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Note on Translation

All translations present in this thesis are my own. I wrote this thesis through the analysis of several original Spanish texts—some primary texts written in the medieval or early modern *castellano*, some secondary sources written in modern-day Spanish. While I mostly relied on my own knowledge of the Spanish language, dictionaries were also needed for my translations. Especially useful was the 1611 *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* by Sebastián de Covarrubias, which connected my modern knowledge of Spanish to the Spanish of the 17th century. There are many ways to think about translation, but a common debate is whether to translate with word-for-word accuracy, or whether to access the meaning (or sense) of the text through adjusting some language. I attempt to give the sense that I understood from my readings of the texts through a merging of these two ideas. My goal was to draw out common phrases used to describe lovesickness, such as “le traía tan fuera de sí,” which consistently appears as “she took him far outside himself,” in order to give the reader a familiarity with these terms. I also wanted to maintain the vivid descriptions of symptoms of lovesickness. At moments when the original Spanish is particularly necessary to understand to my interpretation of the scene, I treat it within the textual analysis. All original Spanish quotations are given in footnotes, except in the case of poetry, where the original appears next to my translation.
In a scene in the first book of Miguel de Cervantes’ *La Galatea* (1585), the character Elicio addresses his love to the titular Galatea by saying, “beautiful Galatea, you look at my soul to damage it and not to cure it.”\(^1\) Galatea responds, “your statement exaggerates my abilities by saying that I, without weapons—for they are not given to women—could have injured anyone.”\(^2\) In this scene, we are able to see a clear example of one of the myriad of ways the concept of lovesickness was addressed in early modern Spanish literature. Additionally, we get one image of how gender was treated in this thematic space. The ideas of a beloved knowingly causing pain (and the beloved denying these accusations) appear several times across the texts that I address in this thesis. Elicio’s focus on the soul and the damage done to it by love references a focus on philosophy that is heavily influenced by Platonic thought, while Galatea’s response tells of the limitations placed on women. Both of these themes will reappear throughout my analysis.

This thesis will address lovesickness, gender, and most especially gendered lovesickness within works of early modern Spanish literature. This study will hopefully add to existing analytical texts on lovesickness in the early modern, while also working to complicate commonly held misconceptions of how gender was addressed in the time period.\(^3\) The first chapter will discuss the historical context of

---


\(^2\) “testimonio me levantas—replicó Galatea—en decir que yo, sin armas, pues a mujeres no son concedidas, haya herido a nadie,” *ibid.*, I.1.56.

\(^3\) There is debate over the exact dates of what can be called the “early modern,” but for the purposes of this study I will be using the time period between the 16th and 18th centuries. The works used in this thesis come generally from the late 16th and early 17th centuries.
lovesickness and provide some background for those unfamiliar with the topic. That chapter will also establish the theoretical framework that I will draw upon in the rest of my thesis. The next chapter will be an analysis of Miguel de Cervantes’ *La Galatea* and the ways in which it addresses lovesickness. Chapter 3 will give an analysis of María de Zayas’ *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* (1637), including comparisons to the treatments of lovesickness in this text and *La Galatea*. The thesis will conclude with an epilogue discussing the continued relevance of lovesickness, including its influence on what is pathologized in the 19th century as female hysteria.

*La Galatea* is an early work of Cervantes’ (published twenty years before the first part of *Don Quixote* in 1605), and it is a pastoral novel. The pastoral is a particular genre of literature and poetry, focused on “these plain and simple elements—scorned love, enjoyment of nature, desperation, solitude, and music—all of the tropes of the pastoral novel are implicit.”

Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce connects the popularity of the pastoral with a sense of escapism, because “when the oppression of the hustle and bustle of civic life threatens to overwhelm the European man, this always sends him out to the pastures of the bucolic, although, as we will see, the escape occurs under costumes of a greater or lesser diversity.” In Spain, the popularity of the pastoral genre began with the publication of Jorge de Montemayor’s *Diana* in 1559. The *Diana* was influential on authors inside and outside of Spain—Cervantes certainly read it, as did William Shakespeare. *La Galatea* follows in the

---


5 “cuando la opresión del trajín ciudadano amenaza agobiando al hombre europeo, éste siempre se dispara hacia los campos de la bucólica, aunque, según veremos, la fuga ocurre bajo disfraces de mayor o menor diversidad,” *ibid.*, 3.
Diana’s path and fulfills the qualifications of the pastoral easily, as it tells the stories of several different shepherds and shepherdesses and their tales of love and woe. It is also a total escape from the life of the city: none of the rigidity found in court life is found in the pastoral, yet it is commonly believed that Cervantes based the characters in *La Galatea* on people he met in court. The freedom of the pastoral allows for the shepherd to become “the other avenue of escape that allows one to live the ideal.”6

The narrative in *La Galatea* often switches between characters as each person is given a chance to tell their story, and the prose is often intercut with the characters’ singing of verse and playing of musical instruments.

María de Zayas’ *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* was published in 1637, over half a century after *La Galatea*. The work is a collection of short novels set up in a larger frame, each told by a narrator over the course of several nights of a party. To achieve this, de Zayas sets up the frame story of the party, and most of the characters attending have their own struggles with love. With her frame novel, de Zayas works off the tradition started by Giovanni Boccaccio and continued by Marguerite de Navarre. Boccaccio’s *Decameron*, written in Italy in the 14th century, is a frame novel consisting of 100 stories told by several men and women over the course of ten nights. The *Decameron* stories cover a range of themes, many of which concern love. The work of Boccaccio was influential on many European authors in the early modern, including Marguerite de Navarre, whose *Heptameron* was published in France in 1558, after her death in 1549. Like the *Decameron*, the stories in the *Heptameron* are shared by several men and women over the course of several days, as

---

6 “la otra avenida de escape que le permite seguir viviendo el ideal,” Avalle-Arce (1959), 1.
the characters are attempting to improve upon the stories of the *Decameron*. They also make the rule that all of the stories shared must be true. While the goal of the *Heptameron* was to have 100 stories, thus creating a successor to the *Decameron*, at the time of Navarre’s death only 72 stories were completed. De Zayas was also influenced by Cervantes’ *Novelas ejemplares*, which was a model for the longer form novela, rather than collections of short stories. These works impacted de Zayas in her composition of the *Novelas*, in which a total of ten stories are told over the course of several nights, and each story comments on the overall theme of love. Many of the stories include violence, a great contrast to the largely non-violent pastoral backdrop of *La Galatea*. De Zayas is often referred to as a proto-feminist writer, and her use of violence (particularly her representations of violence against women) supports this description. Julián Olivares writes that in the “feminine space [of the house] a woman cannot feel safe because this domestic space can turn into a space of violence against women. Zayas represents the house as a space of violence, where the woman is beaten, raped, poisoned, bled dry, and strangled by husbands, brothers-in-law, fathers-in-law, and brothers.”

De Zayas, by taking the feminized space of the home and turning it on its head, writes truthfully about the situations of many women in the early modern period. The analysis of these two works will make up the majority of my thesis, but some further context is necessary before that analysis begins.

