,
 a ver si sabe tomar. (vv.233-242)

Schadenfreude is at play here as Ripio's humorous quip is at the expense of the "lavandriz mujer" who, spurned by Octavio as common, is one target of Ripio's sexual puns. Isabela is the other target. The success of Ripio's comical 'routine' as a *gracioso* depends, in part, on the exaggeration of his boorish movements as well as the tone and volume of his voice, and in her edition of the play, Mercedes Sánchez suggests that his comments would be accompanied by physical gestures, which one can imagine added to the explicit yet humorous nature of the scene (63). Ripio's schadenfreude additionally targets Octavio, whose melancholy he exploits for comic relief.

An integral part of comic relief is relief itself. It was in the eighteenth century that Anthony Ashley-Cooper first used the term "humour" to denote "funniness": "The natural free spirits of ingenious men, if imprisoned and controlled, will find out other ways of motion to relieve themselves in their constraint and, whether it be in burlesque,

mimicry or buffoonery, they will be glad at any rate to vent themselves and be revenged on their constrainers” (Shaftesbury 34). In essence, the relief that humour provides is cathartic. As can be expected of the plays of the Spanish Golden Age, dramaturges routinely call upon servants (or sidekicks) to mete out their share of derision as well as serve as comedic “punching bags.” The *criados* o *graciosos* ridicule those in their social settings, including their masters, their masters’ objects of affection, their own objects of affection, and even themselves. By their masters they are forced to serve as emissaries in matters of courtship, or to take up the sword for the good of their lords, but closer to home, they often bear the physical brunt of serving and must endure beatings from their superiors for foolish behaviour or commentary. Violence and comic relief can go hand-in-hand in any *comedia*, and in *El burlador* it is Catalinón who is on the receiving end of his master’s pummelling – “Una muela / en la boca me has rompido” (vv.2232-2233), he complains – which one might consider to be humour of the slapstick variety. They are the very source of the laughter of which they become the object. The servants, then, represent instruments through which their superiors’ frustrations are released, but these characters are also designed to amuse the public through their discomfiture.

In Tirso’s play tension between decency and insolence may be mitigated by an audience’s acceptance of human nature’s imperfections. For this reason, any hints at the immorality of laughing at obscenities are neutralised by a spectator’s acute awareness of reality or what he or she knows to be truth. The success of representing on stage circumstances which induce laughter relies in part on the audience’s recognition of those circumstances – the playing-out, so to speak, of familiar (real-life) situations. In thinking of insolence as commonplace and as an expression of authenticity one distances oneself

from a moral compass that may lead to feelings of guilt or compassion while observing others endure misfortunes. However, the conflict between mirth and profanity is perhaps needless, and any moral costs of laughing at indecency are immaterial if only because *schadenfreude* is not at odds with human nature. With respect to Tirso's *El burlador*, references to misogyny, physical abuse and irreverence are commonplace, but depending on the manner in which they are received as well as the era in which the play might be performed, these features of Golden-Age theatre are often highly entertaining. Of these features, irreverence is beyond question Don Juan's greatest fault. It is the crux of the play, and the catalyst for his punishment.

1.4. Pleasure, Pain, Punishment

A factor that legitimises *schadenfreude* is what specialists term "deservingness."¹⁴ Simply put, this is a measure of whether or not an individual is thought to deserve his or her misfortune. There is little doubt that Don Juan Tenorio earns his punishment, and so for this character it is only a matter of time before he gets his just deserts. Curiously, Don Juan possesses an admirable quality that might provoke in an audience a form of *schadenfreude* that is rooted in resentment: he is a high achiever, and with high achievement comes reward. Unfortunately, what Don Juan excels at is depravity. What he deserves, then, is not praise but retribution. This, too, is grounds for passive *schadenfreude* on the part of spectators as well as active *schadenfreude* on the part of the playwright.

¹⁴ See N.T. Feather, "Deservingness and *Schadenfreude*" (pp.29-54), Caitlin Powell's "Hypocrisy and *Schadenfreude*" (pp.58-72), and Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwerkerk's work "Striving for positive self-evaluation as a motive for *schadenfreude*" (pp.133-134), all of them in *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*, edited by Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwerkerk.

At the other end of the spectrum is the possible celebration of the very misdeeds that Don Juan commits. In presuming that Tirso's Don Juan was a social "type" during the seventeenth century – in fact existing prior to that era – he would have been a representation of other men of his category, whom Tirso possibly targeted for their wanton behaviour. These men may similarly have been represented within viewing audiences. Arguably pleased with the portrayal of a Don Juan on stage, the donjuanesque type of spectator might object to Don Juan's demise, deeming it undeserved. The notion of deservingness allows for a brief discussion of the possible origins of Don Juan's misbehaviour and whether his ultimate penalty is indeed warranted.

The work of Zelda Brooks and William Heitland provides a base from which to assess Don Juan's deservingness of misfortune. According to these scholars, interpretations of Don Juan have evolved in such a way that the seventeenth century viewed him as morally corrupt, and that by the nineteenth century the psychoanalytical diagnosis was that Juan suffered from a psycho-sexual affliction (172). Contemporary views of Don Juan, they assert, now suggest that his true ailment is not related to sexual drives but rather signals a reaction to restrictions placed on natural human instincts. The humanistic approach has thus superseded the psychoanalytical approach because it is difficult "to dismiss the philosophical possibility that Don Juan is predisposed to act in accordance with human nature" (Brooks and Heitland 176). In attempting to then determine the extent to which Don Juan deserves his ill fate, one must take that very nature into consideration. Though one-dimensional in that his universe revolves exclusively around himself, Don Juan's actions may be interpreted as natural responses to human impulses such as the desire for mirth, sexual freedom, practicing ingenuity, even

self-preservation. That he behaves inexcusably is fair statement, yet debasing him carries the potential of debasing a natural instinct that lurks in many, including those who simply work to quell the urges that Don Juan lives out, or those who understand morality as a social phenomenon and not necessarily as a personal trait or ambition. On more than one occasion Juan speaks of his “condition”:

CATALINÓN: Al fin, ¿pretendes gozar
a Tisbea?
DON JUAN: Si burlar
es hábito antiguo mío,
¿qué me preguntas, sabiendo
mi condición? (vv.891-895)

The word *condición* is ambivalent here. In the above context the most reasonable meaning is that of *naturaleza* or *índole*, that part of us that intrinsically governs disposition. However, “condición” also implies an infirmity, a state that is not natural but rather the result of some outward force or influence. This second definition threatens to legitimise Juan’s behaviour, in a sense forgiving it as beyond his control and therefore not deserving of punishment. Despite this ambiguity it is clear that Don Juan acknowledges his own nature and is true to himself. In most cases this is an enviable quality. Where complications arise is with the “hábito antiguo” of deceiving and dishonouring. Taking pleasure in that which feeds one’s nature makes sense. Taking pleasure in that which causes others disgrace is another matter still.

Brooks and Heitland additionally attribute Don Juan’s comportment to “social learning” or exposure to “parental cruelty and domination” which results in distrust and the fear of showing weakness (176). This theory appends a “nurture” aspect to the already-existing “nature” interpretation of his manner of conduct. In this view, the spectators’ *schadenfreude* – taking pleasure in his misfortune – is unjustified. However,

for those in the audience who adhere to their conceptions of Don Juan as reprehensible and thus deserving of his castigation, passive *schadenfreude* is the only appropriate response. Moreover, those *dramatis personae* he offends also deserve retributive action in order to restore balance and recuperate some sort of justice or a sense of morality.

Conscience in *El burlador* is devised as a pretext of divine intervention and subsequently of divine justice. That is, doubt surrounding the manner in which to respond to a moral dilemma – most notably represented by the phrase “¿Qué he de hacer?” – is designed to inspire introspection as well as provide an opportunity to apply religious convention and act accordingly.¹⁵ Don Juan’s failure to adhere to these conventions is the result of self-importance, which is the trigger that facilitates a means of enjoying his swift and powerful downfall. Fame and notoriety are a source of great pleasure and pride for the trickster, who upon being referred to by his servant as “el burlador de España” declares, “Tú me has dado gentil nombre” (vv.1484-1485). This pride – one of the greatest sins of the Christian faith – motivates irreverence, which obstructs conscience, which then leads to his deserved divine justice. Don Juan’s lack of moral sense becomes apparent even at the moment of his greatest desperation, the moment at which the statue of Don Gonzalo grasps his hand in order to carry out God’s fatal sentence. Resolved to continue evading justice and retribution, he goes as far as to cast blame on a victim. This is a late attempt to deflect responsibility for his actions:

¡Que me abraso! ¡No me aprietes!
 Con la daga he de matarte.
 Mas, ¡ay! que me canso en vano

¹⁵ For a discussion of moral sense in Golden-Age Spanish theatre, particularly with respect to the question “¿Qué he de hacer?”, see Hilaire Kallendorf, *Conscience On Stage: The Comedia as Casuistry in Early Modern Spain*, pp.64-107. In *El burlador* this question is posed by Don Pedro (v.74), and Catalinón (vv.553 and 684, respectively).

de tirar golpes al aire.
 A tu hija no ofendí,
 que vio mis engaños antes. (vv.2773-2778)

Climactic and violent, Don Juan's harsh punishment stimulates the thrill of witnessing a *burlador* get his comeuppance.¹⁶ Thus the biblical phrase "Pride goes before destruction, / and a haughty spirit before a fall" (*New Oxford Annotated Bible* 916) assumes its place in the hermeneutical domain of the play. Apprehended at last, conscience comes too late for Don Juan Tenorio.

1.5. Schadenfreude and the Women of Don Juan

Among its various purposes, *El burlador* also serves as a cautionary tale for women. As the so-called "castigo de las mujeres" (v.896), Don Juan bears the responsibility of inculcating the ladies with an awareness of the consequences of surrendering to the pleasures of the flesh. The women that Don Juan dishonours or threatens to dishonour are not entirely innocent of misconduct. This is because every inter(action) the trickster has with a woman – with the exception of Doña Ana de Ulloa –, each active advance he makes, is in fact an agreeable experience for her at some point. At the opening of the play, the Duchess Isabela is enjoying the company of the man she believes to be Octavio and experiences not pain but the bliss of a romantic exchange with her supposed lover. Fisherwoman Tisbea's first interaction with Don Juan sparks a very brief moment of self-doubt that is quickly overwhelmed by feelings of love towards her seducer. For the peasant Aminta, the love of her husband Batricio does little to prevent

¹⁶ Note a curiosity in this scene. Don Gonzalo's statue is able to take hold of Don Juan's hand and dispatch him to his infernal tomb – an indication of his power to manipulate solid matter. However, the doomed gallant is himself unable to make physical contact with his captor, for his repeated attempts to stab and once again kill the stone statue of Don Gonzalo are tiresome and futile: "Mas, ¡ay! que me canso en vano / de tirar golpes al aire." Tirso denies Don Juan any and all recourse as well as the ability to further inflict harm. Juan's claims of repentance are nullified in light of this attempt to kill Don Gonzalo a second time.

her from straying from him and agreeing to become Don Juan's wife. It is with the promise of Don Juan's love and affection that she willingly abandons her own nuptials, provoking in Batricio the common conception of women as fickle and untrustworthy beings – a running theme in Golden-Age Spanish theatre. Isabela, Tisbea, and Aminta willingly give themselves to Juan without his having inflicted any discomfort. Again, this complements the notion that Don Juan's vice is not sadism but active *schadenfreude* – dishonour does not befall the women until he forsakes them. Doña Ana stands alone in never allowing Juan access to her, but she does mean to secretly entertain the Marquis, and therein lies her flaw and her culpability. The exposure of the ladies' having yielded to a man and given their bodies before marriage is the source of their humiliation, which serves as a form of public punishment that leaves audiences satisfied. Richard Smith, an authority on *schadenfreude*, uses the fitting term "humilitainment" to describe the enjoyment of observing others in humiliating circumstances (94). Under the auspices of the author, seventeenth-century views on womanhood as the personification of deceitfulness and changeability are expressed: "¡Ah, pobre honor! Si eres alma / del [hombre], ¿por qué te dejan / en la mujer inconstante, si es la misma ligereza?" (vv.153-156), laments the king of Naples; and Don Octavio announces, "No hay cosa que me espante, / que la mujer más constante / es, en efecto, mujer" (vv. 356-358). Presumably, this was a widely-held view in the Spanish Golden Age. Humiliation, therefore, satisfies the ladies' deserved punishment for their fickleness.

While Isabela, Aminta, and Ana can be chastised for secretly carrying on relationships with gentlemen or straying from the ones they have committed themselves to, Tisbea is the only female victim of Don Juan's who is initially neither attached nor

interested in having romantic dealings with men. As such, she is a unique figure in *El burlador* and merits special attention. The embodiment of a *mujer esquiva*, Tisbea instantly loses sight of her independent spirit upon interacting with Don Juan. When she first appears in the play, she declares her independence as a woman, vowing immunity from all things loverly:

Yo, de cuantas el mar,
 pies de jazmín y rosas,
 en sus riberas besa,
 con fugitivas olas,
 sola de amor exenta,
 como en ventura sola,
 tirana me reservo
 de sus prisiones locas.
 [...]
 [S]eguramente tengo
 que en libertad se goza
 el alma, que amor áspid
 no le ofende ponzoña.
 En pequeñuelo esquife,
 ya en compañía de otras,
 tal vez al mar le peino
 la cabeza espumosa.
 Y cuando más perdidas
 querellas de amor forman,
 como de todos río
 envidia soy de todas.
 ¡Dichosa yo mil veces,
 amor, pues me perdonas,
 si ya, por ser humilde
 no desprecias mi choza!
 [...][E]n tirano imperio
 vivo, de amor señora. (vv.375-456)

As yet unscathed by the likes of the male species, Tisbea displays a kind of wisdom and maturity regarding the “prisiones locas” associated with love. As she speaks, however, her tone veers from demonstrating resolve and freedom from the troubles of romance, and assumes an air of conceit. Hubris is her first flaw. Tisbea seems to forget herself in the midst of her self-interest. Constance Rose has noted the following:

[T]he spectacle of this fisherwoman speaking in such convoluted Gongoristic terms is somewhat disconcerting; such a speech act is obviously a breach of decorum and defies any semblance of verisimilitude. Since the playwright had to be well aware of this, what, then, was his intention with the creation of this character? What exactly did he hope to accomplish?

In *Tisbea*, it would appear, the author has created a character for whom he has nothing but contempt. He sets *Tisbea*'s character in her long introductory soliloquy, and the process of deconstructing *Tisbea* begins with this very speech, which could be called an ironic variation on the *beatus ille* theme. He is well aware of the impact of her words and her manner of speaking upon the audience/reader. (48)

Questions surrounding *Tisbea*'s existence and role are pertinent in that she is a feminine embodiment of pride, one of the seven deadly sins and, incidentally, the gravest.¹⁷ Rose also notes that *Tisbea*, whose "pies de jazmín y rosas" touch the waters of the ocean, is metaphorically and physically "in danger, sexual danger," and fails to be vigilant (52). Through *Tisbea* Tirso creates tension between a woman who respects herself enough not to seek the company of men, especially surreptitiously, and a woman who challenges the social norms of her time by refusing to wed and assume her place in a traditional household. Feelings of *schadenfreude* towards her likewise cause ambivalence. In going against her better judgement, *Tisbea* falls prey to seduction and disgrace. When Don Juan flees after having "possessed" her, *Tisbea* is devastated but takes ownership of her part in the *burla*: "Yo soy la que hacía siempre / de los hombres burla tanta, / que siempre las que hacen burla / vienen a quedar burladas" (vv.1014-1017). She is the only one of Don Juan's victims to do so. This complicates taking pleasure in her misfortune. Nonetheless, her declarations of free-spiritedness and superiority to Cupid mark her for a downfall, and thus *schadenfreude*. *Tisbea* is able to hold onto her chastity just long

¹⁷The other six are lust, gluttony, greed, sloth, wrath, and envy. Pride is widely considered the gravest of these because it implies that one individual is better than the rest.

enough to feel invincible. Her acquiescence is ultimately its own punishment, to the delight of Tirso and perhaps his audience.