---

7 “en este espacio femenino la mujer no puede sentirse segura, puesto que este espacio doméstico puede convertirse en el de la violencia contra las mujeres. Zayas representa la casa como un lugar de violencia, donde la mujer es golpeada, violada, envenenada, desangrada y ahorcada por maridos, cuñados, suegros y hermanos,” Julián Olivares, introduction to *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares*, ed. Julián Olivares (Madrid: Cátedra, 2010), 25.
Chapter 1: Introduction

“Anxiety, sleeplessness, irritability, nervousness, erotic fantasy…paralytic states.” This is the list of common symptoms that historian Rachel Maines presents as representative of female hysteria. The image of the female hysteric is well established in our culture: a woman who, overcome with her emotions, faints, or has emotional outbursts, or generally cannot process her feelings in a socially acceptable way. While the female hysteric is known to many, the idea of a male hysteric seems farfetched and unlikely. However, the characteristics that Maines lists are also commonly found in representations of lovesick men. In the course of this project, I draw out the similarities between depictions of lovesickness in men and hysteria in women in order to undo the gendered divisions of these two categories, and of hysteric behavior in general.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the importance of my topic, and the ways in which it will add to an already existent body of work on lovesickness. After this, I will provide my frameworks of analysis for both lovesickness and for sex/gender in the texts I analyze. To provide my framework for lovesickness I will analyze the 1535 philosophical work *Dialogues of Love*, written by Judah Abravanel (also known as León Hebreo or Leone Ebreo)—a text presented as a conversation between two characters that traces the creation, existence, and effects of love. I will also treat two medical texts from the 16th century, Andrés Velazquez’s *Libro de la melancholia* (*Book of Melancholy*, 1585) and Oliva Sabuco’s *Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza del hombre* (*New Philosophy of Human Nature*, 1587). Rather than work

---

off a contemporary theoretical framework of gender, I created my analytical framework of sex/gender as it emerged through my readings of the texts I am analyzing, most especially from the de Zayas stories. After establishing these frameworks, in this introduction I will also briefly discuss the two works, *La Galatea* and *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares*, on which I focus this thesis. Finally, I will mention the particular thematic schemes through which I am comparing these two texts: the pastoral/urban, the melancholic/choleric, and the masculine/feminine.

The symptoms of lovesickness appear in both men and women, and while I will treat both, I will focus more on male lovesickness in this thesis because it has been less treated by other scholarly works. This requires an analysis of gender and sex in the early modern. In the Editor’s Introduction to the series *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe*, Margaret L. King and Albert Rabil, Jr. attempt to reconstruct the traditional views of women, from Ancient Greece to the early modern period. Writing about the perceived differences between men and women—particularly drawing on the Greek tradition—the authors quote the Aristotelian view that “the male was intellectual, active, and in control of his passions...the passions generated by the womb made women lustful, deceitful, talkative, irrational, indeed—when these effects were in excess—‘hysterical’.”

This was not the only belief in the early modern, and the book series attempts to question this description by translating and presenting critical editions of texts written by women in this period. However, this conception of the differences between men and women was, for the most part, the

---

9 Margaret L. King and Albert Rabil, Jr., introduction to *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe*, ed. King and Rabil, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), xiii.
status quo in the early modern, and forms of this idea continue in popular parlance to this day. This thesis will present an alternative to these ideas.

There is a commonly-held misconception today that men were always represented in this time period as in control of the passions, while women were constantly under their influence, and this study seeks to challenge that. While many of the depictions of men and women in this time do follow this model, there are important exceptions that deserve to be analyzed. To achieve this, I am choosing to focus on early modern representations of men as irrational, controlled by their passions, and perhaps even “hysterical.” These portrayals of the male hysteric are not uncommon in the early modern, especially when considering the works that treat lovesickness, the physical illness that stemmed from psychological and spiritual reactions to seeing one’s love.

This thesis does not attempt to recreate a single, universal understanding of gender and sexuality within the early modern context, as that would be too broad a task for its scope. Nor should we even assume that there were set conceptions of such a thing. However, I will provide a framework of analysis through which to view gendered concepts. For the purposes of this paper, the terms “male” and “men” will be used to refer to the sexed male subject. Likewise, “female” and “women” will be used to discuss the sexed female subject. I use this definition of the terminology not to erase the possibility of the variance of gender performance or identity within the early modern world, but rather to reflect the representations of men and women within the literature I directly address, which typically assign gender identity and performance along with the assigned sex identity. However, this is not entirely
accurate: if the concept of hysteria has typically been gendered as female since the 19th century, what does it mean for it to be exhibited in a sexed male body?

To answer this question, we will turn to the gendering of characteristics. While I will be using male/men and female/women to refer to sexed bodies, I would like to reserve the use of terms “masculine” and “feminine” for characteristics typically described as such. For this thesis, I would like to propose an understanding of gender and sex in this time period in which characteristics are gendered and then placed onto sexed bodies. This framework comes from readings of both texts I have chosen, but most specifically from the work of María de Zayas. De Zayas questioned the perceived differences between men and women both herself and through voices of her characters. In taking the characteristics of strength and weakness as an example, we can see how this framework works in practice. Strength is generally gendered as masculine, and weakness as feminine. Thus, the characteristics of having a strong spirit and strength are ascribed to the sexed male body, while the reverse is ascribed to the sexed female body.

Additionally, these characteristics take on a perceived meaning—in an early modern Spanish society, weakness is feminine, and weakness is also negative. A male who has the characteristic of being weak, then, is also considered feminine and does not have the standard characteristics of a ‘true’ man. A trait such as strength can have a masculine and a feminine side to it, but the masculine strength appearing in a sexed female body or vice versa is non-normative. Personal choice is complicated in this framework, for many people (and especially women) were unable to access opportunities outside of those given to them. These limitations were most often
determined by sex or class, and there was very little mobility (though that is not to say that this mobility never occurred). Through this, we can see how characteristics are gendered by society and then placed onto sexed bodies, often with little ability for change after the placement. In my literary analysis, I will look at instances where this is true and instances in which this system is challenged by either the characters or the authors.

While gender is an important facet of my analysis, this thesis centers around lovesickness. This project is unique because while comparative studies of lovesickness (sometimes also referred to as love melancholy, or by its Latin name amor hereos) have been written before, to my knowledge there has yet to be a comprehensive look at the theme of male lovesickness within early modern Spanish literature. 10 Marion A. Wells provides a comparative analysis of lovesickness in Italy and England in her 2006 work The Secret Wound: Love-Melancholy and Early Modern Romance. 11 Lesel Dawson has also done extensive work on lovesickness in the early modern English context. 12 Despite the fact that Spanish authors working concurrently with the authors both Wells and Dawson analyze were also writing about lovesickness, the Spanish tradition has been missing as a potential site of analysis in most works on the topic. One article in Spanish, written by G. Yuri Porras, works closely with the text of La Celestina, an extremely influential text published by

10 For discussion of madness and eroticism in the Spanish context (though not treating lovesickness per se, see Carroll B. Johnson, Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983) or Adrienne L. Martin, An Erotic Philology of Golden Age Spain (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2008).
Francisco de Rojas in 1499. The *Celestina*, which presents the ill-fated love story of the gentleman Calisto and the lady Melibea, is a pertinent example of lovesickness. As Porras writes, “the *morbus amoris* or *amor hereos*, also called ‘lovesickness’ and which was defined as the corruption of the *eros*, specifically affected rich and noble youth, whose time and means made them more favorable to this sickness.”\(^{13}\) Porras’ article presents a useful look at the function of lovesickness in the *Celestina*, and particularly how the composition of songs or poetry in the text affect the characters’ suffering. This connection between poetry and lovesickness is present in both the works I treat in this thesis, especially within Cervantes’ *La Galatea*. While Porras’ work is important when considering the literary tradition of lovesickness, he fails to address the medical works that discussed lovesickness as an illness to be cured, rather than a literary construction.

Wells, in her study of lovesickness, quotes from early modern physician André Du Laurens (b. 1558, d. 1609), who writes, “the man is quite undone and cast away…the sillie loving worme cannot anymore look upon anything but his idol: all the functions of the body are likewise perverted.”\(^{14}\) This medical view of lovesickness (published in 1597 and coming from the French context) is actually predated by several Spanish texts writing on lovesickness or melancholy. Andrés Velazquez published his *Libro de la melancholia* in 1585. While little biographical information remains about Velazquez, we know that the text is a response to Juan Huarte de San

---

\(^{13}\) “*el morbus amoris o amor hereos*, también llamado ‘mal de amores’ y que se definía como la corrupción del *eros*, afectando específicamente a jóvenes nobles y ricos, cuyo tiempo y medios los hacían más propicios a esta enfermedad,” G. Yuri Porras, “El mal de amores y las canciones en las primeras dos *Celestinas*,” *Confluencia* 24, 1 (2008), 139.

Juan’s *Examen de los ingenios para las sciencias* (*Examination of Wits*), which was published in 1575. Huarte’s work addressed humoral temperaments and the physical effects of their imbalances. Velazquez similarly discusses humoral theory and illness in the *Libro de la melancolia*, where he defines melancholy as “a negation of the understanding or reason, without fever” caused by humoral imbalance in the brain. Later, he writes that “there are infinite species of insanity, but all fall under one genre. Because there is no more within the furious, maniacs, insane, or melancholics than having a negation of reason or understanding without fever.” The symptoms presented in these excerpts can be observed through those experienced by characters in the literature of the time, most especially the idea of a man being “undone and cast away” and losing reason. In the Spanish context, a commonly used phrase after a man first sees his love is “le robó el alma,” meaning “she stole his soul”; another version of this is “le traía tan fuera de sí,” meaning “she took him far outside himself.” After the soul has been stolen, the man is fully consumed by his love, and he falls into the symptoms that Du Laurens and Velazquez describe.

Velazquez was not the only Spanish author of the time working on these illnesses. Oliva Sabuco published her *Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza del hombre* (*New Philosophy of Human Nature*) in 1587, just two years after Velazquez’s *Libro de la melancolia*. Sabuco’s work, like Velazquez’s, uses language of the humors and their balances. Her goal is for “ordinary people as well as physicians…to understand

---

15 “es una enagenación de entendimiento o razón, sin calentura,” Andrés Velazquez, *Libro de la melancolia* (Sevilla, 1585), 55v, modernization mine.

16 “infinitos son en especio los modos de locura: pero todos caen debajo de un género. Porque no hay más en los furiosos, maniacos, insanientes o melancólicos que ser una enagenación de razón o entendimiento sin calentura,” *ibid.*, 56r, modernization mine.
human nature where emotions and passions play a basic role in the relation to health and life.”

Sabuco introduced the concept of chilo, which is “a white liquid energizing force that travels through a complex network of anatomical conduits…Sabuco’s chilo rises and falls through the body’s conduits from one organ system to another, maintaining proper temperature and humidity.” Through her use of chilo, she actually moves away from Hippocratic medicine and ideas of humoral balance. Within her text, she highlights the importance of the “balance between the physical and the emotional” and discusses many emotions and environmental factors that have an effect on the function of the mind and the body.

One of the emotions that could unbalance these functions is love, which she says “kills in two manners: either losing what one loves, or not being able to reach what one loves or desires.” Both of these appear as causes for lovesickness in the literary works I treat in this thesis. She later writes of the second manner (which appears more frequently in these works) that “everyone knows that many die of love, and many others are killed, and so it would be superfluous to give examples: this effect of love is not governed by reason.” She points to the frequency of lovesick cases and implies that most of her readers would know this was a common occurrence. She also shows that lovesickness is not governed by reason, a definition

18 Ibid., 18.
19 Ibid., 17.
20 “también mata en dos maneras, o perdiendo lo que se ama, o no pudiendo alcanzar lo que se ama, y desea,” Oliva Sabuco, Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza (Madrid, 1587), 24r, modernization mine.
21 “todo el mundo sabe que muchos, y muchos murieron de amores, y otros y otros muchas se mataron, y así sería superfluo traer ejemplos: este afecto de amor no se rije por razón,” ibid., 26r, modernization mine.
similar to Velazquez’s description of melancholy. Sabuco later writes the following of lovesickness:

This effect does not create bad humor, before they die without cold, nor fever, dry, because as in the one they much love, and desire, they have employed their understanding, and will, and all the potencies of their soul, not taking joy in another thing in the world, neither in eating, nor in drinking, nor conversation; and so the vegetative [soul] does not do its job, and they go on consumed, because the discord of the body, and soul, and large affection of the soul, impedes the operation of the body.22

Sabuco follows similar medical terminology to Velazquez, but here she singles out lovesickness as a form of illness that does not involve bad humors, nor as one that causes physical symptoms such as fever. Rather, she argues that the lovers’ understanding and will is focused so entirely on the beloved that they neglect their other needs. Thus, the vegetative part of the soul (the one which provides sustenance and basic needs to the body) fails, which impedes the bodily function and can cause death. From Sabuco’s account, we see the ways in which the focuses of the mind or the soul affect the body’s function. Her description of lovesick symptoms is one that is also present in both the philosophic and literary texts of the time, most especially the idea of the lover being totally consumed by thoughts of their beloved.

While lovesickness was an important theme in both romance literature and the medical texts of the time, there was a distinction between different forms of love. Wells cites Peter of Spain, who wrote in the 13th century and distinguishes that “love falls into two categories: one that is a suffering of the heart (passio cordis) and not

---

22 “este afecto no engendra mal humor, antes mueren sin frio, ni calentura, secándose, porque como en aquello que mucho aman, y desean, tienen empleado su entendimiento, y voluntad, y todas las potencias de su alma, no toma gusto en otra cosa del mundo, ni en comer, ni en beber, ni conversación; y así la vegetativa no hace su oficio, y vase consumiendo, porque la discordia del cuerpo, y alma, y gran afecto del alma, estorba la operación del cuerpo,” Sabuco (1587), 26v, modernization mine.
truly a disease; and one that is accompanied by ‘melancholic worry and depressed thought’…this latter form of love Peter considers ‘a suffering of the brain’ that does constitute a disease.” In this, we see a subtle separation between the non-diseased love and the diseased love, in which the suffering of the heart offers no adverse side-effects but that which involves the brain is pathologized. Notably, however, the *Libro de la melancholia* seems to imply that the common thought of its time (around three centuries after Peter of Spain wrote) believed the heart to be more important.

Velazquez discusses what the philosopher Galen classified as the principal members of the body: the brain, the heart, the liver, and the testicles. He then writes that most people in the time period believed that the heart held primacy in the body and that it was especially important to maintain the health of the heart in a sick body. Velazquez works to disprove this by arguing for the primacy of the brain, and he later describes melancholy as “being first-born of and belonging to the brain, created by a cold and dry intemperance in the brain…which moves or perturbs the substance of the brain and the temperament of the radiant spirits.” These two authors, working out of a medico-philosophical tradition, uphold the idea that lovesickness (or melancholy) was primarily a disease of the brain, though it is implied that not everyone in the time period agreed with this assessment.