Worth noting is the suggestion of gender role reversal when Tisbea first meets Don Juan, testing the boundaries of femininity for which reprimand will be necessary. Having nearly drowned, Don Juan is carried in by his servant like a damsel in distress. Tisbea quickly takes action and comes to the rescue, becoming his knight in shining armour. Her masculinity is again reflected in the manner in which the other fishermen refer to and respect her. Coridón declares, “Di qué nos mandas, Tisbea” (v.645); and Anfriso later adds, “Pues aquí todos estamos, / manda que tu gusto hagamos / lo que pensado no fue” (vv.670-672). Tisbea assumes the role as master and commander, a matter which also connects her to the sea. Juan, meanwhile, is cradled by Tisbea and is instantly “enamoured” of her. However, the order of male superiority and feminine submission is restored when he exploits her kindness, “enjoys” her, and absconds with two horses and, most notably, her honour.

One last note on Tisbea is that she declares her honour preserved, but the manner of preservation is questionable:

Mi honor conservo en pajas
como fruta sabrosa,
vidrio guardado en ellas
para que no se rompa. (vv.423-426)

To preserve a commodity “en pajas” is comparable to keeping a glass object in straw so as to prevent damage. Unfortunately, while straw can literally be a means of preserving that which is fragile, metaphorically it is not strong enough to preserve glass which, like the law of chastity, can be broken. In fact, preserving fragile objects in straw is almost a matter of kindling due to its highly flammable nature. Fire, then, becomes a symbol of

Tisbea's undoing. Upon discovering that Don Juan has used and abandoned her, she emerges crying, "¡Fuego, fuego, que me quemo, / que mi cabaña se abrasa!" (vv.986-987). Ironically, the one thing she had sworn to safeguard is the very thing that is quickest to consume. Tisbea's misfortune, at Tirso's behest, is fostered by the path of least resistance – love at first sight.¹⁸ Nothing stands in Don Juan's way despite Tisbea's initial resolve to maintain her abstinence. In the end, her pain is Don Juan's pleasure, but her pleasure will ultimately be Don Juan's pain as justice for Tisbea, as it does for the rest of Don Juan's victims, can only come in the form of the *burlador's* death.

1.6. Other Considerations

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) postulated that feelings of pleasure are related to goodness and that goodness is inherent in the nobility, because the things that please the masses – who are not pleasant by nature – are in conflict, whereas the things that please those who are fond of the finer things are pleasant by nature (*Nicomachean Ethics* 11). Clearly antiquated, the notion that only the nobility possesses goodness flies in the face of reason, particularly with respect to a figure such as Don Juan who represents aristocratic wickedness. Tirso de Molina's Don Juan Tenorio epitomises treachery and betrayal. He exemplifies a complete lack of restraint in pursuing women, a sense of entitlement fostered by blood ties to the nobility, contempt for authority, indifference to consequence, and even a misguided conception of faith, which along with pride is his fatal flaw. What is lacking in descriptions of Don Juan is sentimentality or emotional

¹⁸In terms of the degrees of resistance, of Don Juan's four victims in *El burlador* Tisbea is the easiest to conquer. More resistant are Aminta, who at first challenges the silver-tongued Juan but allows herself to be swayed by him, and Isabel, who entertains Don Juan and rejects him only after discovering his true identity. Most resistant is Doña Ana, who immediately recognises Don Juan as an imposter and cries for help. Ana is the sole escapee of his deceptions.

sensitivity, the ability to respond towards others with some level of concern. Don Juan's rhetoric is exceedingly self-focused, his actions even more so. It is only with his own well-being in mind that signs of vulnerability emerge – namely fear, which he acknowledges during his encounters with the stone guest.

The nature of Don Juan Tenorio's misdeeds is cyclical and is predicated upon three basic principles: ravish – run – repeat. In addition to this circular logic, however, there exists a dichotomy in his nature. On the one hand his motive is to subvert women, avert capture, and revert to pursuit, all of which involve furtiveness. Conversely, there is a requirement for his actions to be witnessed and lauded, for someone to vouch for his bravado and accomplishments for the sole purpose of augmenting his fame, or perhaps his infamy. This divergence factors into Baroque duality, rather like the concepts of pleasure and suffering. On the whole, however, joy and pain need not be opposing forces but can work in tandem to trigger a side of humanity considered taboo: taking pleasure in the misfortunes of other people. In the *Philebus* Plato makes it clear that pleasure and pain are not mutually exclusive and can exist contemporaneously, because “apart from pain we would never be able to test pleasure adequately” (32). Indeed, *El burlador de Sevilla* begins with Don Juan's pleasure but concludes with his utter ruin, much to the delight of on-lookers on the stage as well as off.

It is curious that although Juan is castigated to the fullest extent of divine law, not all the male figures that err are dealt a punitive hand. For instance, on two occasions his uncle Don Pedro tells untruths: first, he allows Don Juan to escape but informs the Neapolitan king that no-one could stop him; and secondly, in order to perpetuate the lie about Don Juan and protect family interests, Don Pedro willingly implicates Don Octavio

as the man discovered in Isabela's chamber. Pedro cannot be classified as a *schadenfroh* character because he does not take pleasure in Octavio's wrongful arrest, although he is an active participant in this injustice. Yet why should Tirso spare him from punishment? Perhaps the answer lies in the bigger picture: Don Juan's ultimate torture is simultaneously defamation of the Tenorio family. The role that Don Pedro plays in aiding and abetting Don Juan is inconsequential because his actions do not suffice to alter the horrifying outcome of the play. It is a distorted matter of "no harm, no foul."

In her introduction to *El burlador de Sevilla* Mercedes Sánchez states the following: "El tema de don Juan ha dado origen a multitud de interpretaciones y variaciones, pero es en el drama de Tirso desde donde emerge para convertirse en un mito universal, aún vigente, quizás porque en su personalidad esconde elementos que de una u otra forma se encuentran en los individuos de cualquier sociedad y de cualquier época" (37). Thus did Tirso's character become a template on which other playwrights would base their own Don Juans. The archetype has endured centuries of evolution and rebirth and continues to build on an exhaustive body of critical analyses.

Dramaturges also play a very significant role as an audience, for it is through them that donjuanesque dramatic works are reconstructed and sometimes immortalised. The focus of the next chapter is Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado's *La venganza en el sepulcro*. While it still centres on an egocentric Don Juan, the direction of this play veers from defamation of the many (women) to exaltation of the one. Pleasure and pain unite to form another *schadenfroh* merger. As we shall see, however, the fame-hungry, morally corrupt rogue Don Juan Tenorio falls in love, and *donjuanismo* acquires a new countenance.

CHAPTER 2 – *La venganza en el sepulcro*

2.1. A New Interpretation of Don Juan Tenorio

In 1957 Emilio Cotarelo erroneously attributed *La venganza en el sepulcro*, hereafter *La venganza*, to Tirso de Molina. Arcadio Baquero rectified the matter in 1966 by correctly assigning authorship to Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado (Arellano 36). An undated manuscript of the play held at the *Biblioteca Nacional de España* in Madrid bears Córdoba's name, and critics estimate that the play was written in the late seventeenth century. Little is known about the author of this dramatic work except that he was an officer at the court of King Philip IV. To date, *La venganza* is the only extant text known to have been composed by Alonso de Córdoba, yet so inspired was he that either he chose the theme of Don Juan as a means of expressing strong dramaturgical inclinations, or the very subject of Don Juan motivated him to put pen to paper – or quill to parchment, as the case may be. Either way, with his play *donjuanismo* would venture into uncharted territory.

Generally described as inferior by the few scholars who have handled the play – among them Ignacio Arellano, José Franquesa y Gómis, Piero Menarini and Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez –, *La venganza* is the story of Don Juan Tenorio's ill-fated love of Doña Ana. The play opens with Don Juan pursuing her on foot in the outskirts of Seville and showering her with praises of her beauty in an attempt to have her hand in marriage. From a lengthy monologue we learn of his father's death and his decision to abandon courtly duties in order to wander about the world. Unfortunately, his bid to

impress her with a retelling of great feats and grand acts of courage only succeeds at creating an image of a barbaric killer who claims to have slain, single-handedly, fifty assailants at once and to have fought off an entire village of opponents. Don Juan gives an account of the attempted conquest of a village girl whom he fails to win over and who later weds a prince. The jealous Don Juan claims to have then murdered this prince in retaliation. He also claims to have held off four hundred soldiers in a battle at Flanders, unassisted, which begins to give one a sense of the type of figure Don Juan is, or purports to be. Ana, meanwhile, is set to marry the Marquis de la Mota, a vow from which she never strays throughout the play. In order to keep Don Juan appeased, fearing a violent reaction to being rejected, she leads him to believe that she will become his bride. Don Juan then introduces himself to her father, Don Gonzalo, as well as to Mota, both of whom are aware of his reputation and become suspicious of his presence. Demanding to see Ana late one evening, Don Juan spies her father as the latter enters his home and attempts to force his way in. When Don Gonzalo denies Juan entry, a duel ensues in which Gonzalo is fatally wounded. The unfortunate Mota, who happens to have been nearby and to have witnessed the altercation, is first to come upon Gonzalo's lifeless body and is promptly apprehended and charged with the murder. Ana continues to feign a commitment to Don Juan although she suspects him of her father's killing. He eventually admits to having Don Gonzalo's blood on his hands, but before he is forced to take revenge on himself, Don Juan escapes to a church, finds Don Gonzalo's tomb, and the double invitation, as per *El burlador*, takes place. During the second supper with the ghost, Don Juan's admission to murder is overheard by the king's aide, an *Asistente*, thereby sealing his fate while exonerating Mota. The punishment prescribed by Tirso in

El burlador is also administered here by Córdoba, with the ghost of Don Gonzalo seeing Juan to his infernal death, thus allowing Doña Ana to wed the Marquis.

There is a temptation to view all characterisations of the Don Juan archetype as a narcissistic, defiant, and unrepentant womaniser. This is a relatively accurate assessment of Tirso de Molina's Don Juan Tenorio, yet it is not wholly so with that of Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado. Extreme self-interest and disregard for authority do indeed constitute the nature of Don Juan in Córdoba's play, yet his reputation as a cad becomes dubious. Though it is clear that Córdoba borrowed from *El burlador* four principal *dramatis personae* – Don Juan Tenorio, Doña Ana de Ulloa, Don Gonzalo de Ulloa, and the Marquis de la Mota – as well as the motif of the double invitation and the climactic fatal conclusion of the play, deviations in the storyline as well as the personality of Don Juan in *La venganza* suggest that the objective of this play was to deny Don Juan his heroic stance in the Spanish Golden Age, rob him of his virility by denying him the ability to successfully seduce a woman, minimise his impact on the society that popularised him, and cast a shadow on the legacy of the great trickster of Seville. While Tirso's Don Juan is represented as a man who essentially lacks respect for women and thinks nothing of their honour, Córdoba's antihero is portrayed as having little success in the business of seducing and taking advantage of women. What is more, he abandons his Tirsian identity as a trickster to pursue the apparent love of his life, Doña Ana. Now capable of commitment and fidelity, Don Juan's attempt to leave his reputation as a *burlador* behind suggests his lack of interest in accomplishing what Tirso's hero was capable of achieving – fame as “El gran burlador de Sevilla.” For Alonso de Córdoba,

however, this change of heart (and habit) does not suffice to save Don Juan from himself, nor his demise.

2.2. Deconstruction and Reconstruction

Córdoba's play is less than stellar. What it lacks in narrative creativity, rhetorical eloquence, and stylistic refinement it never quite makes up for, but for the purposes of this study it provides a fitting example of the manner in which *schadenfreude* can play out principally vis-à-vis an author, although instances of *schadenfreude* among the characters on stage do exist. In essence, *schadenfreude* may be considered a literary device that the playwright applies in the course of adapting his Don Juan from that of Tirso de Molina. Familiarity with *El burlador* appears to pervade Córdoba's sense of purpose. This is evident in his apparent objective of deconstructing Don Juan's image as a hardened, proud trickster who lacks a conscience and the capacity to have feelings of guilt or remorse, and then reconstructing Don Juan as an aspiring *burlador* who is inept at seduction, boasts of committing countless murders in an attempt to impress the object of his desire, fails to recognise that she is in fact deceiving him, and is later banished to hell after confessing to her father's murder. The role of *schadenfreude* in *La venganza* materially centres on the playwright taking pleasure in the misfortunes of Don Juan. This play is an apt example of the playwright engaging in active *schadenfreude* by subjecting his protagonist to scorn as well as ridicule. Don Juan Tenorio is no longer the trickster par excellence. Instead, a quick temper and propensity for violence are juxtaposed with great loverly passion and an insistence on monogamy in order to produce, at the playwright's behest, a derisive yet pathetic and laughable personality.

As seen with *El burlador*, “humilitainment” – taking pleasure in others’ humiliating circumstances – is also utilised in *La venganza* to exploit Don Juan’s bid to present himself as noble, courageous, and a paragon of virtue, all qualities that serve only to emphasise the contrary. The storyline is not complicated but it does permit one to delve into the character of Don Juan, which reveals an individual whose existence is comedy wrapped in tragedy.¹⁹ That is, Don Juan’s character flaws – his irreverence, his impudence, and his proclivity for violence – are the agents that fuel his demise, but they are also more of a façade that aims to conceal those inadequacies at his core. For this reason, enjoyment of the play appears to be firmly planted in deposing “El gran burlador de España” of Tirsian renown.

One manner in which Alonso de Córdoba begins to exploit the Don Juan archetype is by injecting him with insecurities. The opening lines of the play provide a clue of Don Juan’s departure from assuredness in securing the affections of a woman to pleading for her attention:

DON JUAN: Detén, deidad hermosa,
para no ser cruel, mas cariñosa,
el curso acelerado;
no revoques la dicha de mi estado.
Vuelve, vuelve a la fuente,
que en el puro cristal de su corriente
prodigio te traslada,
bien que ofendida por no bien pintada. (I.1-8)

There are three phrases here that factor into Don Juan’s pleas: “detén,” “no revoques,” and “vuelve.” *Detener* suggests the “holding back” of his newly beloved. With *no revocar* the request is to stay the “taking back” of joy she has brought him. Lastly, the

¹⁹ Incidentally, the Don Juan archetype embodies several traits of Greek tragedy, chiefly hamartia (a protagonist’s fatal flaw), hubris (excessive arrogance and pride), and peripeteia (the reversal of fortune), all of which can be linked to schadenfreude: excessive pride as a fatal flaw can lead to the reversal of fortune, which then induces satisfaction in the outcome.

term *volver* represents a “turning back” towards him that she is not willing to oblige. Taken together, these phrases connote supplication, which is uncharacteristic of a self-assured Don Juan. Additionally, praises of Doña Ana’s beauty and lamentations over her absence from him are answered with, “¿Por qué mis pasos sigues?” (I.33), while his threats to commit suicide fail to persuade her to have a change of heart. Ana leaves Don Juan with this in answer to him: “[V]erás, ¡suceso extraño!, / lo que he de hacer por ti. Mas tú lo piensa, / que en decírtelo yo me hago ofensa. / Adiós, don Juan, adiós” (I.434-437). Having secured neither a “yes” nor even a “perhaps,” Don Juan falls prey to Ana’s deception, exclaiming upon her departure, “¡Qué mayor dicha!” (I.444). Unfamiliar to audiences, this lack of finesse and control over a conquest has the potential to precipitate their mockery of him.