---

24 “el oficio del corazón es de muy gran primacía y dignidad, y más necesaria, que las demás todas para los enfermos,” Velazquez (1585), 12v.
25 “aquella melancholia, que se nace y es primogénito y propia pasión del cerebro, se hace y engendra por mala destemplanza fría y seca del cerebro…la cual muda o perturba la substancia del cerebro y el temperamento de los espíritus resplandecientes,” ibid., 66r.
26 It should be noted here that while love is sometimes considered a form a melancholy, lovesickness and melancholy are different. While other authors may refer to lovesickness as love-melancholy or love-madness, I will use ‘lovesickness’ exclusively.
Lovesickness shows us the lover’s external experience of love, and we can now turn to a philosophical text that treats the interior experience. The concept of love and its effects were not an uncommon topic of philosophical inquiry in the early modern period. Particularly, many attempted to assess the philosophy behind the experience of lovesickness, usually through a neo-Platonic perspective. One of the most prominent texts from the period that treats this concept was the *Dialogues of Love* by Judah Abravanel, more commonly known as León Hebreo in Spain (and Leone Ebreo in Italy). Born in Lisbon between the years of 1460 and 1465, Abravanel was member to a prominent Jewish family in the Iberian Peninsula. The Abravanel family moved from Lisbon to Seville in the 1480s, and Judah began to work in the court of the Catholic Monarchs of Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella. In 1492, Jews were expelled from Spain, and Abravanel fled with his family to Naples, where he was once again employed as court physician and began to write philosophical and theological works. For a period, Abravanel moved to Genoa, where many Jews exiled from Spain lived, and he expanded his intellectual circle there. He returned to Naples for a time, then spent time in various Italian cities, but mention of him in the historical record disappears after 1521. The *Dialogues of Love* was published posthumously in 1535.\(^\text{27}\)

Though Abravanel spent much of his life in Italy, the *Dialogues of Love* was translated into Spanish in 1568, and it was very popular in its time. The original language of composition is unknown, because no original manuscript has survived; scholars have worked off of early Italian manuscripts to provide modern translations.

translations. The text, published under the name León Hebreo, then “exerted a deep influence over the future centuries on the work of figures as diverse as Giordano Bruno, John Donne, Miguel de Cervantes, and Baruch Spinoza.”

The text is structured as a Platonic dialogue between two people: a man named Philo (meaning love) and a woman named Sophia (meaning wisdom). Combined, the two names form philosophia, love of wisdom, and this pun plays itself out in the characters’ relationship. Philo is in love with Sophia, though Sophia’s feelings for him are not specified, and the three Dialogues each address a different aspect of love: “On Love and Desire,” “On the Universality of Love,” and “On the Origin of Love.” While the Dialogues are rife with potential points of inquiry, what most pertains to this study are those instances in which the effects of love are described, rather than its origins. In the first dialogue, “On Love and Desire,” Philo describes the effects of love to Sophia:

In fact, true love forces the reason and the person who loves with a marvellous violence in unbelievable ways; and more than any other human hindrance love confuses the mind, where judgment lies; it erases the memory of all other things in order to fill the mind only with itself, and utterly alienates a man from himself, and makes him a slave of the beloved. It makes him enemy of every pleasure and company, a lover of solitude, melancholic, full of passions, surrounded by sufferings, tormented by depression, martyred by desire, nourished by hope, stimulated by despair, oppressed by thought, anxious from cruelty, afflicted by suspicion, pierced through by jealousy, constantly distressed, overtired by restlessness, always in pain and full of sighs, never unbowed by grief or wrongs. What else can I tell you, save that the lover’s part is a continual death in life and life in death?

Pescatori and Bacich write that while most people from as early as the 16th century have been confident the original language was Italian, others are unsure. However, they say that “while there is no precise consensus among scholars, it is generally accepted that the Dialogues was composed in Italian and subsequently edited in conformity with the linguistic standards,” Ibid., 8.


Ibid., 67-68.
This passage provides a kind of road map for the common symptoms of lovesickness, which are frequently presented in the Spanish literature. The prevalence of similar descriptions of the symptoms of lovesickness within Cervantes’ *La Galatea* and de Zayas’ *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* proves the widespread conception of the common symptoms of lovesickness and also points to the influence of Hebreo’s philosophy on the authors. Notable in the passage is the contradiction of the symptoms—one is “martyred by desire, nourished by hope, stimulated by despair, oppressed by thought,” etc. The contradictory and paradoxical nature of the symptoms demonstrates the illogical formulation of lovesickness, and the ways in which the illness removes one from reason. As we have seen from the *Libro de la melancolia* and in the *Nueva filosofía*, an illness in the brain causes a loss of reason and leads to a serious illness and often madness. The *Libro de la melancolia* supports a medical view of the dominance of the mind over the body that is also shown philosophically in the *Dialogues*.

In a neo-Platonic context, the loss of the reason or the understanding (the mind) and the ruling of the passions (the body) is the worst possible scenario—it’s not surprising that Philo refers to this situation as a “continual death in life and life in death.” This final statement is repeated by many characters in *La Galatea*, including the shepherd Mireno, who is devastated at the prospect of his love marrying another:

My death is certain, for it is not possible for one to live who has his hope so dead and so alienated from glory; but I fear that love will make impossible my death and that a false confidence will give life to my sadness, to the memory.

Cierta mi muerte está, pues no es posible que viva aquel que tiene la esperanza tan muerta y tan ajeno está de gloria; pero temo que amor haga imposible mi muerte, y que una falsa confianza dé vida a mi pesar, a la memoria.31

---

31 Cervantes (1961), I.iii.180
Mireno’s plight parallels that of Philo’s in that, while they both feel as though they should die from the pain of being separated from their love, for love’s sake they also cannot die and so must live on in suffering. The constant life in pain is the plight of lovesick lovers; they cannot escape the pain, but they also do not desire to escape it. For these men, to lose love would be the worst outcome, and so even though they suffer they must keep going for love’s sake.

Another level to the discussions on love in the Dialogues comes in the form of Philo’s own love for Sophia. Several times in the text he accuses Sophia of knowing fully the extent of his love and purposefully ignoring him to cause him pain (“she who wishes me well is the enemy of my well-being…you have been generous towards me only with suffering”). These accusations also appear within the Galatea, like in the passage I quoted at the beginning of my Prologue. Philo’s love for Sophia frames their conversations: no matter how philosophical they get, the dialogues consistently circle back around to Philo’s (potentially unrequited) love for Sophia. Their conversations may also be seen as a courtship, in which Philo is taking the opportunity to show off his knowledge to impress Sophia in the hopes that she may return his feelings. Thus, even as Philo is the teacher explaining love, he is also the lover experiencing love’s adverse effects. One of the strongest examples of this comes at the very beginning of the third dialogue:

SOPHIA: Philo! Philo! Do you not hear or do you not want to reply?
PHILO: Who is calling me?
SOPHIA: Do not pass by in such a hurry. Listen to me.
PHILO: Are you here, Sophia? I had not seen you. I was passing by without noticing.
SOPHIA: Where are you going with such attention that you neither speak to nor hear nor see the friends around you?

32 Abravanel [Hebreo] (2000), 76.
PHILO: I was attending to some needs of the part of lesser value…my mind, bothered by worldly business and the necessity of such base pursuits, has withdrawn into itself for refuge.³³

Sophia questions Philo as to what he could be contemplating so seriously that he would fully withdraw into the mind. Philo then, again, accuses her of knowing perfectly well of what (or, rather, who) he is thinking. Eventually, he gives in, saying: “since you would like me to tell you what you already know, I say that my mind, as it often is, was withdrawn in contemplation of the beauty formed in you, whose image is impressed upon it, and which is always desired. This caused me to take leave of my perception of what is outside me.”³⁴ With this, Philo exhibits the symptom he described earlier, that love “erases the memory of all other things in order to fill the mind only with itself, and utterly alienates a man from himself.”³⁵ Philo goes on to describe this state, “‘ecstasy, or we can name it ‘alienation,’ caused by loving meditation, which is more than half-death.’”³⁶ The ecstatic state is an important point of analysis for descriptions of love during this time period, and Philo tells Sophia of its dangers. The ecstasy is not similar to sleep, he says, because “sleep is a cause of life rather than a semblance of death. But the alienation caused by loving meditation happens with sensory and motion deprivation, not naturally, but violently, and it brings neither rest to the senses nor refreshment to the body.”³⁷ In short, the contemplation of one’s love can forcibly remove one from their senses and bring them to an ecstatic state which could, if left that way for long enough, cause death.