The first time Juan speaks of love in his extended monologue he gives an account of a chance meeting with a mountain girl for whom he felt an attraction, simultaneously shedding light on the difference between love and lust as he interprets it:

[...] Desmintiendo
 espías y centinelas,
 bajé una mañana al valle,
 donde una serrana bella
 me sale al paso; rindióme,
 y ésta fue la vez primera
 que tuve amor; pero no,
 no fue amor, pues luego intenta
 gozarla; apetito fue,
 que quien la dicha no espera,
 sabiendo obligar, no ama,
 apetece, sí, u desea,
 para ser la posesión
 olvido de tanta deuda. (I.181-194)

According to Juan, love never attempts to “enjoy” the beloved. That is a role reserved for lustful fancy. To be sure, “gozarla” in this context points to physical enjoyment as

discussed in the previous chapter. For Córdoba's Don Juan, love respects the significant other enough that it ought never to attempt to satisfy lust, which only ever leads to antipathy towards a lady who grants sexual favours. Don Juan's dubious distinction as a heartthrob is thwarted here by a display of reason and sensitivity. What remains uncertain is whether or not this reformed Don Juan would have garnered praise on the part of the seventeenth-century public. Nevertheless, Córdoba maintains his authority over his protagonist's misfortune as, invariably, the mountain girl declines Don Juan's advances, excusing herself by stating that if he is indeed a mountain dweller they will surely meet again. Don Juan's inability to detain her, additionally impeded by the sudden approach of a military troop, leads to yet another failure of seduction. Utilising active *schadenfreude* as a literary technique, Córdoba denies his antihero the aforementioned fame, and thus the pleasure, of being a "burlador." Additionally, he goes about testing Don Juan's mettle as a faithful admirer. Unaware that Doña Ana means never to reciprocate his feelings of love, Don Juan's personal mission to marry her and assume his role as master of her household will not falter for the duration of the play, but his turn from lust to love is doomed from the start.

Because Doña Ana becomes the centre of Don Juan's world in this dramatic work, it is worth considering Alonso de Córdoba's possible motivations in selecting her among the other ladies featured in *El burlador*. His election of Doña Ana as the sole female protagonist and catalyst for his undoing seems appropriate for various reasons. The first is that in *El burlador* Don Juan is considered an esteemed individual by the king and thus becomes the man to whom Ana is promised as a token of gratitude to her father Don Gonzalo for the latter's faithful service. As such, Doña Ana theoretically has an

obligation to wed Don Juan. Secondly, amongst the women in Tirso's play, Doña Ana is the only lady who never strays from her commitment to her true love, the Marquis de la Mota, in addition to which she is the only woman Don Juan fails to seduce. Finally, there is the matter of Ana having been an important *dramatis persona* in Tirso's play despite never appearing on stage. She is only ever heard screaming from within her chamber as Don Juan attempts to seduce her in Mota's stead. That she now takes on a physical, visible presence in *La venganza* facilitates the pleasurable exposure of Don Juan as a vagabond and an underachiever for consistently failing to attract a woman and maintain a meaningful relationship with her. Representative of "the one that got away," Ana becomes an ideal theatrical device through which Córdoba manages to undermine Don Juan's prodigious image and ultimately humiliate him through her refusal to acquiesce.

Córdoba's characterisation of Doña Ana reveals a very strong and decisive woman who, although she fears Don Juan or the threat he poses to her honour, at no time shows signs of that unease and remains firm in her resolution never to entertain him nor allow herself to be violated by him. It is also apparent that Don Juan's servant Colchón is aware of Ana's astuteness. Tasked with entering her room to confirm that she will keep her word of faithfulness to Don Juan, Colchón expresses concern at her possible reaction: "Ruégale a Dios que [ella] no elija / por respuesta algunos palos, / que veo muchos Gonzalos / deste Gonzalo en la hija" (I.742-745). His worries are not unfounded. When Colchón later finds himself in her company on Don Juan's behalf, Doña Ana makes her standpoint perfectly clear:

Diréis, pues, a vuestro amo,
[que escuse l]a nota
que ha dado, y que el de la Mota
es mi dueño. Y no volváis

vos aquí, que haré que os den,
y no lo dudéis, la muerte... (I.882-891)

Having thus imbued fear in Colchón, Doña Ana will still struggle to abate discourteous advances by Don Juan, who even in the presence of her father and Mota fully expects her to attend to him the first time he enters her home. He complains, “[E]s poca fineza / no sepa [Ana] que a verla vengo” (I.760-761). Don Juan’s obsession with Doña Ana and his high expectations of the requital not necessarily of love but of fulfilling a promise of marriage, which was in truth never made, blinds him to the mortal punishment towards which he is working. On-lookers or readers of this play can begin to be certain that the man they presumed had changed his ways after falling in love continues to test the very boundaries of integrity that he himself demands be honoured. Sullyng the integrity of a woman, even the stereotypically fickle lady, is reason enough for punitive measures to be taken against an offender. Transgression against a highly honourable woman, then, carries a greater penalty. Because that punishment is well deserved, it can be relished by the author as well as the public.

It should be noted that Ana’s displeasure also proves a source of delight for Don Juan. This is reflected in his attitude when visiting her following the death of her father, for which he is responsible: “[M]irad / cuánto me precio de ser / dueño de esta casa ya” (III.165-169), he proclaims as he enters her home. Her pain over losing Don Gonzalo is irrelevant, and the thought of gaining Gonzalo’s homestead is what he focuses on and what gives him pleasure. Because she suspects Don Juan of her father’s murder, Doña Ana holds him in abeyance by challenging him to take revenge against the person responsible for the crime before she weds. Don Juan duly confesses to the murder, but turns the tables on Ana by telling her that if he is to avenge her it would be best to

exchange vows first, for fear he will not survive the just deserts he must hypothetically impose on himself. Their dialogue hints at Don Juan's playful ingenuity and Doña Ana's panic. She is saved, *deus ex machina*, when the authorities arrive having been summoned by her earlier. Juan's own active *schadenfreude* is thus curtailed, but the king's aid, the *Asistente*, displays his own brand of *schadenfreude* when he declares that he will release the Marquis and instead incarcerate Don Juan: "No sé cuál es más dichoso, / pero ya es mío este empeño" (III.329-330). Before the *Asistente* is able to make an arrest, Don Juan challenges him as well as his entourage and haughtily leads them off stage in combat. He later resurfaces having done no harm to these latest opponents. This, again, makes one question the legitimacy of his prior claims of bravery and mass murder.

A trait common to both Tirso's Don Juan as well as Córdoba's is an inflated ego. Both think of themselves as invincible, but while Don Juan of *El burlador* is duly able to follow his words up with actions, the Don Juan of *La venganza* projects his inflated ego mainly through a tendency to be loquacious. The audience only ever hears of his great feats – chiefly against high-ranking adversaries and in the battlefield. Although his reputation for violent behaviour is echoed in asides by Don Gonzalo and Mota when they are first introduced to him, evidence of Don Juan's victories – apart from an uncanny ability to survive attack – is questionable at best. During his first encounter with Doña Ana, Don Juan devotes two hundred and ninety verses not to merely telling his life story but to boasting: "[E]scucha, y sabrás a quién venciste, / porque admires en mí lo que supiste" (I.47-48). He additionally delivers something of a refrain between episodes recounted, repeatedly uttering the phrase, "Paso adelante, / que aquesto es nada."²⁰

²⁰ See Act I: vv. 135-136; vv. 175-176; vv. 259-260.

Rather than conveying a sense of worthiness he manages only to come across as bombastic, which has a negative effect on his intended paramour. His ostentation is an excellent way for the playwright to prime Don Juan for well-deserved ruin.

Don Juan's arrogance and sense of superiority are also key triggers of *schadenfreude*. He differs from Tirso's Don Juan, however, in that the trickster of Seville targets women from all social strata while he demonstrates biases that show his acute awareness of class structure. In Don Juan's not-very-humble opinion, people should be aware of, and adhere to, their own stations in life:

Diferencia ha de tener
el que es noble del vulgar,
y el hombre particular
del que tiene gran poder.
Aun en astros e influencias,
en cielos y en jerarquías,
se ven estas mayorías
porque hay estas diferencias. (II.455-462)

It is in part for this reason that he favours Doña Ana, who is of noble birth. While higher-ranking members of the Golden-Age audience may have been fully in agreement with this stance, such remarks presumably did little to arouse sympathy on the part of those viewers in the audience who belonged to the lower classes. There is, then, the distinct possibility that those belonging to the lower classes had little respect for members of high society and therefore relished their trials for the very reason that the upper echelon looked down upon them. Still, the right to hold beliefs of class superiority does not necessarily warrant reproof from a moralistic perspective. At issue is that to Don Juan superiority seemingly represents the right to court a wellborn lady, pressure her into marriage, assassinate her father, and then place the blame on the innocent bystander who also happens to be his rival for her affections. The ease with which Don Juan expresses

own mind – “[Q]ue / se acuerde [Ana] de que me dio / la palabra de ser *mía*” (I.732-734) – Don Juan portrays himself as a victim of Mota’s alleged underhandedness in pursuing Doña Ana – “[S]é ya que el Marqués / me ofende con su porfía” (I.736-737). Between playing the fool, which is undignified, and playing the victim, which is unjustified, Don Juan is capable of inciting a high level of disdain from theatre spectators.

Juan’s lack of credibility is echoed again when he describes to Ana during their first meeting a scene in which along their travels he and Colchón – whose suggestive name affirms his role as the *gracioso* – happen upon a wedding:

Caminé a Toledo, y antes
de llegar una u dos leguas,
está un lugar donde había
una boda, cuya fiesta
rústicamente ostentaban
banquetes, bailes y ofrendas.
Parecióme bien la novia:
acerquéme con sospechas
del novio que me atendía
ya celoso. (I.105-114)

The scene is reminiscent of the episode in *El burlador* in which Tirso’s Don Juan interrupts Aminta and Batricio’s wedding ceremony with the sole purpose of supplanting the groom to enjoy the affections of the bride. Unlike the trickster, however, this Don Juan’s desire to court and conquer the nameless bride goes unfulfilled, with events unfolding in such a way that he narrowly escapes with his life when beset by the other villagers. Don Juan’s fixation, however, is not on having failed to seduce the unnamed *novia* – an unthinkable defeat for any self-respecting *burlador* – but on having apparently run the villagers off with his mighty sword. Again, he is less successful as a trickster but still aspires to be thought of as a man of valour, yet the idea that Don Juan could single-handedly terrorise angry subjects has no ring of truth to it, particularly when one

considers his flight from the aforementioned scene of the killing of Don Gonzalo in the second act of the play. Because his retelling of the events is not altogether convincing, Juan ceases to be a credible figure and instead spurs antipathy, and *schadenfreude*, on the part of the audience. In this way, Córdoba forges enough circumstantial evidence to warrant delight in Don Juan's disastrous end. Indeed, Juan's poor performance record and lack of credibility are linked to his penchant for violence, which is perhaps an expression of frustration.

The use of *schadenfreude* as a rhetorical device resurfaces in the aforementioned wedding scene, which hints at a layer of social violence that could further encourage the enjoyment of Don Juan's ineptitude on the part of the playwright as well as the public. The people's rebellion is provoked by the presence of an authoritative figure – which Don Juan is not in terms of military or political rank but rather because of his aristocratic origins. During Spain's Golden Age, officers of the court were routinely posted to villages that fell under their protection. Unfortunately, these men often posed a real threat to villagers living under the auspices of leaders who instead took advantage of the locals in rural areas, exploiting women in particular. Don Juan's offensive behaviour at the wedding, and the subsequent revolt of those in attendance, is suggestive of similar circumstances. Even here, however, Alonso de Córdoba discredits Don Juan both as a nobleman and as a *Lothario*. By having him fail to seduce the bride and then becoming the target of the people's wrath, the author actively sets into motion the unravelling of his antagonist's image as a man who consistently gets his way. Don Juan's domination in his former life as a *burlador* appears to be a thing of the past.

DON JUAN: ¿Doña Ana te dijo eso?
 COLCHÓN: Esto me dijo Ana,
 y que a ti te lo dijese.
 DON JUAN: ¿Mis celos no me bastaban?
 Pues. ¡vive Dios!, que he de ver
 cómo lo dice mañana.
 Gozarla tengo esta noche
 que quiera o no, mi palabra
 cumpliéndole yo al Marqués,
 pues le dije se casaba
 conmigo esta noche. (I.954-964)

Linked to Córdoba's use of the word *gozar*, we encounter a very sudden and isolated threat of physical violence against Ana. Because Don Juan never repeats the word nor this threat, its use here is awkward. It does, nonetheless, point to the enjoyment he aims to derive not only from dishonouring Ana – which represents a form of sadism – but also from impugning the Marquis – which constitutes the active but non-direct enjoyment of Mota's misfortune that is nevertheless facilitated by him. This is an example of Don Juan's active *schadenfreude*, a reaction triggered by jealousy.

Although scholars point to envy rather than jealousy as a source of *schadenfreude*, both are viable triggers.²¹ In the strictest of terms, envy is covetousness, a desire for that which is the possession of another individual, while jealousy denotes a general feeling of malice, suspicion or resentment for perceived wrongs. With jealousy as a root, one can observe *schadenfreude* in Don Juan's satisfaction with Mota's swift imprisonment following Don Gonzalo's murder. In truth, Don Juan is only indirectly responsible for Mota's adversity in that the latter simply finds himself in the wrong place at the wrong

²¹ In *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others* there are numerous studies on the relationship between envy and *schadenfreude*, including: "Morality and Schadenfreude" by John Portmann (pp.17-28); "Deservingness and Schadenfreude" by N.T. Feather (pp.29-54); Richard H. Smith, Stephen M. Thielke, and Caitlin A. J. Powell in "Empirical Challenges to Understanding the Role of Envy in Schadenfreude" (pp.91-109); Niels van de Ven's "Malicious Envy and Schadenfreude" (pp.110-117); and "Stereotypes and Schadenfreude" by Mina Cikara and Susan Fiske (pp.151-164). A search of the collection of articles reveals that jealousy is only referred to once, in Smith, Thielke, and Powell's "Empirical Challenges to Understanding the Role of Envy in Schadenfreude" (p.106).

time, having been present during Juan's altercation with Don Gonzalo and having subsequently been discovered near the corpse by the authorities once Juan has fled. Don Juan points no fingers but readily benefits from Mota's predicament. A visit to the tower in which the Marquis is being held culminates in Don Juan assuring the prisoner of friendship but warning of the dangers of interfering with his plan to marry Doña Ana. Taking full advantage of Mota's incarceration, Don Juan cautions him, "Vuelvo otra vez a deciros / no me deis celos; mirad / que perderéis mi amistad" (II.495-497). Since schadenfreude can be linked to competition, one person's loss is another person's gain. Moreover, given that Don Juan values the containment of social classes and the recognition of one's place in society, his rivalry with the Marquis violates a code between men of equal rank. Giseline Kuipers points out the following: "[W]hen schadenfreude manifests itself *within* a group, not only is this a breach of etiquette, it also produces a social rift. [...] In hostile and competitive situations with clear social boundaries, morality is relatively straightforward: us against them. Within social groups, it becomes us versus us" (268-269). Don Juan, then, demands mutual respect but is quite oblivious to the fact that respect must be reciprocated, particularly within his own social group.

Juan's feigned friendship with the Marquis is not an isolated instance of falsehood in *La venganza*. The display of pleasure, affection, or agreement, however disingenuous, serves Doña Ana in attempting to deter her infatuated pursuer. Another tactic she employs to ward Don Juan off is to inform Colchón of another woman in Seville who is said to have fallen in love with Don Juan. The audience is never present for this conversation but is apprised of it as Colchón relays Ana's message to his master:

DON JUAN: ¿Qué te dijo?
COLCHÓN: Que te diese un recado,

un ángel, un serafín,
 y, en fin, la mayor ventura.
 COLCHÓN: Pensarás que del anzuelo
 ya cuelga alguna lamprea
 y será algún tollo.
 DON JUAN: Sea.
 COLCHÓN: Que te ha de engañar recelo.
 DON JUAN: Colchón: ¿qué mujer, qué dama
 fue posible que engañase
 que manchada no quedase
 en la opinión o la fama?
 Malicia es tuya, no mía,
 que aquella rara belleza
 es efeto de nobleza,
 como de la luz el día.
 [...]

MIRA, pues, si puede ser
 que mujer de tan gran fama
 me enamore como dama
 y engañe como mujer.
 COLCHÓN: Sí, puede ser:
 porque nacer principal
 no es haber mudado el ser,
 y es el engaño mujer,
 según regla general.
 DON JUAN: [¿]Todas engañan, Colchón[?] ²²
 COLCHÓN: Todas engañan, Don Juan.
 DON JUAN: A mí no me engañarán. (I.449-480)

Always the voice of reason, as dictated by the norms of Golden-Age Spanish theatre, Colchón's intuition hits the mark, although his attitude towards women is peppered with the same seventeenth-century biases that designate female characters as changeable and untrustworthy. Córdoba's servant signals the divide between wisdom and foolishness, the latter of which Don Juan is the embodiment. Don Juan's refusal to see reality also communicates the whittling away of his superiority – that is, his perceived superiority to others as well as that dominance that is expected of him in the minds of those readers or spectators who are familiar with the Don Juan archetype.

²² I have added question marks to this line, which in Menarini's edition appears simply as a remark. Within the context of the dialogue the utterance is most fittingly interrogatory.

Alonso de Córdoba continues to systematically whittle away Don Juan's ego by also having him acknowledge that Don Gonzalo is indeed superior to him, saying, "[Doña Ana e]s hija de don Gonzalo / de Ulloa; conózcole bien, / y su calidad también, / que es tal que aun yo no le igualo" (I.465-468). Despite this recognition, Don Juan's function as Gonzalo's assassin nullifies his own respectability. Additionally, Don Gonzalo's warm reception of Don Juan when they first meet is feigned. During the exchange of niceties we learn that Juan's reputation precedes him: "Cosas cuenta dél la fama / que asombran" (I.719-720), utters Gonzalo in an aside. Based on the information that an audience has about Don Juan at this point, it is doubtful that these "cosas" have painted a favourable picture of him. Don Gonzalo's gracious welcome, then, exemplifies deceit on the elder's part as well as Juan's inability to discern it. It is the second deception to which Don Juan is subjected by the playwright, following that of Doña Ana.

Among Juan's faults is a tendency not to recognise and learn from his mistakes. Ana is twice able to convince him of her commitment to him, and with little effort. Fully engaging in deceit, she comes to manipulate Don Juan to the very best of her ability. Doña Ana's words and actions come to be motivated by a desire to avenge herself as well as Don Gonzalo, and there is no truth to her promise to Juan when she claims, "[E]s mi palabra mi ser" (II.118), yet her smitten admirer is not able to see through this, having fallen under her spell: "[N]o sé, Colchón, no sé / qué encanto tiene, qué hechizo / esta mujer que deshizo / rayo que vibré" (II.141-144). Don Juan is unaware of Ana's disdain for him (nor the degree of it) until the end of the play when he is besieged by the *Asistente* and his men. He chooses to continue believing that Ana's beauty and nobility guarantee the fulfillment of a promise of marriage. His infatuation with Doña Ana

conforms to what is perhaps Córdoba's agenda: the development of a character whose ignorance of wrong-doing does little to save him from a horrifying end. It may indeed be that ignorance that fuels the author's *schadenfreude*.

Like the tragicomedic *El burlador*, Córdoba's dramatic work appeals to the moralistic sensibilities of its audience. Conspicuous by its absence from *La venganza*, though, is Don Juan's noted refrain "Tan largo me lo fiáis" which establishes Tirso's grand purpose. Supposing that it was not in error, this omission by Córdoba suggests Don Juan's ignorance of his religious and moral obligations as a man of the Spanish Golden Age. As discussed earlier, he appears to have no sense of his own wrong-doing. Conceivably, then, to portray Don Juan as having no concerns regarding punitive measures for his actions, especially those administered by the Divinity, is fitting. In *La venganza* God is only acknowledged respectfully by Don Gonzalo, the *Asistente*, and Doña Ana – although the church itself is featured first as a refuge for Ana and her servant Inés when pursued by Don Juan in the opening act, and then as the final resting place for Don Gonzalo. It is unlikely that Córdoba overlooked the function of religion given its theological weight at the conclusion of *El burlador* as well as the importance of the Catholic church in Spain, in addition to his role as a member of Philip IV's court. It would appear that the playwright crafted his work in such a way that *schadenfreude* might, again, be useful as a literary tool through which Don Juan's apathy toward divine retribution could incur an audience's scorn and the enjoyment of his punishment.

Ignorance of his own impending doom becomes clear when Don Juan and Colchón stumble upon Don Gonzalo's tomb with an epitaph that reads, "Aguardo aquí de un traidor / que Dios venganza me dé" (II.575-576), and rather than showing concern

Juan responds, “A mí [el letrero me hace] reir” (II.585). His desire to laugh in this case is a *schadenfroh* response to a threat he perceives as empty. He immediately follows this remark with, “¿Qué cosas tiene tan ricas / la capilla!” (II.586-587), an indication of the levity with which he views the ominous warning on Gonzalo’s gravestone. His pleasure is not derived from having taken Gonzalo’s life – to this he is, like Tirso’s Don Juan, quite indifferent. On the contrary, he poses to his deceased victim these two questions: “¿[A]guardáis que os venga Dios? / ¿No es mejor vengaros vos?” (II.592-593). This reveals mockery at Don Gonzalo’s inability to avenge himself. With this, Don Juan invites Gonzalo to dine with him and proposes that they engage in a duel to settle their differences. Don Gonzalo’s ghostly statue nods in agreement, setting in motion the very climactic conclusion of the play. Again, however, superiority and naïveté burst forth in Don Juan’s careless language:

DON JUAN: A cenar me voy; venid,
 y no me hagáis esperar.
COLCHÓN: ¿Con un muerto has de cenar?
 ¡Vive Dios que eres un Cid!
DON JUAN: ¿Qué fue el Cid para conmigo?
 ¿No ves que es poco blasón
 para ser comparación
 de mi valor? (II.621-626)

To presume to challenge the historical and legendary medieval nobleman Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, under whose leadership real wars were fought and won in eleventh-century Spain, is foolish pride. Blind to the threat of the invitation, Don Juan’s pleasure in that moment overshadows his future suffering. Colchón’s assessment of him is telling: “[A]lgún demonio fue padre / y alguna demonia madre, / sin duda, de este don Juan” (II.628-630).

While Don Juan's *criado* Colchón represents wisdom and reason in *La venganza*, Alonso de Córdoba does not spare him from dramaturgical schadenfreude. That is, he takes pleasure in causing Colchón to endure immense discomfort, and to this Colchón openly objects. When the ghost of Don Gonzalo joins Don Juan for the first supper, fear strikes the very core of this servant as well as his master. Questioning the motives of the dramaturge, Colchón airs his grievance as follows:

¡Que se obliguen los graciosos
de las comedias a esto,
siendo tan gran disparate
pensar que puede ser cierto
que al lado de un muerto un vivo
tenga humor para el gracejo! (II.683-688)

Clearly unappreciative of the nonsensical practices that *graciosos* are subjected to in the composition of *comedias*, as well as the entertainment value supposedly associated with such things as dining with ghosts, Colchón's objections address the playwright directly, rupturing a rhetorical fourth wall. In the same way that Tirso de Molina obligates Catalinón to tolerate Don Juan's lifestyle and exposes him to Don Juan's circumstances, Alonso de Córdoba commands Colchón to bear the burden of having Don Juan as his master. Unfortunately for Colchón, evenings spent in the company of ghosts constitute a key component of his duties. Ever the source of comic relief, Don Juan's accomplice is also complicitly involved in his master's misadventures. As the bystander, he may do nothing yet still feel compassion towards Don Juan's victims. To be sure, both Colchón and Catalinón express criticism at their masters' misdeeds. Contrarily, as a bystander, the *criado* may do nothing and feel pleasure at the victims' misfortune. There are no signs of this in either *El burlador* or *La venganza*. That said, the servant may facilitate a victim's misfortune in the way of finding and misusing information, arranging secret meetings,

delivering letters, and the like. For Córdoba, Colchón's displeasure is a necessary evil without which theatrical convention and the articulation of pleasure and pain – and *schadenfreude* – would otherwise be contravened.

Córdoba's *criado* presents an inversion of Catalinón with respect to the relationships between men and women and the joys and sorrows inherent in them. For instance, the aforementioned scene in *El burlador* in which Catalinón employs a play on the words *dar* and *tomar* assumes his encouragement of physical contact with a lady. Pleasure in that regard is reserved for a man. Colchón, on the other hand, finds neither enjoyment nor temptation in the pleasures of the flesh. That lack of interest is in stark contrast to his master's enchantment with Doña Ana. Following their debate on whether or not Don Juan has managed to attract or frighten Doña Ana with his bold and perhaps reckless approach, Juan turns the conversation to Colchón's prospects with Ana's *criada* Inés:

DON JUAN: [...][D]ime cómo te fue
 con la criada.

COLCHÓN: Se fue.

DON JUAN: ¿Y no hubo más?

COLCHÓN: Dos extremos:
 uno en ella de pedir
 y en mí otro de no dar,
 con que se quiso enojar
 y yo me quise reir. (I.519-525)

Colchón's inclination to laugh at Inés's unrequited advances suggests a form of active *schadenfreude* by proxy. That is to say that he is the reason for her misfortune but is not at all responsible for it. Because she has fallen in love with the disinterested servant sans any effort on his part to make it so, she is the agent (or proxy) of her own suffering (his rejection of her), the same misfortune that gives him pleasure. For Colchón, Inés's petition is comical; for her, his amusement at rejecting her is probably offensive.

Colchón's denial of Inés's request places him in a position of advantage and is therefore laced with superiority. As such, misfortune for him is perhaps warranted. In the grand scheme of the play he embodies disinterest in matters of the heart, representing a type of "hombre esquivo" for whom the final resolution following Don Juan's demise is monastic life: "¿Si he de acertar a salir / de la iglesia? El fin que tuvo / mi amo, mi conversión / ha de ser siendo cartujo" (III.721-724). Sufficiently terror-stricken at the conclusion of the play, Colchón earns himself a licence to leave violence, skirt-chasing and, above all, snake-eating spectres behind. He evidently does just that.

In addition to introducing Colchón and even Don Juan to fear in the exchanges with the statue of Don Gonzalo, Alonso de Córdoba introduces a curious detail: the apparition's manner of entry and exit when visiting Don Juan. As they await the arrival of the stone guest Juan says, "Mira, Colchón, si le abren," to which the servant replies, "¿Para qué, si ya está dentro / sin llamar ni abrirle?" (II.671-672). The stage direction then reads, "*Sale Don Gonzalo, en la forma del 'Convidado de Piedra'.*" Having entered without knocking or having physically opened the door, Don Gonzalo's ghost appears to have reserved no formalities of protocol when penetrating Don Juan's home space. This detail is unique in that it can retrospectively be associated with Don Juan's attempt at forcing entry to Gonzalo's own abode on the fateful night of the latter's death. Within this dinner scene decorum no longer applies. Córdoba appears to emphasise this when Don Juan offers to open the door for the departing ghost and is reminded, "Sin que me abriesen entré" (II.785). This is another of Córdoba's implicit allusions to Don Juan's loss of control, as well as the foreboding of the author's planned *schadenfroh* retribution.

Vengeance undoubtedly plays an important role in *La venganza*. Several of the *dramatis personae* have good reason to seek revenge against Don Juan, not the least of which is Doña Ana. Both the loss of her father and the threat of losing Mota assuredly warrant reprisal: “¡Ea, que sí; muera don Juan / para que viva mi honor!” (III.379-380). Mota’s admitted jealousy towards his adversary likewise arouses the need to retaliate: “[S]on ofensas de marido / las que resuelvo a vengar” (I.940-941). With much to answer for as the end draws near, Don Juan’s reckless abandon still leads him to believe that his deeds have been inconsequential. It is conceivable that the reason for his escape from the *Asistente* in the final moments of the play is for Córdoba to surrender him to Don Gonzalo, through whom God will exact divine punishment: “Es de Dios / mi venganza” (III.663-664), states Gonzalo. For the playwright, too, it seems that this is justice. Any other punishment would be unsuitable.

The rhetorical value of *schadenfreude* is again evident when, as a final act of shaming, Alonso de Córdoba subjects his protagonist to contempt in such a way that Don Juan’s final moments with the ghost of Don Gonzalo are witnessed by the *Asistente*, who notes the following:

Junto al sepulcro
 de don Gonzalo, o me engaño,
 determino algunos bultos.
 Yo me acerco. Mas ¡qué veo!
 Cenando con un difunto
 don Juan está. ¡Caso raro!
 Desde aquí todos ocultos
 el fin de tan gran prodigio
 esperemos. (III.616-624)

Don Juan then has a brief exchange with the ghost of Gonzalo before the *Asistente* continues:

Don Gonzalo es con quien cena,

y algún celestial impulso
 dispuso que yo llegase
 a este tiempo y que ninguno
 de cuantos lo ven desmaye,
 siendo así que aun yo me turbo. (III.653-658)

The “celestial impulso” represents Córdoba, whose machinations of all the circumstances facilitate this outcome. Don Juan is overheard by these on-lookers confessing to the murder of Don Gonzalo and thus affording confirmation of his guilt as well as vindication for the Marquis. For Don Juan the aftereffect is death, and unlike with *El burlador*, there is never any regret or repentance in his final moments – only reproach for Gonzalo for allowing Doña Ana’s betrothal to the Marquis. Thus Don Juan’s journey from nobility to condemnation reaches its lowest point. For his victims, however, the outcome is life. Both the *Asistente* and Doña Ana express sorrow at the tragic aftermath, but Alonso de Córdoba, not to mention the public, is able to take pleasure in this resolution, satisfied that the malcontent has paid the ultimate price.

A fundamental reason for Don Juan’s fate emerges during supper with the ghost when reproachful singing warns him that pleasure and youth are deceitful. He answers saying, “Todo dura lo que quiero; / todo se sujeta a mí / y nada obedece al tiempo” (II.718-720). These words echo Tirso’s “Tan largo me lo fiáis” but lack the religious implications of disobedience. Don Juan puts the final nail in his proverbial coffin by later adding: “Si el mundo me teme a mí / y si yo al mundo no temo, / ¿caducas mis esperanzas / ya presumís en sus riesgos?” (II.751-754). Unfortunately for Don Juan, a change is never as good as a rest, and so the new-found sensitivity and loyalty bestowed by the playwright fail to deliver a restorative denouement. His conversion from trickster to devotee is ultimately overruled by Córdoba, who opts to demoralise Don Juan.

2.3. The Reader or Viewer as the Writer

It is curious, though not surprising, that Alonso de Córdoba was compelled to try his hand at dramaturgy and compose a play based so intimately on the infamous figure of Don Juan Tenorio with which he was clearly familiar. Whether the exercise was for him a form of catharsis or simply a frivolous desire may never come to light. Given the little that we know about Córdoba and his motivations, it is at least fair to conjecture that he had a need to cultivate his interests, among them the realm of literature through which to actively engage in literary *schadenfreude*. Richard Smith explains the motivations of *schadenfroh* behaviour in this way: “If *schadenfreude* arises to the extent that we gain from another’s misfortune, then any natural tendencies we have to favor our own self-interests should further this pleasure” (xiii). The mere existence of the text is indicative of a powerful inclination to re-write the history of a fictional character and subject that personage to an entirely new sensibility and a different kind of misfortune – that of unrequited love. Romance, as of the late seventeenth century, still eluded Don Juan despite his efforts to prove himself a worthy suitor and a man of honour.

Though it remains unclear whether or not *La venganza* was performed publicly, it is safe to assume that an audience would at the very least have been familiar with Tirso’s *burlador* and would therefore have been able to recognise certain aspects of Córdoba’s play – the protagonist, his history, his reputation, and the like. As such, viewers (or readers) may also have been able to recognise weaknesses in Córdoba’s work.

Accustomed to the Don Juan of early- to mid-century fame who deceived and evaded capture with the utmost precision, reception of Córdoba’s less-than-suave Don Juan may

have straddled a fence between celebratory acceptance of the new lovely type, or scornful wonder at the sentimentality of their hero.