---
³⁴ Ibid., 171.
³⁵ Ibid., 68.
³⁶ Ibid., 171.
³⁷ Ibid., 172.
This description of the alienated state tracks with the description of lovesickness that Sabuco gives in her medical treatise. In that text, Sabuco writes that the vegetative part of the soul fails to do its operation because the mind is totally consumed with thoughts of the lover. We also see this form of ecstasy or alienation in both *La Galatea* and in the *Novelas*, where men are often so consumed by their passions (whether they be melancholic or choleric) that they lose control of their actions.

One such occasion happens in the second book of *La Galatea*. The hermit Silerio is overheard by the other shepherds singing a tragically beautiful love poem, which ends “with a profound sigh.”38 The shepherds enter, wanting to see the man who recited such beautiful poetry, but when they do “they clearly knew that he had fainted, which was the truth, because the profound imagination of his miseries had many times brought him to a similar end.”39 When Erastro, one of the shepherds, wakes Silerio, “he returned to himself, although so out of himself that it seemed like he had woken from a sorrowful dream, and with such signs of pain.”40 Though Philo was able to maintain certain bodily functions while in his state of alienation (he walks around the city even while fully absorbed in thought), Silerio cannot and loses consciousness. When he is revived, it is as Philo describes—Silerio has received no rest nor refreshment from his contemplation, and he seems to be in pain as he returns to himself. Philo calls this state of alienation a “half-death,” and Silerio’s fainting spell upholds this description as well. The fact that Silerio’s imagination of his

39 “claramente conocieron que desmayado estaba, como era la verdad, porque la profunda imaginación de sus miserias, muchas veces a semejante término le conducía,” *ibid.*, I.ii.125.
40 “le hizo volver en si, aunque tan desacordado, que parecía que de un pesado sueño recordaba, las cuales muestras de dolor,” *ibid.*, Lii.125-126
miseries regularly induces him to faint explains the dangers that Philo tells Sophia about in the *Dialogues*.

While the *Dialogues of Love* provides important philosophical background, the central work of this thesis will be the literary analysis of two texts: *La Galatea* by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1585) and *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* by María de Zayas y Sotomayor (1637). As I described in the Prologue, the *Galatea* is a pastoral novel, while the *Novelas* is a work of frame fiction. I am particularly interested in the ways that these texts treat lovesickness differently, and what these differences tell us about lovesickness as a whole. To draw out these differences, I will analyze the two texts by working between several different thematic dichotomies.

One of the themes I will use is the difference between the pastoral and the urban. As mentioned, *La Galatea* is a pastoral novel set on the banks of the river Tajo (in English, Tagus). While some of the scenes take place in small villages, there is very little urbanity to be found, which frees some of the characters from the restrictions of society. In fact, the few characters who leave the urban space to travel to the pastoral bring with them events that are foreign to the pastoral, including urban violence. The characters in the *Novelas*, on the other hand, are almost never outside the urban space. The stories all take place in cities, and often inside the home as well. The characters (especially the women) are thus trapped into the restrictive society of early modern Spanish nobility, and they struggle to work around or free themselves from these binds.

In addition to the themes of the pastoral and the urban, I will also be investigating melancholic and choleric forms of lovesickness. While both of the texts
address lovesickness in some way, the ways in which it is expressed are vastly different. *La Galatea* provides a view of lovesickness that I will refer to as the “melancholic,” that is, most influenced by the overproduction of the melancholic humor. This results in feelings of intense depression or sadness in the subject. The men in the novel express this melancholy through love poetry, with lines such as “I am a phantom formed for love. / I sustain myself with only hope.”41 The overwhelming melancholy also occasionally causes the shepherds to faint.42 The stories presented by de Zayas in her *Novelas*, on the other hand, showcase a more “choleric” form of lovesickness, from the overproduction of choleric humor. These usually resulted in more violent reactions—men overcome with passionate choler would induce men to fits of violence. One such scene leads to the male character, don Fadrique, beating his love until she is “bañado de sangre,” bathed in blood, because he discovered her in bed with another man.43 The two different interpretations of lovesickness also relates to the choice of location: there is almost no violence in the pastoral, and urbanity is continually associated with such violence.

The final theme I will investigate is the perspectives of the authors themselves on love and its benefits or detriments. Cervantes was a man, and while there are women in *La Galatea*, most of the novel is given over to the stories and the lyric poetry of men. The pastoral setting is an opportunity for Cervantes to present these characters (many of whom are thought to be based off of people Cervantes knew

---

41 “fantasma soy por el amor formada,/que con sola esperanza me sustento,” Cervantes (1961), I.ii.107.
42 This occurs to the hermit Silerio in the second book of *La Galatea*, due to the “profound imagination of his miseries,” (la profunda imaginación de sus miserias), *ibid.*, I.ii.125.
personally) away from court society, which also allows some freedom for the women in the story. De Zayas was a woman writing in a time when very few women were able to, and many of her stories involve violence against women. It is likely that de Zayas’ perspective of the urban scene and choleric lovesickness was influenced by her own experience, or by experiences of those close to her. In relation to these perspectives, another theme I will discuss, particularly in relation to the Novelas, is the theme of honor. Many of the women in the stories told by de Zayas feel trapped by their honor. In one story, the woman Aminta, who is tricked into marrying an already married man, says, “it cannot be argued: she who loses honor loses her life!”

She later attempts suicide with the rationale that “the death of just one woman restores the honor of so many men.” The importance of honor, and particularly a woman’s honor, appears throughout the Novelas. When a woman loses her honor, she has lost everything; on the other hand, a man’s honor seems relatively unrelated to their social position or their ability to marry. While the women often experience intense despair when they realize they have lost their honor, de Zayas gives her characters opportunities to change this, usually through violence. The loss and subsequent recovery of honor through violence demonstrates the ways in which de Zayas inverts societal norms to empower her female characters. In the Galatea, the theme of honor seems to be less constricting, but it is also inherently related to the validity of one’s behavior as a lover. A rational lover, who acts following neo-Platonic ideals, is considered more honorable than a man who simply acts on physical

44 “no hay que replicar: ¡pierda la vida quien perdió el honor!” de Zayas (2010), 234.
45 “la muerte de sola una mujer se restauran las honras de tantos hombres,” ibid., 235.
desires. The relationship between honor, reason, and lovesickness is one I will explore throughout the thesis.

Even as I have established these thematic dichotomies, I recognize that to work in binaries is a restricted form of analysis. These themes should be seen as guidelines for my analysis, not strict rules. When possible, I will point to moments in the texts where the authors move outside, through, or across these boundaries. My goal is to utilize these thematic concepts to draw out what, exactly, each of these texts tells us about lovesickness, and how that information is useful to us as modern readers.
Chapter 2: *La Galatea*

In the fifth book of *La Galatea*, the shepherds Elicio and Erastro learn that the woman that they love, Galatea, is to be married to a Portuguese shepherd and will be leaving their region forever. When the other shepherds find Elicio and Erastro, they see Erastro weeping. Elicio, who has fainted, lies unconscious in the grass next to him. After Elicio regains consciousness, he tells the shepherd Damón of Galatea’s betrothal, which he says is “the cause of my fainting, and that which will be [the cause] of my death, for to see Galatea in foreign power, and foreign from my sight, I could not wait for another thing other than the end of my days.”

Elicio’s intense desperation caused by the imminent loss of Galatea and the physical expression of his internal sadness through fainting provide examples of two of the ways that lovesickness functions within the text of *La Galatea*. Through scenes like the one above placed throughout the novel, Miguel de Cervantes creates a setting in which love (and lovesickness) is expressed freely, both verbally and physically.