By subjecting his character to the rejection and disdain of an honourable woman, Córdoba constructed an inversion of Tirso de Molina's trickster, turning the "burlador de Sevilla" into a "burlado de Sevilla." Not only do pleas for a promise of marriage go unanswered at first, the would-be bride resorts to distraction and the deceitful rhetoric that leads Don Juan to readily believe the very promises she means never to fulfill. Don Juan's single happiest moment is encapsulated in the few verses in which Ana appears to agree to marry him:

Si a ser mi esposo aspiráis,
todo está ya en mi favor,
pues me obligáis con amor
cuando marido me honráis.
[...]
Vuestra soy, vuestra nací.
(Si supiera que le engaño
segunda vez.) (II.91-101)

His response is this: "Loco estoy, que de otra suerte / no cumple bien mi alegría" (II.109-110). Notwithstanding, he spends the remainder of the play chasing a dream and in the end succumbs to the will of a phantom. A pitiful figure par excellence, this Don Juan's ignorance of his inadequacies leads to his downfall, which is in turn a source of pleasure for an audience and was presumably so for the dramaturge.

Indeed, Alonso de Córdoba's is not the only donjuanesque figure that is replete with inadequacies in spite of a powerful inclination to love. As shall be seen in the chapter that follows, the tables are turned when a woman lives up to the changeability attributed to her gender in the Spanish Golden Age. Once again, a woman practices deceit, but her motives are quite exceptional.

CHAPTER 3 – *La traición en la amistad*

3.1. From Don Juan to Doña Juana

Fortune, it has been said, favours the brave. Those of us who establish goals and pursue them with vim and vigour might at last reap the benefits of those efforts. Periodically, though, one's pursuits may stem purely from self-interest and misguided desires, leaving the misfortunes of other people in their wake. Such is the case with the donjuanesque figure Fenisa in María de Zayas y Sotomayor's comedy *La traición en la amistad*, whose perhaps well-intentioned ambition to love vastly surpasses the boundaries of decency, even morality. Although she is not the only character in the play that embodies *donjuanismo*, as we will see, Fenisa represents the gravest of traitors in that her libertinesque tendencies threaten and effectively destroy her relationships with other women, with whom there should be solidarity. In Zayas's play, womanhood takes the lead in transgression, but it also acts swiftly to redress this misbehaviour.

Although we cannot speak of feminism as an ideal that existed in early modern Spain, it is still fitting to speak of a feminine voice that emerged in the literature of that era. Women – especially those belonging to the lower classes – were gravely under-represented in the socio-political and cultural spheres of the time, but also in the realm of literature, particularly with respect to authorship. Representative female authors of the male-dominated dramatic genre in the Spanish Golden Age are few, but among them, María de Zayas y Sotomayor (c.1590-?) openly challenged the status quo. Best known for composing two collections of *novelas*, the *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* (1637) and

Desengaños amorosos (1647), her only extant theatrical work *La traición en la amistad* was written sometime between 1628 and 1632. While her short novels were extremely well received by the public during her lifetime, no record of performance exists for her play. We do know that a manuscript of her play was read by her peers, among them Juan Pérez de Montalbán who referred to Zayas as the “Décima musa de nuestro siglo” (Soufas 273).²³ As a woman among the many pre-eminent male playwrights of her time, her position of nobility aided in the awareness and publication of her works. Her *novelas* address very real and weighty issues such as sexuality, violence, and love, all of which involve the male gender. Zayas, concludes Lisa Vollendorf,

indicts many men and a handful of women for their malicious treatment of women. For the most part, Zayas’s texts rebuke unvirtuous, undignified, and often lower-class or somehow othered women. The ‘evil’ or ‘unvirtuous’ women receive their harsh criticism, condemned by the narrators as traitors to women’s cause. (207)

Although stated in the context of her novels, Vollendorf’s remarks also ring true with Zayas’s play. The violation of women in *La traición en la amistad*, hereafter *La traición*, assumes the guise of a woman’s betrayal of female solidarity. This warrants the kind of punitive action inculcated with *schadenfreude*. Much in the same way that Alonso de Córdoba utilises *schadenfreude* as a literary technique in *La vengaza en el sepulcro*, María de Zayas relies on *schadenfreude* as a rhetorical device that she utilises against the waywardness of the donjuanesque protagonist Fenisa.

²³ The title of ‘Décima musa’ resonates with another prolific female writer of the Golden Age: Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz (1648-1695), also known as the ‘Décima musa’ or ‘Décima musa mexicana’. Principally engaged in the composition of poetry, Sor Juana also composed *loas* and sacramental *autos* in addition to producing a satirical *comedia* in 1683 called *Los empeños de una casa* (based on the work of Pedro Calderón de la Barca), co-authoring with Fray Juan de Guevara the mythological comedy *Amor es más laberinto* (1689), and completing Agustín de Salazar y Torres’s *La segunda Celestina* (1676) following his death. Scholarship on Sor Juana and her corpus is extensive, but for our purposes it suffices to point out that she was extremely vocal in championing the rights of women, particularly with respect to their intellectual endeavours.

The story of *La traición* centres on two best friends, Marcia and Fenisa, who find themselves at odds when the young gallant Liseo infiltrates their sorority. In the opening scene we learn that Marcia and Liseo locked eyes with each other while on a stroll and, invariably, fell for one another.²⁴ Marcia then reveals a small portrait of Liseo to Fenisa, who is likewise instantly enamoured of him, thus setting into motion the course of the play. Fenisa decides to make it her mission to steal Liseo from Marcia, who is already being pursued by Gerardo. Not only is Liseo on Fenisa's list of conquests but she also victimises Marcia's cousin, Belisa, by wooing the latter's lover, Don Juan. Liseo, meanwhile, has previously enjoyed the favours of Laura but has grown tired of her. The dishonoured Laura, having caught wind of her lover's deceitful ways, discovers that it is Marcia to whom he has attached himself. Imploring the ever-prudent and like-minded Marcia – Liseo's now-preferred lady – Laura soon sets about righting wrongs. Marcia gladly relinquishes her attachment to Liseo. She and Laura conspire to see to it that Liseo fulfill his promise to Laura, and also that Don Juan reject Fenisa and return to Belisa. Following a series of *enredos* involving letters, cloaks, and assumed identities, Fenisa's deceitful ways come to light. Don Juan is first to reconcile with Belisa after he learns of Fenisa's deceptions. Gerardo, whose love for Marcia never waivers despite his beloved's rejection as well as Fenisa's efforts to seduce him, unites with Marcia, who recognises the error of her ways in having rebuffed him for the likes of Liseo. Liseo, finally bored with the duplicitous Fenisa whom he had planned only to enjoy and then deceive, regrets his mistreatment and abandonment of Laura, whom he believes has chosen to become a nun – this was part of Laura and Marcia's plot. Determined to marry

²⁴ The Golden-Age *tópico* of love entering through the eyes, and at first sight, is exercised to its fullest extent in this play. Physical beauty – that of both Marcia and Liseo – is sufficient for romantic enthrallment.

Marcia he visits her with the purpose of expressing his desire and is tricked into vowing commitment to Laura, even signing a declaration of the same. Thus the re-coupling of suited pairs. Fenisa, having lost Don Juan, Gerardo, Liseo, and eventually an otherwise romantically unattached young man named Lauro – the only other male companion of Fenisa’s to make a stage appearance – ultimately finds herself repudiated and alone.

Fenisa’s insatiable need not for one man but a multitude touches on an aspect of femininity that transcends action and translates into psychological realms. As previously mentioned, analysing the psychology of a fictional character poses challenges that cannot be resolved with concrete evidence, but it does allow one to make hypotheses about those characters. The issue of feminine psychology, then, warrants its share of consideration. As active as Fenisa is in entertaining men, the irrationality that emerges in her discourse gives an indication as to her thought process (and the reasons for which Zayas must eventually castigate her):

Estimo a don Juan, adoro
a mi querido Liseo,
gusto de escuchar a Laur[o],
y por los demás me pierdo.
Y si apartase de mí
qualquiera destes sujetos,
quedaría despoblado
de gente y gusto mi peçho. (vv.2353-2360)

Companionship, lust, excess, and the fear of being alone are all factors that drive Fenisa. Almost compulsive in nature, these needs can never be satisfied. By the conclusion of the play she has unravelled, saying to Marcia, “[He venido a] quejarme que consientas / que don Juan hable a tu prima / siendo mi esposo” (vv.2800-2802). She seems to lose touch with reality, and a mild form of paranoia takes hold. Although any unattached man will do, Fenisa is also evidently the type of woman who freely preys on those men who

are spoken for. This is strongly suggested in the first *jornada* when her servant Lucía announces that Gerardo and Lauro await her company:

LUÇÍA: Gerardo está allá fuera y quiere hablarte,
y Lauro ha más de una hora que te aguarda.
FENISA: Sean muy bienvenidos. Di, Luçía,
que entre Gerardo y me aguarde Lauro.
LUÇÍA: ¿Tanto estimas la vista destes hombres?
FENISA: Sólo porque me aguardan. ¿No te digo,
Luçía, lo que estimo su presençia?
Anda, no aguarden; di a Gerardo que entre. (vv.1477-1484)

The not-altogether-subtle implication is that the gentleman who is already committed to another woman – Gerardo only desires Marcia – in spite of having recently arrived takes precedence over the man who is uncommitted but has been waiting for a longer period of time. Through Zayas’s rhetorical machinations Fenisa’s preference for gentlemen who have established relationships with other women reinforces her notoriety as an unprincipled and narcissistic woman. These traits have the potential to enhance an audience’s pleasure in any misfortune that may befall her.

For María de Zayas y Sotomayor, the model of Don Juan is embodied by a strong, resolute, and regrettably shameful woman. According to Valerie Hegstrom, this female character personifies a *mujer varonil* because she does not adhere to the values of feminine honourability that the women who are victimised by Don Juans in other plays typically represent (16). The implications of this statement are two-fold: first, it suggests that the display of *donjuanismo* is more befitting of the male gender rather than female; the second proposition, which must be taken with a grain of salt, is that Fenisa’s betrayal is therefore the result of masculine rather than feminine duplicity, a matter that then excuses her behaviour as not in fact stemming from womanhood, and thus not warranting punishment for breaching a female alliance. This second implication hints at the

deflection of culpability on the grounds of gender, but as already mentioned, in this play Zayas emphasises female solidarity and, in particular, the consequences of failing to adhere to the tenets of female friendship. Of the latter Fenisa is fully culpable. The main consequence is what Monica Leoni terms the “[v]indictive expulsion” of Fenisa from women’s society of the seventeenth century (66). Such banishment supports the theory that through the act of writing her work, Zayas was exercising an inclination to subject Fenisa to scorn and was thus actively engaging in *schadenfro*h behaviour.

Fenisa embodies *donjuanismo* in the self-interest and lack of concern for the effects her actions have on others. Nevertheless, she differs from the other donjuanesque figures in her motives for seeking many lovers. Whereas Tirso’s Don Juan labours to win women over, deceive and later abandon them, and Córdoba’s Don Juan commits to one woman after failing to seduce any other, Fenisa aims to seduce as well as maintain meaningful and intimate relations with the many men to whom she is drawn. Evidence of this can be traced in a sonnet she recites in the second act of the play following a re-affirmation of affection between herself and Liseo, who is in fact using her:

Gallarda condición, Cupido, tengo,
 muchos amantes en mi alma caben;
 mi nuevo amartelar todas alaben,
 guardando la opinión que yo mantengo.
 Hombres, así vuestros engaños vengo,
 guárdenos dellas neçias que no saben,
 aunque más su firmeza menoscaben,
 entretenerse como me entretengo.
 Si un amante se ausenta, enoja o muere,
 no ha de quedar la voluntad baldía,
 porque es la ociosidad muy çivil cosa.
 Mal haya la que sólo un hombre quiere,
 que tener uno solo es cobardía;
 naturaleza es vana y es hermosa. (vv.1463-1476)

Fenisa's lovely convictions are clear, but her motivations are misguided and suspicious. Citing vengeance against the deceptions of men as the influential force behind her passions, Fenisa instead comes to exemplify lust and excess, thus giving spectators a motive for enjoying her undoing. Her errant sentiments, grand as they may be, are laced with spitefulness – “Honbres, así vuestros engaños vengo” (v.1467). Essentially, her ambivalent nature of claiming to love men yet seeking revenge against them leads her astray. This vengefulness may in fact be a means of coping with rejection or the fear of it, yet ultimately neither lust nor vindictiveness prove beneficial.

In a bid to convince Gerardo that she can be his refuge, Fenisa speaks ill of Marcia, revealing to him that her best friend is in pursuit of the dashing Liseo. To this Gerardo becomes indignant, telling the seductress, “¡Calla, lengua de serpiente! / ¡Calla, amiga destes tienpos! / ¡Calla, desleal, y advierte / que he de adorar aquel ángel!” (vv.1570-1573). For Fenisa, however, the challenge appears to make Gerardo all the more attractive:

FENISA:	Gerardo, Gerardo, ¡escucha! ¡Óyeme, señor, y vuelve! ¡Que con aquesas ynjurias amartelada me tienes!
LUÇÍA:	Señora, ¿por qué hazes esto, y sin mirar lo que pierdes?
FENISA:	Tienes razón. ¡Ay, Luçía, enredo notable es éste! ¡Traición en tanta amistad! Mas, discurso sabio, tente, que no hay gloria como andar engañando pisaverdes.
LUÇÍA:	Mira, que Lauro te aguarda.
FENISA:	Vamos.
LUÇÍA:	Temeraria eres.
FENISA:	Calla, que en esto he de ser estremo de la mugeres. (vv.1583-1598)

There is no end to Fenisa's betrayal. Though she claims to love the men in her life she expresses her secondary purpose: "[engañar] pisaverdes."²⁵ The assumption, then, is that she also considers Gerardo among the young and arrogant bachelors who must be deceived. Because she presumes Marcia to be enraptured by Liseo, Fenisa takes advantage of what she perceives as Gerardo's singlehood. Fully aware of her own errant ways and the treachery in which she is engaged, Fenisa elects to suppress her reasoning and feelings of guilt, allowing them to be overruled by the pleasures of romancing the young man. In this she finds glory. Ironically, by stopping reason in its tracks – "Mas, discurso sabio, tente..." – she simultaneously marks consciousness of the same, but her actions are dictated by reckless passion and an inflated ego, which she expresses as admirable qualities – "[H]e de ser / extremo de la mugeres." Thus the playwright's portrayal of feminine duplicity, which must be reprimanded.

It is ironic that María de Zayas's heroine is aware of her treachery and the possible aftermath yet protests when those she has betrayed look to avenge themselves. In a letter confessing her love for Liseo, Fenisa justifies her betrayal of Marcia, saying, "[A]mor no mira amistades, / ni respecta parentescos," and almost in anticipation of the outcome of the story she quickly adds, "No se queda sin castigo / mi amoroso atrevimiento" (vv.494-499). This last statement is in stark contrast to the vengeance she later demands against the women she has offended. In the final moments of the play she confronts Belisa, threatening violence and seeking retribution for the wrongs done unto her. Marcia intervenes, to which Fenisa exclaims: "Marçia, no puede mi ofensa / dejar la venganza" (vv.2782-2783). Fenisa's statement reflects a deeply self-obsessed individual

²⁵ Bárbara López-Mayhew defines a *pisaverde* as "un joven muy presumido." See note 71 on p.107 of her edition of *La traición en la amistad*.

whose actions do not match her words. Calls for admonition cannot go unanswered by Zayas, who is continually weaving the web in which Fenisa will find herself trapped through the author's active *schadenfreude*.

Zayas's "Doña Juana" inevitably loses the respect of her closest friend, Marcia, as well as the other ladies in her circle. What of the level of respect Fenisa secures in the eyes of the men she solicits? Working under the assumption that men value that which they have earned and quickly tire of that which is easily obtained, one can comprehend the short-lived desire that Fenisa inspires in Liseo, Don Juan, as well as Lauro. Beyond being extremely accessible, Fenisa labours to attract the attention of suitors, and because she is easily conquered, the challenge of having her entertain them is non-existent. The men soon lose interest, and this is ruinous for Fenisa. Duly deserved, Fenisa's comeuppance allows an audience the pleasure of her misfortune.