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra was born in 1547 in Castile to a minor gentry family. In 1569, Cervantes left Spain for Rome, where he learned of Italian Renaissance art and literature. He then spent some time as a private soldier, stationed in Naples. While a soldier, he was injured in the Battle of Lepanto and lost the function of his left hand. Later, on his way back to Spain with letters of recommendation for his promotion, Cervantes’ ship was captured by pirates, and he was sold into slavery in Algiers. He remained as a slave for five years before his family was able to ransom him and bring him back to Spain. Upon his return, he

---

46 “la causa de mi desmayo, y la que será de mi muerte, pues de ver a Galatea en poder ajeno, y ajena de mi vista, no se puede esperar otra cosa que el fin de mis días,” Cervantes (1961), II.v.131.
began working various clerical positions to support himself while writing on the side. In 1585, he published La Galatea, his first novel, which gained him a small amount of notoriety, but he did not find large literary success until the publication of Don Quijote in 1605. While not his most famous work, La Galatea was still valued highly by Cervantes, who repeatedly promised to write its sequel before his death in 1616. The text is also considered to be the peak of the pastoral genre in Spanish literature, the popularity of which eventually waned after the publication of Lope de Vega’s Arcadia in 1598.

The Galatea is comprised of six books. While various characters appear and share interpolated stories, the central story concerns the shepherd Elicio and his beloved, the beautiful Galatea. Other characters that I will discuss include Teolinda, a shepherdess who is left extremely saddened after her beloved Artidoro leaves her; Silerio, a man who became a hermit after he believed he lost his best friend Timbrio and his beloved Nisida; Tirsi and Damón, inseparable friends who frequently comment on the philosophy of love; Lenio the ‘desamorado,’ or ‘loveless,’ who argues against love until he himself falls in love with the ‘endurecida’ or ‘hardened’ Gelasia, who has also sworn off love; and Erastro, a dear friend of Elicio’s who also loves Galatea. These characters are joined by others who share their own stories and experiences of love, all coming together to present a mosaic of characterization and experience. The book is a prosimetric work, written in prose with the characters often expressing themselves through lyric verse, and it addresses love in a myriad of ways. In this chapter, I will close read six passages from the Galatea—one for each book of the novel—to examine the prevalence and understandings of lovesickness at the time.
it was published. I will be working through several dichotomies of themes to analyze the differences between representations of lovesickness in the two texts I treat in this project. This chapter will focus mostly on the theme of the pastoral, melancholic lovesickness, and the male authorial perspective, and I will explore the counter themes in the next chapter, on María de Zayas’ *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares*. To help draw out the themes in this chapter, I have grouped my close readings into the following subsections: the philosophic framework of love, the metaphor of love as faith, and the role of women in lovesick interactions.

**Philosophic framework of love**

The following passage comes from the fourth book in the *Galatea*, after the central group of shepherds meets a group of travelers. One of the travelers, named Darinto, begins a discussion with the shepherds in which he argues that the pastoral life is superior to the urban, because in the pastoral people are freer. The distinction between the pastoral and the urban here enters the text directly, proving the freedom that the characters of the pastoral novel have for their expressions of love. After this discussion, there is a debate between the ‘desamorado’ Lenio and the shepherd Tirsi over whether or not love should be praised as it is. Lenio, who has sworn off love completely, poses an argument against love, while Tirsi defends it. At the end of the argument, the shepherds agree with Tirsi’s perspective that love is good and should be commended for all that it does. The argument between the two shepherds provides an extensive look into Cervantes’ philosophical framework of love. Ultimately, we can trace this form of argument back to the debate between Socrates and Lysias in Plato’s *Phaedrus* on the lover and the non-lover. The influence of neo-Platonism is
also clear in this section, as it references León Hebreo’s *Dialogues of Love* several times. Lenio’s argument comes first in the text, and his speech against love includes the following section:

Well from this love or desire of corporeal beauty, has been born, is born, and will be born in the world the devastation of cities, the ruin of states, the destruction of empires, and the deaths of friends; and when these [disasters] generally do not occur, what greater misfortunes, what graver torments, what fires, what jealousy, what shames, what deaths could the human understanding imagine that can compare to those that the miserable lover suffers? And it is the cause of this that, as all of the happiness of the lover consists in enjoying the beauty they desire, and this beauty is impossible to possess and enjoy entirely, the lover cannot reach the end of what he desires, and this produces in him sighs, tears, complaints, and depression…and so, it can be concluded that where there is love, there is pain, and anyone who denies this also denies that the sun is light and that fire burns.

This section begins with the mention of “this love or desire of corporeal beauty,” which brings up a distinction that Lenio makes earlier in the argument about beauty. In this distinction, Lenio separates beauty into the corporeal and the incorporeal.

Lenio says that “the love that loves corporeal beauty as its ultimate goal cannot be good, and this is the love of which I am an enemy.” He argues that while the incorporeal beauty is made up of virtues and the sciences of the soul (and the love of such beauty would be good), the corporeal beauty is baser and grounded more in pleasure than in virtue. Separations between love of virtue and desire for pleasure are

---

47 “Pues deste amor o desear la corporal belleza, han nacido, nacen y nacerán en el mundo asolación de ciudades, ruina de estados, destrucción de imperios y muertes de amigos; y cuando esto generalmente no suceda, ¿qué desdichas mayores, qué tormentos más graves, qué incendios, qué celos, qué penas, qué muertes puede imaginar el humano entendimiento que a las que padece el miserable amante puedan compararse? Y es la causa desto que, como toda la felicidad del amante consista en gozar la belleza que desea, y esta belleza sea imposible poseerse y gozarse enteramente, aquel no poder llegar al fin que se desea, engendra en él los sospiros, las lágrimas, las quejas y desabrimientos…Y así, se concluye que, donde hay amor, hay dolor, y quien esto negase, negaría asimismo que el sol es claro y que el fuego abrasa,” Cervantes (1961), II.iv.45-46.

48 “el amor que la belleza corporal amare como último fin suyo, este tal amor no puede ser bueno, y éste es el amor de quien yo soy enemigo,” *ibid.*, II.iv.44.
central to early modern philosophical understandings of love. This separation is made

clear when Lenio says that human beings mostly:

consider incorporeal beauty with the eyes of understanding, clean and clear, and view the corporeal beauty with the corporeal eyes, blind and muddy in comparison to the incorporeal eyes, and as the eyes of the body are more prepared to look at the corporeal beauty, which pleases them, and the eyes of the understanding are less likely to consider the absent incorporeal beauty, which they glorify, it follows that mortals are more likely to love the feeble and mortal beauty, which destroys them, and not the singular and divine beauty, which betters them. 49

The corporeal beauty is that which leads humans to base desire and eventual destruction, while the incorporeal beauty leads them to higher desires and eventual ascension. After he establishes his two different forms of love, he continues his argument against the desire for corporeal beauty, which he believes is the form that most humans follow. Lenio says that from the desire of corporeal beauty “has been born, is born, and will be born in the world the devastation of cities, the ruin of states, the destruction of empires, and the deaths of friends.” He blames love, and particularly the baser love of corporeal beauty, for these tragedies because of the actions of men at the hands of love. This follows along with arguments made by Philo in the Dialogues of Love, in which he says that “sensitive knowledge and appetite, or sensuous love, is what we find in irrational animals; they follow what is good for them, and they avoid what is disadvantageous.” 50 The connection of this sensuous love—which we can interpret as a desire for corporeal beauty—to irrationality

49 “la belleza incorpórea se considera con los ojos del entendimiento, limpios y claros, y la belleza corpórea se mire con los ojos corporales, en comparación de los incorpóreos, turbios y ciegos, y como sean más prestos los ojos del cuerpo a mirar la belleza presente corporal, que agrada, que no los del entendimiento a considerar la ausente incorpórea, que glorifica, síguese que más ordinariamente aman los mortales la caduca y mortal belleza, que los destruye, que no la singular y divina, que los mejora,” Cervantes (1961), II.iv.45.

50 Abaravanel [Hebreo] (2000), 81.
supports Lenio’s claim. Within the speech, Lenio brings up several historical examples of the pains brought from the desire of beautiful women, which only served to cause destruction, not any sort of ascension to the ideal that many of the other shepherds believe comes from love. Some of these allusions were biblical: he mentions Lot lying with his daughters, Amnon lying with his sister Tamar, and the story of Samson and Delilah. Other allusions are mythological: he discusses Hercules, Medea, and the destruction of Troy. All of these examples are meant to show how even the strongest people are brought down by love, and how love causes people to act on their worst impulses.

Lenio concedes that love does not always cause such external, extreme violence: “and when these [disasters] generally do not occur, what greater misfortunes, what graver torments, what fires, what jealousy, what shames, what deaths could the human understanding imagine that can compare to those that the miserable lover suffers?” Even when outsiders to the situation may not be able to see the suffering, it still occurs very seriously to the lover. There may not be physical violence, but the mental violence that the lover suffers at the hands of love is, according to Lenio, more serious and graver than any disaster the human understanding could imagine. This part of the argument actually fits closely with representations of the suffering of the lovesick lover; often, his sufferings may seem unexplainable to the outsider. In the *Galatea* specifically, the women are usually the ones who question the causes of the men’s sufferings. While the other shepherds may easily comprehend just what the lover suffers from (and are usually suffering similar things themselves), their beloveds are usually unaware—or pretend to be unaware—
of whatever pain occurs within the lover, and as such could not imagine what kinds of disasters are occurring within their minds. While the women may suspect exactly what causes pain in the lover, they want explicit communication of the feelings. Several times in the *Galatea* the beloveds tell the lovers that they cannot be blamed for any pain if they are not aware of the exact cause of the pain, essentially telling the men that they must tell the women it is love for them that causes suffering, not just a general desire.

Lenio then continues, “and it is the cause of this that, as all of the happiness of the lover consists in enjoying the beauty they desire, and this beauty is impossible to possess and enjoy entirely, the lover cannot reach the end of what he desires, and this produces in him sighs, tears, complaints, and depression.” For Lenio, the lovesick state comes as a result of the lover’s inability to fully enjoy the beauty he desires. This “enjoyment” is a topic that comes up frequently in discussions of a lover’s validity and should be read as referring to a sexual or base enjoyment. If the lover only sets out to “enjoy” or “revel in” (in Spanish: gozar) the beloved’s beauty, he is not a true lover, because the true lover would not want to only interact with the beloved sexually. The true lover loves the beloved for deeper qualities, and he looks to this love to help him achieve rational ascension. Lenio believes that most lovers only have the sexual enjoyment of beauty as their end goals, and since they are usually unable to fully satisfy this desire, they then feel melancholy. Lenio lists “sighs, tears, complaints, and depression” as the effects of the lover’s inability to enjoy his beloved’s beauty, which uphold a melancholic form of lovesickness. That the lovers convey their sufferings through expressions of sadness, rather than
expressions of anger, proves that their lovesickness comes from a melancholic impetus rather than a choleric one.

Lenio concludes this part of the argument, “where there is love, there is pain, and anyone who denies this also denies that the sun is light and that fire burns.” Within Lenio’s reasoning, there is no love that doesn’t cause pain, and for Lenio there is no love that is worth the suffering it causes. He continues his speech with further reasons why love is not virtuous nor rational, and why men should no longer sing its praises. He ends his speech with a song, in which the comparisons of love and fire appear once again:

Love is fire that consumes the soul, 
in that freezes, arrow that opens the chest so at its hands [he] lives carelessly; roiling sea that has never seen calm, minister of rage, father of spite, enemy disguised as friend, giver of scarce good and abundant bad, affable, enjoyable, cruel and fierce tyrant.  

Amor es fuego que consume al alma, hielo que hiela, flecha que abre el pecho que de sus manos vive descuidado; turbado mar do no se ha visto calma, ministro de ira, padre del despecho, enemigo disfrazado como amigo dador de escaso bien y mal colmado, afable, lisonjero, tirano crudo y fiero.

His characterization of love here is not dissimilar from the ways in which lovesick characters speak of love. They will also bring up the idea of the soul’s consumption by love, and occasionally they might use the language of tyranny or cruelty when discussing love. His use of antithesis at the end of the stanza, “affable, enjoyable / cruel and fierce tyrant,” also follows along with the use of antithesis by Philo in the Dialogues to describe lovesick experience. However, the characters who believe in love would shift their speech into an appreciation of love’s character, rather than a

---

51 Cervantes (1961), II.iv.55.
denigration of it. Lenio wants to live his life completely without love, while the other shepherds would never give it up, even if it brings them pain.

After Lenio finishes his argument, Tirsi poses his counter-argument in defense of love. In it, he separates love into the same categories that Philo does in the *Dialogues of Love*: “honest love, useful love, and delightful love.” Tirsi says that “the honest love looks toward heaven’s things, eternal and divine; the useful, towards the earth’s things, happy and perishable, like riches, power, and titles; the delightful, to the delicious and pleasant things, like the living corporeal beauties,” and while we should strive towards this honest love, we should not shun the useful or the delightful loves, because they too are natural within us. Tirsi again follows Philo’s idea that the three types of love must be balanced with reason in order to become true love. He also accuses Lenio of fundamentally misunderstanding love, because “love and desire are two different things, not all that is loved is desired, and not all that is desired is love.” Tirsi here follows Sophia’s logic on the difference between love and desire, which she expresses at the very beginning of the first dialogue:

> loving and desiring, as aspects of the will, are contrary to each other…love is for the object loved, whereas desire is the wish to possess or acquire that object…I desire what I do not love, since I do not possess it. Yet, as soon as I have it, I will love it and no longer desire it.

---

52 “amor honesto, en amor útil y en amor deleitable,” Cervantes (1961), II.iv.59. While ‘deleitable’ translates to ‘delightful,’ the form of love it refers to is the same as what Hebreo calls ‘pleasurable’ love.

53 “el amor honesto mira a las cosas del cielo, eternas y divinas; el útil, a las de la tierra, alegres y perecederas, como son las riquezas, mandos y señoríos; el deleitable, a las gustosas y placenteras, como son las bellezas corporales vivas,” ibid., II.iv.59.

54 “amor y deseo son dos cosas diferentes, que no todo lo que se ama se desea, ni todo lo que se desea se ama,” ibid., II.iv.58.

In fact, much of the language Tirsi uses in this passage follows Sophia’s argument, including the examples of a healthy person not continuing to desire health but instead loving it because they possess it or a person with children not saying they desire children but rather that they love them. This is an interesting choice on the part of Cervantes, since Philo and Sophia debate her claims about love and desire for a while. Philo eventually proposes the definition that both agree upon: “defining desire as an affect of the will for the existence or possession of what it lacks and love as an affect of the will to enjoy the thing judged good through union with it.”

This distinction between possession and union is one that will be particularly useful when considering the depictions of love and lovesickness in both the *Galatea* and in María de Zayas’ *Novelas*.

Tirsi then explains that love is the father of desire, and that his definition of love is the following: “love is the first mutation that we feel in our mind, from the appetite that moves us and that tears us from ourselves, and that delights and soothes us; and this pleasure creates movement in the soul, and this movement is called desire,” and thus the desire moves us closer to that which we love, and we will only love it when we possess it. Movement towards the beloved is another central tenet of neo-Platonic love, because in honest love we love what is better than us, and through union with the good thing we move ourselves closer to ascendance to the divine. In placing love before desire, Tirsi also aligns himself with the distinction between union and possession. If love is what causes desire to move the lover closer

---

56 Abravanel [Hebreo] (2000), 34.
57 “amor es aquella primera mutación que sentimos en nuestra mente, por el apetito que nos conmueve y nos tira a sí, y nos deleita y aplace; y aquel placer engendra movimiento en el ánimo, el cual movimiento se llama deseo,” Cervantes (1961), II.iv.58.
to the beloved, then it has its goal of union. A desire whose father is also desire would want possession of the beloved, rather than union with her and all of her good qualities.