Having observed *schadenfreude* in Tirso de Molina's Don Juan Tenorio as well as that of Alonso de Córdoba, one might expect the same of María de Zayas's "Doña Juana." Nevertheless, Fenisa operates against the grain in this regard. At no point does Fenisa derive pleasure from her betrayal of Marcia, Laura, or Belisa. Perhaps it stands to reason that Fenisa should be denied the experience of *schadenfreude*, which requires a level of self-assuredness. That is, she lacks the confidence to take pleasure in her friends' trials because her moral sense leaves her doubtful of her own enterprises. Evidence of this doubt is noted the instant she resolves to supplant Marcia and seduce Liseo:

Pierda la vista de Marçia
 quien piença ganar la vista
 de la gala de Liseo.
 ¿Hay más notable desdicha?
 ¿Soy amiga? Sí. Pues, ¿cómo
 pretendo contra mi amiga

tan alevosa traición?
 ¡Amor, de en medio te quita!
 ¡Jesús! El alma te abrasa.
 ¿Dónde, voluntad, caminas,
 contra Marçia, tras Liseo?
 ¿No miras que vas perdida?
 El amor y la amistad,
 furiosos golpes se tiran;
 cayó la amistad en tierra
 y amor vitoria apellida.
 Téngala yo, çiego Dios,
 en tan dudosa conquista. (vv.159-176)

Schadenfreude permits no room for a conscience in conflict. There is a distinct possibility that “Zayas wrote a play primarily about women for a primarily female audience” (Bayliss 13). One might then make the judgement that Zayas associates femininity with the readiness to possess a moral sense, and so Fenisa is cheated of all pleasure in seducing. True delight does not question its motives. Tirso’s Don Juan is extremely self-assured and allows himself the freedom to draw every last trace of enjoyment that he can in the wake of his villainy. While Córdoba’s Don Juan is not the most fitting representation of confidence, his determination and the belief in his own cause facilitate his enjoyment of his victims’ pain. María de Zayas does not allow the insatiable Fenisa the indulgence of wayward delight. Restricted to her interactions with men, Fenisa’s pleasure proves singularly male-focused – much to the conceivable chagrin of a reader who possesses feminist sensibilities – yet men never truly satisfy her. Zayas assigns to Fenisa the capacity to feel guilt (at first) even in the midst of her contrivances to court and conquer her already-betrothed male companions. By the conclusion of the play, the desperation to hold onto her companions takes her guilt over and she is never able to enjoy the fruits of her labour. Remorse emerges fleetingly when she discovers that Don Juan has reunited with Belisa: “Ya parece que Cupido / ofendido de mí está”

(vv.2297-2298). Lamentably, her remorsefulness fails to endure. This is arguably one of Fenisa's most objectionable traits, only following her betrayal of the sisterhood she previously maintained.

As noted with Córdoba's *La venganza en el sepulcro*, group dynamics play a role in experiencing *schadenfreude*. It is no surprise that human beings treat members within their own groups preferentially (Portmann 17), and because Fenisa ruptures the ties that bind women, a group that is socially repressed in the male-dominant culture of seventeenth-century Spain, she commits an injustice against the very group with which an alliance is crucial. Zayas thus chooses to portray Fenisa as a siren whose desires for male companionship blind her to her own hypocrisy. The existence of this love-lorn maiden appears to be an indictment of the treachery in courtly life. Her preference for the company of men – who constitute the “other” as opposed to the “self” – guarantees backlash from her own group. As Belisa explains: “[A] las mugeres de prendas / les basta para castigo / no hazer, don Juan, caso dellas” (vv.1741-1743). Zayas then makes an appearance through Belisa, who attempts to point out to Juan the role of a real woman: “Ninguna muger, / si se tiene por discreta / pone en op[i]nión su honor, / siendo joya a que se quiebra” (vv.1764-1767). It is never expressed whether or not Fenisa's “honour” remains intact or with whom she may have shared it. Irrespective of this detail, her moral compass is entirely compromised by those deeds for which she never shows repentance. The imposition of shame, antipathy, and dereliction upon Fenisa becomes a means of administering justice in addition to being a source of amusement not necessarily for her group within the play but for the reading (or viewing) public.

As her world begins to crumble with the deterioration of her relationships and news of the couples' reunions reaches her, Fenisa calls for vengeance. She swears to her servant Lucía, “¡Yo he de vengarme! / Luçía, no hay que tratar; / yo los tengo de matar, / no tienes que aconsejarme” (vv.2325-2328). With that, she vows to exact violent justice on behalf of the unjust – that is, on her own behalf. Of punishment she opines the following in a soliloquy:

Si, mi amor, un alma porque tiene
 sufrimiento en sus penas y tormentos,
 yo, amor, que amando a muchos, mucho siento;
 no es razón que tu audiència me condene.
 Razón más justa, amor, será que pene
 la que tiene tan corto pensamiento,
 que no acaben en él amantes çiento
 y amando a todos juntos se entretiene.
 Si quien sólo uno ama premio espera,
 con más razón mi alma le mereze,
 pues tengo los amantes a dozenas. (vv.2365-2375)

Fenisa's reasoning, though logical, misses yet another mark representative of moral rectitude. Hindered by tunnel vision until the very end, she makes repeated calls for justice for the ills committed against her. This is evidence of her hypocrisy. Neglecting entirely the role she plays in her own misfortune, her final words in the play are: “¡Justiçia, çielos, justiçia / sobre aquesta casa venga!” (vv.2895-2896). Deficient in composure, Fenisa surrenders her reasoning and enlightenment. In a comparative analysis of *La traición* and its antecedent *El burlador*, Catherine Larson notes Zayas's double standard in the inherent disapproval of her female characters' propensity to challenge their traditional feminine roles (133). The liberated Fenisa also becomes a target of this double standard. No longer innocent, no longer submissive, no longer obedient, and perhaps no longer chaste, Fenisa's life is the picture of ethical derailment for which dissociation from her social circle is a just remedy.

There is, to be sure, good cause to strive to rein this free-spirited character in: too much freedom can lead to feelings of superiority. A recurrent issue in Fenisa's discourse is that she ironically fancies herself godly. For instance, late in the first act of the play we learn that there are ten men with whom she is involved, and she refers to them as her "commandments": "Dies amantes me adoren y yo a todos / los adoro, los quiero, los estimo; / [...] / Estos llamen desde hoy, quien lo supiere, / los mandamientos de la gran Fenisa" (vv.1518-1523). This is a clear indicator of pride – again, one of the seven deadly sins. Fenisa then offers to become Gerardo's "templo santo" (v.1566). By the third act, her heavenly disposition is the reason she can love one and all:

FENISA:	[A] todos quantos quiero yo me ynclino. Los quiero, los estimo y los adoro, a los feos, hermosos, mozos, viejos, ricos y pobres, sólo por ser hombres. Tengo la condición del mismo cielo, que como Él tiene asiento para todos, a todos doy lugar dentro en mi pecho.
LUÇÍA:	También en el ynfierno hay muchas sillas y las ocupan más que no en el cielo. (vv.2392-2400)

Like Tirso's *burlador*, Fenisa does not discriminate. Indeed, her heart is open to any and all subjects willing to dwell therein. Unfortunately, adulterous behaviour – hers as well as that of her lovers – flies in the face of the real *mandamientos*. In seeing herself as a godly figure she likewise fails to note the covetousness of her actions, and in exegetical terms, coveting her neighbours' partners is as ironic or satirical as it is sinful. Discipline is therefore incumbent and it is exacted by Zayas in the most subtle of ways. Whereas Tirso and Córdoba are aggressive in the castigation of their respective Don Juans – with the grand theatrics of the ghost and fire and hell –, Zayas's "Doña Juana" is evidently contemptible to such a degree that she is unworthy of even the smallest gesture of rebuke.

That is, despite every effort to stand out in the hearts of men, her punishment is simply abandonment and loneliness. This is perhaps the most just of deserts for Fenisa in that what she desires most – attention – she is least entitled to and denied in the end.

Denial plays a part in one other aspect of Zayas's dramatic work. The final scene of the play has a distinctly Tirsian feature that ties the play back to Don Juan's fate in *El burlador* as well as *La venganza*, and that is the hand motif. In *La traición* it is Fenisa who assumes the role of the supplicator, although it is not for mercy that she begs but for a man's hand in marriage:

MARÇIA: Liseo, cosa ynposible
es apartar lo que ordena
el çielo; pues Laura es tuya,
por mí tu mano merezca.

FENISA: Liseo, pues eres mío,
lo que hazes considera,
cunple con mi obligación.

MARÇIA: ¿Qué ha de cunplir? Calla neçia,
que sólo por ser muger
no te eçho por la escalera.
¿Dudas, Liseo? Que esto,
pues, para que egenplo tengas,
mira como doy mi mano
a Gerardo porque sea
premiada su voluntad.

GERARDO: De rodillas en la tierra
la reçibo, Marçia mía.
Al fin vençió mi paziencia,
bien enpleados trabajos.

LISEO: Laura, mi ventura es ésta.

LAURA: No dirás sino la mía.

LISEO: Ésta es mi mano y con ella
el alma, pue[s], será tuya.

FENISA: ¿Que aquesto mis ojos vean?
Dame la mano, don Juan;
pues quiere el çielo que sean
tuyas mis humildes partes.

DON JUAN: Di a Belisa que consienta
en ello.

FENISA: Sólo tu gusto,
don Juan, puede hazerte fuerza.
Acaba, dame tu mano.

BELISA: Desvíate a un lado, neçia,

que don Juan no ha de ser tuyo
 mientras el cielo me tenga
 viva, porque es ya mi esposo.
 DON JUAN: Yo soy, Belisa discreta,
 él que ganó en tal partido. (vv.2837-2873)

In the midst of these manual exchanges even Liseo's servant León ceases the opportunity to mock Fenisa, turning to her servant and saying, "Luçía, no te detengas; / dame de presto esa mano, / que según Fenisa queda, / pienso que ha de asir de mí" (vv.2874-2877). The scene is comedic and tragic all at once. To add insult to injury, León closes the play addressing the audience thus: "Señores míos, Fenisa / qual ven, sin amantes queda; / si alguno la quiere, avise / para que su casa sepa" (vv.2911-2914). In this manner the couples are reconstituted while the author simultaneously, and perhaps pleasurably, washes her hands of her troublesome and troubling Fenisa through her rhetorical yet active schadenfreude.

By way of the feminised Don Juan archetype, duplicity meets multiplicity, the result of which is slander for the perpetrator, as well as punitive isolation. Through the voice of Fenisa's servant Lucía, Zayas makes a plea for women's temperance and discernment in dealing with the opposite sex:

LUÇÍA: [...] Buena te ponen los hombres,
 pero no es mucho que penes,
 que dar gusto a tantos hombres,
 yn posible me parece.
 FENISA: Deja las burlas, Luçía.
 LUÇÍA: Ya verás, llamarlas puedes
 las que dan tanto pesar;
 y si por burlas las tienes,
 no hay sino tener amantes
 y sufrir lo que viniere.
 Burlas, yo las doy al diablo.
[A las mujeres del público]
 Señoras, las que entretienen,
 tomen egenplo en Fenisa;
 hu[y]an destos pisaverdes. (vv.2462-2475)

The warning is explicit: “Ladies beware, for it is not possible to please all men. And so, break away from young, arrogant men!” Still, to wholly chastise Fenisa poses a problem. Constance Wilkins calls attention to Fenisa actively “[bursting] the constraints on women’s freedom of sexual expression” (quoted in Hegstrom 18). This is the very sort of expression denied women of the Spanish Golden Age and which was considered contrary to social as well as familial integrity. With this in mind, it may not be the power of sexuality that Zayas censures in Fenisa but rather the indiscriminate and misguided unleashing of that sexuality not only onto a multitude of male subjects but also onto those men who are spoken for and who therefore have obligations to their respective romantic partners.

3.2. Men at Court

It should be noted that Fenisa is not the only personage guilty of philandering in *La traición*. Both Don Juan and Liseo deviate from their loved ones in favour of the seductress Fenisa. Of the two men, however, Liseo is most changeable. Having enjoyed and dispensed with Laura, he pursues Marcia. He then instantaneously veers from Marcia after receiving and reading a letter from Fenisa, planning, still, to deceive this latest of love interests: “Divina Marçia, perdona / si en no ser leal te ofendo, / que a Fenisa voy a ver, / y aun a engañarla si puedo” (vv.610-613); and, “León, si yo a Fenisa galanteo, / es con engaños, burlas y mentiras; / no más de cunplir con mi deseo” (vv.1298-1300). With these words he is, in theory, already working towards María de Zayas’s retribution. Nonetheless, that the author creates both male and female representatives of donjuanesque behaviour leads to what Robert Bayliss calls Zayas’s “ideological ambivalence” (9). The reason is simply that Liseo, in spite of his

unfaithfulness, does not receive the sort of punishment handed down to Fenisa. In fact, despite speaking ill of Laura and showing signs of disdain towards her – “[Sus] penas estimo en nada / [...] y haga de sí lo que dize / la ya aborreçida Laura!” (vv.1316-1320) –, Liseo experiences a change of heart and, prompted by revelations of Fenisa’s infidelity, recalibrates himself to return to Laura. That is, Zayas overlooks Liseo’s womanising, granting him the “happy ending” typical of a *comedia*. Is regret and seeing the error of his ways Zayas’s way of assigning repentance? Perhaps. Cruelty towards Laura should be a catalyst for his downfall because it is she who Liseo is obligated to marry following the consummation of their relationship.²⁶ Still, Liseo escapes being the subject of Zayas’s *schadenfreude*.

Likewise an escapee, whether or not it is justified, is Don Juan. It remains unclear whether or not he and Marcia’s cousin Belisa are lovers, but they are certainly a pair. Juan’s character reveals a somewhat feeble gentleman. He goes to Marcia’s home and finding Belisa there asks the latter whether Fenisa might be keeping Marcia’s company. This, of course, sparks jealousy and rage in Belisa, another woman scorned. Her suspicions, immediately and harshly voiced to Juan at that moment, suffice first to extract from him an admission of having had an interest in Fenisa, and secondly to have him instantly retract that interest. Her power of rhetoric, which essentially entails making Juan feel extraordinarily guilty, achieves what Laura cannot. Following Don Juan’s pleas for forgiveness, Belisa has a change of heart and declares her love for him. Again, this swift turn of events may explain the immunity from dramaturgical *schadenfreude* that María de Zayas grants to Juan.

²⁶ The ease with which Laura acquiesces to Liseo is the reason he loses interest in her. This may explain why Zayas temporarily causes her to suffer the pain of rejection.

Of the three high-ranking male *dramatis personae*, Gerardo is the most exemplary due to his fierce rejection of Fenisa and remaining steadfast and true to his commitment to Marcia, in spite of the latter's initial disinterest. Oddly, however, *schadenfreude* surfaces in this character, albeit as a response to Marcia's indifference. Frustrated and despondent, Gerardo bemoans her dismissiveness:

¡O, Dafne fugetiva
y aun más yngrata que ella,
pues huyes de tu amante
quando amarle debieras!
Plegue a Dios que el que amares
te deje qual me dejas,
pues a mí, que te adoro,
desdeñosa desprecias.
[...]
Plegue a los çielos, Marçia,
pues mi pasión te alegra,
que ante tus fieros ojos
muerto a Gerardo veas. (vv.711-734).

The pain Gerardo feels is articulated through the (plausibly) insincere hope that Marcia be forsaken by her new love interest in the same manner that she has forsaken him. In his comments, Gerardo projects the satisfaction he would theoretically experience through his beloved's suffering. Marcia may indeed be deserving of any misfortune that comes her way because of the manner in which she shuns Gerardo, the same apathy for which fickle donjuanesque men are reprimanded by the ladies to whom they are promised.²⁷ In any case, by virtue of his unwavering love for Marcia, Gerardo forges a uniquely heroic identity that allows him to prevail as the only male *dramatis persona* never to vacillate between two or more lovers.

²⁷A question might arise with respect to Marcia's perceived changeability and Zayas not administering punishment to her. Why should Marcia, who causes Gerardo to suffer, escape castigation? What an audience is informed of is that Gerardo has for many a year pursued and professed his adoration for Marcia. Notwithstanding, there is no evidence of his having "enjoyed" her, nor of her having entertained or surrendered to him. Marcia's attitude towards Gerardo, then, is one of indifference or perhaps diffidence rather than disdain.

3.3. The Ungracious *Gracioso*

Having thus discussed the aristocratic male representatives of María de Zayas's play, we can now turn our attention to the other significant *schadenfreude*-related personage in *La traición*. As is common in Golden-Age Spanish theatre, the servant's pleasure is frequently at the expense of his master. In fact, *criados* – who double as *graciosos* – are often the antitheses of their masters, particularly in matters concerning women. Liseo's servant León takes centre stage as the vehicle of impertinence as well as physical humour. Not named for bravery as his name might imply, León is referred to by Belisa as a “rey de las fieras” (v.2631) and as such bears the characteristics of a wild and dissolute individual.

Liseo's servant is the epitome of a Lothario not only with respect to his own lifestyle but also with his responsibilities as Liseo's advisor. The encouragement of an affair between his master and Fenisa is a strong indicator of León's wayward ways: “[E]res neçio [Liseo] / si no goças la ocasión, / pues te ofreçe sus cabellos” (vv.513-515). Ever a proponent of enjoying the company of women, León is ruled by passion rather than prudence, and although he champions Liseo's cavorting, his opinion of women can be summarised by this sentiment: “[S]i engañan los hombres, aprenderán / de los engaños que hay en las mugeres” (vv.2523-2524). Apparently, León is not convinced of women's capacity to love:

BELISA:	Mira, León, quando una muger ama ni busca fiestas ni [v]isita plaza, pasea calles, ni pretende fiestas.
LEÓN:	Tienes razón, quando una mu[g]er ama; mas tengo para mí que no hay ninguna, y si la hay es sola como fenis.
BELISA:	Pues esa fenis sola en mí la miras. (vv.2493-2499)

The cynical León “serves as Zayas’s spokesperson for decrying the hypocrisy prevalent in the Spanish court of the day” (Hegstrom 17). Through this servant of the court Zayas appears to take pleasure in disparaging the lifestyles of the noble classes or portraying negatively the concept of love as it was practiced by them in the seventeenth century. Contemporary courtly love, according to León, only expresses women’s deceitfulness.

León additionally serves as Zayas’s weapon of choice in the mockery of Liseo – or the upper class as a whole. In this way, the *gracioso* assumes active *schadenfreude*, taking every opportunity to deride and laugh at what he perceives to be his master’s foolishness. An example of this occurs when León presents to Liseo a letter of complaint from Laura, for whom Liseo has developed an intense aversion. The servant jests: “Tu condición, por Dios, me mueve a risa; / ¡que te tenga apetito desa suerte!” (vv.1306-1307).²⁸ Moreover, while observing a trite and quite melodramatic exchange between Liseo and Fenisa, León remarks (probably in an *aparte*): “¿Hay borraçhera como ésta? / Entre muelas derribadas / retoçando está la risa” (vv.1443-1445). The “muelas derribadas” of which León speaks are a reference to the violence he suffers at the hands of Liseo and Fenisa due to his relentless insolence. Zayas, then, avails herself of León for the delivery of humour as it relates to *schadenfreude*. León undoubtedly takes pleasure in his master’s unfortunate circumstances and *enredos*, while Liseo in turn has a licence to strike his discourteous servant, which consequently affords the play’s physical humour.

²⁸ Please note: there is an error in the versification of Bárbara López-Mayhew’s edition of the play. Ten lines are unaccounted for between v.1306 and v.1320, with v.1320 appearing as v.1310. The remainder of the play follows the erroneous numbering. I have chosen to handle López-Mayhew’s edition on the grounds that her notes are highly constructive. Additionally, I am partial to orthography that has not been modernised as it reflects the manuscript more closely. Typographical errors in this edition do not affect outcomes in the reading of the text.

One should note an inversion in which subordinates, or those members of society who are marginalised, duly become targets for the *schadenfroh* Zayas. Lisa Vollendorf's assertion that the author has a tendency to rebuke unvirtuous or lower-class women can readily be observed in another of León's discourses. Describing his indifference towards courtly ladies and preference for earthier women, León proclaims:

Si preguntas, señor, de las gallegas
 rollicas, cariartas y que [c]alçan
 doze puntos, o treze por lo menos,
 dos varas de sintura, tres de espalda,
 que se alquilan por meses y preguntan
 si acaso hay niños, viejos o escaleras,
 de las que sacan de partido un día
 y hurtan cada día algunas horas,
 buscan sus cuyos quando salen fuera,
 y venimos a serlo los lacayos
 por nuestra desventura y mala estrella.
 [...]
 Éstas, como te he dicho, son gallegas,
 y fruta para nosotros solamente;
 que de las fregonçillas cortesanas
 no hay que dezir, pues ellas mismas dizen
 que son joyas de príncipes y grandes. (vv.303-336)

León's description of his preferred type of woman is anything but flattering, and his laudatory comments target women who represent the direct opposite of the dictated standards of beauty in Zayas's time. This creates humourous tension in the play, something that is unexpected and produces pleasure in the spectators for that reason. While the audience laughs, Zayas relishes the ridicule she unleashes onto her *gallegas*. At play in these lines is the humour theory of incongruity, which proposes that humour is the result of perceiving that which is out of place, inconsonant, unexpected, or a violation of our mental patterns and expectations (*Philosophy of Humor* Web). The "gallegas" are therefore the subjects of Zayas's mockery precisely because León showers praise on the type of women deemed undesirable by high society and, conceivably, by Zayas herself.

Although humour tends to favour “the other” as a target, it can also befall “the self.” As such, for all the pleasure that León derives from the misfortunes of those around him, it is only a matter of time before he becomes the target. In *La traición*, scatology fleetingly rears its head, but it provides yet another channel through which glee can emanate from misfortune. When Liseo discovers that Marcia has caught wind of his trysts with Fenisa he becomes hysterical: “¡Ay, León! ¡Ay, fiel criado! / Muerto soy; yo soy perdido” (vv.2156-2157). This causes León to panic, albeit with a comical tone: “¡Ay, señor de mis entrañas, / que me has quitado el sentido! / ¿Perdido? no, que aquí estás; / ¿muerto? yo te veo vivo” (vv.2158-2161). As soon as Liseo explains his hysteria, the witty attendant responds:

¿Eso es no más? ¡Lleve el diablo
 tus terribles desatinos!
 ¡Vive Cristo! que en las calzas
 he criado palominos.
 ¡Miren qué traición al rey!
 ¡Por Dios santo, que me río!
 Calla, pues eres mentecato. (vv.2169-2182)

As León chuckles at the lovesick Liseo, he in turn becomes the subject of ridicule for the audience, having “criado palominos” (or defecated) in his breeches. There is a binary emergence of schadenfreude here in which León laughs at his master’s quandary, and the audience laughs at León’s. Granted, the scatological reference is figurative, but it suggests a prior retension of stress and anxiety – unduly caused by Liseo’s foolish histrionics – followed by laughter and an overall loss of control that then produces a sense of relief. Essentially, relief predicates a cathartic experience of which scatological humour is an outlet.

Despite the crass and lasciviousness with which León comports himself, he manages to evade the heavy hand of reprisal. Much in the same way that she spares Liseo and Don Juan, Zayas spares León the humiliation of punishment for all his incivility. Besides providing humour, which is prized in any *comedia*, he endows the play with realism and honesty. This is perhaps León's single most admirable quality.

3.4. Disparity and Consequence

In the grand scheme of *La traición en la amistad*, Marcia, Belisa, Laura, and Gerardo are the most exemplary personalities, serving to embody virtue, courtly etiquette, and, perhaps most importantly, restraint and loyalty. Both Marcia and Fenisa, who represent polar extremes, are strong and influential characters. They are equipped with the acumen to plan and execute, and each believes in her purpose, but although the play starts with them being on equal footing in terms of knowing who or what they want and actively pursuing those desires, Marcia gains the upper hand while Fenisa succumbs to the collective power of the women she challenges throughout this dramatic work. Interestingly, even though Liseo, Don Juan and Fenisa all display impropriety, it is only Fenisa who finds herself at the receiving end of Zayas's judgement by the conclusion of the play. Contrarily, Laura and Belisa have good reason to relish any misfortune that might befall their suitors Liseo and Don Juan, both of whom at one point or another stray from their lovers to enjoy the favours of Fenisa. Yet *schadenfreude* towards these men is conspicuous by its absence. Perhaps cognizant either of Fenisa's sexual power over them or the ease with which men are swayed, neither Belisa nor Laura desire any harm to come to their mates. Instead, Laura pleads for her own death and the pleasure with which she anticipates Liseo will receive it in a melancholic sonnet that begins thus: "Que muera yo,

Liseo, por tus ojos, / y que gusten tus ojos de matarme” (vv.849-850). Belisa lashes out at Juan with the result that he immediately recommits to her and promises to be faithful, thereby assuaging her fears and anger. For Juan and Liseo there are no consequences, but perhaps their exemption from punishment is the result of regret and of seeing the error of their ways. Fenisa’s lack of restraint, despite her feelings of guilt, ultimately merits decisive action, leaving the *schadenfroh* audience and author satisfied.

As the title *La traición en la amistad* suggests, friendships among the women take centre stage in this theatrical work. Romantic relationships are secondary. Love and lust may be the motivating forces of the action, but at the core of the play is Fenisa’s duplicity, which is a reflection of the scandalous comportment that had permeated courtly life during the author’s lifetime. Monica Leoni poses the question of why Zayas would create a figure who “display[s] strength of spirit and singularity of mind, only to have her admonished,” and she concludes that the author makes critical commentary on the impossible expectations set by the male-dominant society of Golden-Age Spain (68). That is, men lived in a more liberal and expansive world while women nurtured the uncertainty of their own exclusive and excluded world. This in turn fostered cattiness and disloyalty.²⁹ For this reason, women should not have been expected to function without harbouring biases against the retaliatory structure of their own community. Psychosexual constraints within an already-restricted environment of femininity were kindling for explosive behaviour. Zayas absolutely wears the cap of a *schadenfroh* writer in crafting the pitiful end of her antagonist’s exploits. Nevertheless, she launches a rhetorical attack not only on the theatrical Fenisa, but presumably on the Fenisa “types”

²⁹ Leoni’s theory is based on the work of Elizabeth Janeway, from whose book the hypotheses on masculine and feminine worlds are borrowed. See *Man’s World, Woman’s Place*, p.111.

in her real-life surroundings. This donjuanesque play was not inspired by Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla* but evidently by true events. In the closing lines of the play Liseo makes this declaration:

Con esto, senado y lustre,
justo será que fin tenga
la traición en la amistad,
historia tan verdadera
que no ha un año que en la corte
subçedió como se quenta. (vv.2905-2910)

As such, Zayas's agenda is not simply the public ridiculing of Fenisa but to some degree it is a cautionary work, though not with the vigour and moralising weight of *El burlador* but rather with what Valerie Hegstrom considers the levity associated with the idle and noble aristocrats of the Spanish Golden Age (17).

One cannot with any degree of certainty make assertions as to the reception of *La traición* in the seventeenth century, especially given its presently non-existent performance history. In an article addressing the exemplarity of the play, Robert Bayliss points out that the recent – that is, within the last thirty years or so – interest in the play and its historical context still precludes a firm understanding of it, as well as its reception in the seventeenth century, as a consequence of the four hundred years that it existed beyond the scope of academic curiosity (2). Interpretive evidence of the audience's experience of *schadenfreude*, then, is tenuous at best. Yet the compulsions of human beings cannot be superseded, even over a period of four centuries. Therefore, a contemporary reader who is well versed in Golden-Age Spanish drama can glean from it at least some of the humour and intrigue that an early modern reader would have appreciated in addition, I would argue, to the pleasure and pain associated with the immemorial and timeless experience of *schadenfreude*.

Zayas's literary *schadenfreude* in *La traición en la amistad* may be understood as an instrument through which the transgressions of key *dramatis personae* can be countered with the moral codes put forth by her society and culture. It might even attempt to trounce the inherent egocentrism of said transgressors. In any case, as with any classical or modern writer whose works necessitate analyses by the probative minds of literary scholars, María de Zayas y Sotomayor facilitated the work of deciphering, conjecturing, and inferring from her lone extant theatrical piece (to date) by creating a work and a personage that were exemplary. Fenisa challenges the norms of feminine comportment but she also allows an audience to be entertained by her brazen departure from ethical norms. Perhaps it is fitting that readers and critics of the play allow themselves to experience the joys and misfortunes of the play's characters wholly and unapologetically.

Conclusion

Enthusiasm for the archetype of Don Juan and the proliferation of this character in the literature of the Spanish Golden Age are evidence of the fascination aroused by this character's display of treachery, lack of self-restraint, narcissism, and an unwillingness to bear the burden of consequence. An adequate description of the atmosphere that fostered the emergence of the legend of Don Juan is as follows:

Of all major countries in Europe, in the early part of the seventeenth century, Spain was the nation that reflected many of the Baroque tensions and suffered from the great political, moral, and social difficulties of the age of which Don Juan was an ideal expression. He was the epitome of pride and lust, a man who reveled in immediacy and sensual pleasures, neglecting canon law and church traditions. (Saad 305)

The politically and religiously charged climate of the Spanish Golden Age supplied a breeding ground for articulating ethical conflicts. Cultural tensions of that time are also reflected in the Baroque obsession with duality, practiced with full force in the donjuanesque plays *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*, *La venganza en el sepulcro*, and *La traición en la amistad*. Oppositions that function within these works include masculinity and femininity, obedience and disobedience, liberty and restraint, heaven and hell, as well as loyalty and betrayal. That said, the binary concepts of pleasure and pain which have been the focus of this study need not represent opposing forces – pleasure indicating that which is good, and pain representing that which is bad. Quite on the contrary, they complement each other exceptionally well, particularly in the sphere of *donjuanismo*, a theory one can intimately link with *schadenfreude*. Taking pleasure in the misfortunes of other people is a distinctly human trait that can be especially pronounced in matters of love and seduction.

Tirso de Molina's conception of Don Juan in *El burlador de Sevilla* is profanity at its best. Audiences are introduced to an extremely egocentric and brazen gallant whose purpose in life it is to defame women and then abandon them. In this play Tirso applies irony as a rhetorical device through which Don Juan begins to earn his fate. Juan's language, which is a reflection of his thinking, demonstrates his ironic lack of self-awareness, and his ideas on the concept of service bring this irony to light:

CATALINÓN: La razón hace al valiente.
 DON JUAN: Y al cobarde hace el temor.
 El que se pone a servir
 voluntad no ha de tener,
 y todo ha de ser hacer,
 y nada ha de ser decir.
 Sirviendo, jugando estás,
 y si quieres ganar luego,
 haz siempre, porque en el juego
 quien más hace gana más.
 CATALINÓN: Y también quien hace y dice
 pierde por la mayor parte.
 DON JUAN: Esta vez quiero avisarte,
 porque otra vez no te avise.
 CATALINÓN: Digo que de aquí adelante
 lo que me mandas haré,
 y a tu lado forzaré
 un tigre y un elefante. (vv.1356-1373)

Don Juan's sentiments on service, which he interprets as servitude as opposed to doing good works in general, emerge here through his faulty logic. According to him, a person who sets out to serve ought not to have "voluntad" and must focus on serving his superior, yet this rogue is driven exclusively by the very free will that he denies Catalinón. At this moment in their conversation their roles – as per the norms of Golden-Age theatre – are reversed and Juan becomes the advisor, briefly restoring the social order of master and servant, the result of which is Catalinón's subsequent acquiescence and promise to fiercely defend his master even against the deadliest of

beasts. In a much broader sense, however, serving may be linked to religion, for service to the church represents one of the pillars of the Christian faith. That is, the good Christian must serve God through his or her good works. There is a disparity between Don Juan's advocacy of service and his failure to comply with it. Driven by self-interest, negligence, and the pleasure he derives from repressing his servant, Juan's oversight only exacerbates his fall to damnation. While Tirso speaks through Catalinón, Don Juan's voice may be that echoed by an errant public whose sense of right and wrong has been abated.³⁰ Moreover, Juan's directive to hold one's peace contradicts his boastful nature. This hypocrisy can reinforce as well as justify the public's feelings of *schadenfreude* towards him.

The above passage outlines another pertinent matter regarding the reaping of benefits from providing service. Although Juan is referring to it within the context of a servant's domain, by alluding to the "juego" as a means of profiting he unwittingly turns the tables on himself. His allegorical use of gambling – suggesting that the more one does the more one stands to gain – proves ironic, for throughout the play he gambles with his own fortune and fate, testing both to the limit until the opportunity for salvation becomes irretrievable. Each time Don Juan is warned against venturing to commit another *burla*, because God will surely punish him, he utters his famous maxim: "Tan largo me lo fiáis."³¹ This primes him to eventually face the consequences of failing to adhere to a Catholic moral code, and for doing himself and his victims a grave disservice.

³⁰ In her article "Carnival, Spectacle, and the *Gracioso's* Theatrics of Dissent," Teresa Soufas points out that "in many of the greatest *comedias* the *gracioso* provides even an important spiritual ingredient to these secular works while enacting the most overtly political role through this advocacy of change and his subversion of the norms that society complacently accepts" (p.327).

³¹ See *El burlador*, vv.1445, 1931, 1993, and 2284.

The religious domain within which Tirso operates is explicit in terms of the immorality that the play underlines. Audience members can certainly take pleasure in the chastisement of such ungodly behaviour – except, perhaps, those who partake of it.

Religious overtones are conspicuous by their absence in Alonso de Córdoba's *La venganza en el sepulcro*, which is something of a precursor to the later metamorphoses of the archetype that see Don Juan fall in love. Córdoba's Tenorio purports to exude self-assuredness and nobility in pursuing love interests. Regrettably, his lack of success at the very serious enterprise of courtship – or winning over the affections of another man's paramour – proves comical rather than unfortunate. Don Juan's comedic shift from early-seventeenth-century hero to late-seventeenth-century has-been corresponds with the notion that we laugh when people bring adversity upon themselves, not because they deserve it but because efforts to avoid that misfortune lead directly to it (Monro 78). His displays of haughtiness and bravado only succeed at turning an audience's sympathy for his misfortune into cheer for the same. Pleasure in this play is at the complete expense of Don Juan, whom the author strips not only of his honour and his life but also of his livelihood. Don Juan Tenorio is no longer "el burlador de Sevilla." As even the play's title suggests, *La venganza en el sepulcro* is not necessarily about Don Juan but rather "la venganza en el sepulcro," with Juan existing as a vessel through which to exact vengeance. Revenge displaces him as the main subject matter and assumes its place as a manifestation of schadenfreude exercised dramaturgically by the playwright. In theory, this title may be applied to any number of storylines and personages. Nevertheless, Córdoba does opt to rewrite the story of Don Juan and recreate a Don Juan figure who fails to achieve the notoriety of his Tirsian predecessor.

While Tirso and Córdoba's Don Juans represent the errors of masculine seduction and courtship, María de Zayas's *La traición en la amistad* lends a feminine perspective. Relationships become contentious when licentiousness takes hold. Borrowing from Tirso de Molina's *El burlador* the notion that "mal haya la mujer que en hombres fia,"³² Zayas repeats this sentiment through Marcia, who cries, "Bien dijo quien dezía, / mal haya la muger que en hombres fia" (*La traición* vv.2066-2067). Through the character of Fenisa the author reiterates this sentiment, but with an inversion: "Mal haya la que sólo un hombre quiere / que tener uno sólo es cobardía" (vv.1474-1475). Fenisa's efforts to dissuade Marcia from entertaining Liseo's advances – prior to being shown a portrait of him and subsequently falling under his spell – are ironic in that she harbours a secret: she has several lovers of her own. Evidence of her errant character lies in the following declaration: "Aunque a don Juan digo amores, / el alma en Liseo está, / que en ella posada habrá / para un millón de amadores" (vv.189-192). The trouble with Fenisa is, evidently, that the capacity of her heart is too vast for the love of only one man, or even a few. She must possess them all. Naturally, this will lead to her (deserved) heartache when her lovers desert her en masse. Though it is noble to love, the loving of all men violates honour and virtue. Fenisa's tragedy is that she has a conscience that at first instills feelings of guilt for usurping the attention and affections of men, whether or not they are spoken for. As the play progresses, however, that guilt wanes and selfishness takes over. Whether it is a matter of familiarity with the women in her circle breeding her contempt for them or a deeper, more sinister need for validation, Fenisa loses the battle while her creator – along with all proponents of female solidarity – wins the war

³² See *El burlador de Sevilla*, vv.2205, 2213, and 2219.

against feminine duplicity and betrayal. In the end, not only does one despise Fenisa's sense of entitlement but Zayas's muted, anticlimactic disregard for her is the ultimate punishment. There is satisfaction in her misery.

It is logical to view schadenfreude as a questionable characteristic of human nature. What cannot be denied, however, is its legitimacy and validity as a psychological phenomenon but also as a literary tool. Analysing schadenfreude is rather like scientific dissection: at first the specimen is a neat and tidy unit, but the moment one delves into it a host of other curious elements begins to emerge, and so a concept as simple as taking pleasure in the pain of others is complicated by the subsequent exposure of the viscera, so to speak, of schadenfreude. These include its possible sources (competitiveness or jealousy, for instance) and manifestations (such as humour and the need for justice).

By way of the traits of Greek tragedy – namely hubris, hamartia, and peripeteia – donjuanesque violations become vices through which an author's catharsis is achieved. For Aristotle, this release is a natural response to human drives, and the pleasure of pain is fostered by imitating real-life occurrences (*Poetics* 7). That is, theatre as a form of “spectator sport” allows an audience to recognise on the stage aspects of daily life and to glean from a performance the enjoyment of relating to what is represented, even if this representation or imitation of real life is sorrowful or macabre. Although the mimetic nature of theatre is clear, as an art form it also facilitates a means through which enjoying the misfortunes of others becomes inconsequential in reality, and therefore harmless and acceptable. In any event, theatrical displays of philandering, deception, and treachery become vessels of cathartic expression for the audience as well. Don Juan figures, however, are wholly at the mercy of their creators, who are responsible for their villainy.

To be sure, playwrights who followed in Tirso de Molina's footsteps were among the reading and viewing audience. Composing works that recreated Don Juan was perhaps a compulsion or desire to contribute to the legend or to amend it. One might imagine that the task of addressing *donjuanismo* involved some degree of pleasure and some degree of hardship, both experienced on stage as well as off.

Salvador de Madariaga makes a distinction between Don Juan the literary figure and the character of a donjuanesque man: "Una cosa es Don Juan y otra cosa es el hombre donjuanesco. El uno es un potente símbolo literario, quizás el más potente de los símbolos de nuestro arte; el otro es...Pérez el de la casa de al lado y Martínez el de la de enfrente" (12). This declaration is decisive since it reaffirms the authentic existence of a donjuanesque "type" to which Tirso was possibly referring in his play. This real-world "Pérez" or that real-world "Martínez" may have been the very sort of fellow (or lady) who even in the seventeenth century gleefully looked on as the events unfolded on stage, taking pleasure in the wickedness of a powerful archetype, and perhaps seeing him- or herself in it. While it is true that Don Juan Tenorio is a literary figure that stands in a league of his own, the naming of a "type" of man after him indicates a correlation between the man (that Pérez or Martínez) and the model (our Tenorio).

At the hands of a playwright the archetype of Don Juan becomes an instrument not only of moralistic instruction but also artistic self-expression. It is the delightful burden of scholars to then immerse themselves in these donjuanesque works and in the lives of their creators as well as the literary figures created, among them the masculine and feminine representations of the libertine. Nearly four hundred years after Tirso de Molina's play was first published, Don Juan, Don John, Don Giovanni, and countless

other Dons have been brought to life. Others are sure to follow. The dissemination of this character has been vast, not only in its theatrical form but in lyric form as well as prose. Perhaps we keep Don Juan alive because although it is in our nature to be compassionate and civilised, we are also driven by a fascination with the darker side of human nature. Immodesty, deception, betrayal, and defiance underly donjuanesque transgressions. Nevertheless, to observe these behaviours plucks at our raw sensibilities in some positive manner. The archetype of Don Juan is an excellent vehicle for the expression of schadenfreude because through it no deception is too devious, no remark too derogatory, no deed too unkind. For playwrights as well audiences, dramatic representations of joy and pain know no bounds. Ultimately, it is as human to experience pleasure as it is to experience displeasure, but the enjoyment of another individual's misfortune is likewise undeniably human.

Bibliography

- Arellano, Ignacio. "Las raíces del mito: Don Juan, de Tirso a Zorrilla." *Don Juan, genio y figura*. Ed. Gonzalo Santoja. Madrid: España Nuevo Milenio, 2001. 25-46. Web. 19 Nov. 2014.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Ed. and trans. Terence Irwin. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1999. Print.
- . *Poetics*. Ed. O.B. Hardison Jr. Trans. Leon Golden. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. Print.
- Bayliss, Robert. "Feminism and María de Zayas's Exemplary Comedy 'La traición en la amistad.'" *Hispanic Review* 76.1 (2008): 1-17. Web. 18 Jan. 2015.
- Ben-Ze'ev, Aaron. "The Personal Comparative Concern in Schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 77-90. Print.
- Bergson, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. Trans. Cloudesley Brereton and Fred Rothwell. London: MacMillan and Company, 1911. Print.
- Brooks, Zelda Irene and William Heitland. "A Psychological Perspective of the Don Juan Character." *Tirso's Don Juan: The Metamorphosis of a Theme*. Eds. Joseph M. Sola-Solé and George E. Gingras. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1988. Print.
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *El gran teatro del Mundo/El gran mercado del mundo*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003. Print.
- . *Tan largo me lo fiáis*. Ed. Xavier A. Fernández. Madrid: State University of New at Albany, 1967. Print.
- Carroll, Noël. *Humour: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. Print.
- Cikara, Mina and Susan Fiske. "Stereotypes and Schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 151-164. Print.
- Córdoba y Maldonado, Alonso de. *La venganza en el sepulcro*. Eds. Piero Menarini and Patrizia Campana. Bologna: Atesa, 1989. Print.

- Covarrubias Horozco, Sebastián de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Eds. Ignacio Arellano and Rafael Zafra. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2006. Print.
- Davies, Ann. *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan's Women: Early Parity to Late Modern Pathology*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004. Print.
- Díaz-Plaja, Fernando. *El «Don Juan» español*. Madrid: Encuentro, S.A., 2000. Print.
- Feather, N. T. "Deservingness and schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 29-54. Print.
- Franquesa y Gómis, José. "La venganza en el sepulcro: comedia inédita de D. Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado." *Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo en el año vigésimo de su profesorado. Estudios de erudición española*. Ed. Juan Valera. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez, 1899. 2 Vols. *Internet Archive*. 253-268. Web. 15 Mar. 2015.
- Frenk, Margit. "El personaje singular: un aspecto del teatro del Siglo de Oro." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 26.2 (1977): 480-498. Web. 21 Sep. 2014.
- Hegstrom, Valerie. Introduction. *La traición en la amistad/Friendship Betrayed*. By María de Zayas y Sotomayor. Lewisburg: Buckness University Press, 1999. Print.
- Janeway, Elizabeth. *Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1971. Print.
- Kuipers, Giseline. "Schadenfreude and social life: a comparative perspective on the expression and regulation of mirth at the expense of others." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 259-274. Print.
- Larson, Catherine. "Gender, Reading, and Intertextuality: Don Juan's Legacy in María de Zayas's 'La traición en la amistad'." *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica* 40/41 (Otoño 1994-Primavera 1995): 129-138. Web. 4 Nov. 2014.
- Leach, Colin W., Russell Spears, Nyla R. Branscombe and Bertjan Doosje. "Malicious Pleasure: Schadenfreude at the Suffering of Another Group." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84.5 (2003): 932-943. Web. 24 Mar. 2014.
- Leoni, Monica. "María de Zayas's 'La traición en la amistad': Female Friendship Politicized?" *South Atlantic Review* 68.4 (2003): 62-84. Web. 17 Jan. 2015.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. *Don Juan y la donjuanía*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1950. Print.

- Mandel, Oscar. *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630-1963*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963. Print.
- Mandrell, James. *Don Juan and the Point of Honor: Seduction, Patriarchal Society, and Literary Tradition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992. Print.
- Menarini, Piero. Studio critico. *La venganza en el sepulcro*. By Alonso de Córdoba y Maldonado. Bologna: Atesa, 1989. 5-25. Print.
- Monro, David Hector. *Argument of Laughter*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963. Print.
- New Oxford Annotated Bible*. Ed. Michael D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.
- Philosophy of Humor*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2012. Web. 29 Jul. 2014.
- Portmann, John. "Morality and schadenfreude". *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwerkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 17-28. Print.
- Powell, Caitlin A. "Hypocrisy and Schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwerkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 58-72. Print.
- Rennert, Hugo A. *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega*. New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1909. Print.
- Rodríguez López-Vázquez, Alfredo. Introducción. *El burlador de Sevilla*. By Tirso de Molina. Madrid: Catedra, 2004. 9-143. Print.
- Rogers, Daniel. *Tirso de Molina: El burlador de Sevilla*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1977. Print.
- Rose, Constance. "Reconstructing Tisbea." *The Golden Age Comedia: Text, Theory, and Performance*. Eds. Charles Ganelin and Howard Mancing. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press. 48-57. Print.
- Round, Nicholas G. "Sex, Lies, and Dinner with the Dead." *Selected Interdisciplinary Essays on the Representation of the Don Juan Archetype in Myth and Culture*. Eds. Andrew Ginger, John Hobbs, and Huw Lewis. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000. 9-34. Print.
- Saad, Youssef. "The Don Juan of Classical Arabia." *Comparative Literature Studies* 13.4 (1976): 304-314. Web. 13 Nov. 2014.

- Sánchez Sánchez, Mercedes. "Introducción." *El burlador de Sevilla*. Madrid: Castalia, 1997. 21-38. Print.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley-Cooper, Earl of. *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. Ed. Lawrence E. Klein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. *MyiLibrary eBook Collection*. Web. 10 July. 2015.
- Smeed, John W. *Don Juan: Variations on a Theme*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Smith, Richard H. *The Joy of Pain: Schadenfreude and the Dark Side of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Print.
- Smith, Richard H., Stephen M. Thielke and Caitlin A. J. Powell. "Empirical Challenges to Understanding the Role of Envy in Schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 91-109. Print.
- Soufas, Teresa S. "Carnival, Spectacle, and the *Gracioso*'s Theatrics of Dissent." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 14.2 (Invierno 1990): 315-330. Web. 8 Feb. 2015.
- . *Women's Acts: Plays by Women Dramatists of Spain's Golden Age*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997. Print.
- Tirso de Molina. *El burlador de Sevilla*. Ed. Mercedes Sánchez Sánchez. Madrid: Castalia, 1997. Print.
- . *El burlador de Sevilla*. Ed. Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez. Madrid: Catedra, 2004. Print.
- Van de Ven, Niels. "Malicious Envy and Schadenfreude." *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Eds. Wilco W. van Dijk and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 110-117. Print.
- Van Dijk, Wilco W. and Jaap W. Ouwkerk. Eds. *Schadenfreude: Understanding Pleasure at the Misfortune of Others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Print.
- Vollendorf, Lisa. *Reclaiming the Body: María de Zayas's Early Modern*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2001. Print.
- Weinstein, Leo. *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959. Print.

- Zayas y Sotomayor, María de. *La traición en la amistad*. Ed. Bárbara López-Mayhew. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2003. Print.
- . *La traición en la amistad*. Ed. Valerie Hegstrom. Trans. Catherine Larson. Lewisburg: Buckness University Press, 1999. Print.