As Francisco López Estrada writes, these arguments were meant to “concentrate in them the most common arguments about this material in an ordered and harmonious form.” While Cervantes was very familiar with León Hebreo and other Italian neo-Platonists (such as Pietro Bembo or Mario Equicola), the audience of the *Galatea* may not have been as familiar. López Estrada writes that “the pastoral literature since the *Diana* of Montemayor (1561) had served to diffuse between their readers the notions of a theory of love that was acceptable to understand many aspects of the literary expression, above all of the lyric.” The argument between Tirsi and Lenio is a way for Cervantes to convey these philosophical ideas to the audience, and the audience should understand these ideas in order to understand the rest of the text. For that reason, though the argument occurs in the fourth book, I have chosen to begin my analysis of the *Galatea* with this debate. The ideas proposed here by the two shepherds, and the references they make to the *Dialogues*, should be kept in mind when reading the rest of this chapter.

The next passage comes from the third book, within which the shepherds attend the wedding of Silveria and Daranio, two others who live in their village. The wedding is fraught from the beginning, as another shepherd named Mireno is deeply

---

59 “los libros de pastores desde la *Diana* de Montemayor (1561) habían servido para difundir entre sus lectores las nociones de una teoría del amor que les era válida para entender muchos aspectos de la expresión literaria, sobre todo de la lírica,” *ibid.*, 193.
in love with Silveria and believes she is only marrying Daranio for his wealth. During the wedding reception, the shepherds Orompo, Orfenio, Crisio, and Marsilio perform an eclogue, a series of short poems and exchanges on a pastoral subject. The subject chosen by the four shepherds is a debate over which of them suffers the worst pain from love. Orompo opens the eclogue with a poem about his beloved Listea, who has died, in which he says that when death took her, it also took “grace, finesse, beauty and sanity” from the world.\(^{60}\) He speaks of his lack of hope in the wake of Listea’s death, and he concludes that “the sorrow will never leave me.”\(^{61}\) Marsilio follows Orompo’s poem; he is labelled as the “hopeless” lover because his love is not returned by his beloved. He speaks of the combined good and bad he faces—while he can still look upon and see his beloved, she will not return his feelings and so he is constantly suffering. After Marsilio’s song, Crisio tells of his pain in the face of his absent beloved. He claims that “deaths, diversions, jealousy, severity / of livid breast, moveable condition, / do not torment like nor harm as / this pain does,” attempting to place his pain above those of the other shepherds.\(^{62}\) The final shepherd to sing is Orfenio, the jealous lover. He tells the other shepherds to be quiet, because “death, disdain, or absence / do not have competition with jealousy.”\(^{63}\) He says that jealousy is the worst pain because there is no remedy: “it is impossible to separate me / from this sad living death,” he concludes.\(^{64}\) The four shepherds end the eclogue by

---

\(^{60}\) “la gracia, el donaire, belleza y cordura,” Cervantes (1961), I.iii.207.

\(^{61}\) “la pena que nunca me deja,” ibid., I.iii.207.

\(^{62}\) “muertes, desvíos, celos, inclemencia/de airado pecho, condición mudable,/no atormentan así ni dañan tanto/como este mal,” ibid., I.iii.212.

\(^{63}\) “muerte, desde ni ausencia/no tengan con los celos competencia,” ibid., I.iii.215.

\(^{64}\) “es imposible apartarme/desta triste viva muerte,” ibid., I.iii.220.
summarizing their arguments for why their pain is the worst, which invites the other wedding guests to debate the subject afterward.

The other shepherds take up the task of debating the eclogue, and Damón makes the convincing argument that Orfenio, who suffers jealousy, suffers the most. Damón generally believes that jealousy does not prove love at all, but even if one conceded that the jealous lover is still in love, their jealousy proves that their love is an ill love. Lovesickness runs throughout this passage, especially the jealous form of lovesickness. The entire debate over which form of love is the most painful tracks with how lovesickness is presented in works of this time period. More generally, Damón’s speech here, and the eclogue that precedes it, represent the common philosophical discussions that characters in the *Galatea* hold about love’s benefits, detriments, and its effects on the lover. Within this argument, he says to the other shepherds:

It has more, as well, the strength of this harsh venom: for there is no antidote that preserves [the jealous lover], no advice that he values, no friend that helps him, nor excuse that suits him; all of these fit in the jealous lover, and more: that whatever shadow scares him, whatever triviality troubles him, and whatever suspicion, true or false, undoes him; and to all of this misfortune another is added: that with the reasons they give to him, he believes that they deceive him. Because no other medicine exists for the illness of jealousy than reasons, and the jealous lover does not want to admit them, it follows that this illness is without remedy, and should be placed before the rest… jealousy is not a sign of much love, but one of much impertinent curiosity; and if [jealousy] is a sign of love, it is like a fever in an ill man, that having one is a sign of life, but a sick and ill-disposed life, and so the jealous lover has love, but it is sick and badly conditioned love.65

---

65 «Tiene más, asimismo, la fuerza deste crudo veneno: que no hay antídoto que le preserve, consejo que le valga, amigo que le ayude, ni disculpa que le cuadre; todo esto cabe en el enamorado celoso, y más: que cualquiera sombra le espanta, cualquiera niñería le turbá, y cualquier sospecha, falsa o verdadera, le deshace; y a toda esta desventura se la añade otra: que con las disculpas que le dan,
Damón argues for “the strength of this harsh venom,” over the other sufferings of love (death, unreciprocated love, or absence of the beloved) because jealousy’s venom has “no antidote that preserves [the jealous lover], no advice that he values, no friend that helps him, nor excuse that suits him.” With this list of symptoms, it becomes clear that the jealous lover has lost his reason. His inability to see an antidote, accept advice or excuses, and to find friends means that the jealous sentiment has completely taken over his mental capacity and influences all of his decisions. This loss of reason occurs with the other pains from love as well, but Damón argues that jealousy is still worse: “all of these fit in the jealous lover, and more: that whatever shadow scares him, whatever triviality troubles him, and whatever suspicion, true or false, undoes him.” This, again, proves the lack of reason: the jealous lover can no longer discern between rational reality and irrational fantasy. This is what makes jealousy the “harsh venom,” as it poisons the mind with irrational notions and removes the lover from rational conceptions of the world.

This definition of jealousy is one that tracks with Sabuco’s definition in her medical treatise published just two years after the Galatea. Of jealousy, she writes that “it is a fear and apprehension of losing what they love, which later follows great love, overthrowing the brain with bad humor, melancholic, and so they suspect what doesn’t exist.”

---

66 “es un temor y miedo de perder lo que se ama, que luego se sigue al grande amor, derruba del celebro mal humor, melancólico, y así sospechan lo que no es,” Sabuco (1587), 37v-38r, modernization mine.
form of lovesickness. The introduction of jealousy here presents a type of lovesickness different from others. The other shepherds in the eclogue suffer from some sort of extreme sadness, caused by the death, absence, or unrequitedness of their love; all of these forms fall under the umbrella of melancholic lovesickness. Jealousy, however, seems to be a more choleric form—in Damón’s description, the language of violence and severity is utilized several times. While the Galatea primarily provides examples of melancholic lovesickness, this discussion of the more choleric form of jealousy constitutes an interruption of the standard. Because jealousy is a form of choleric lovesickness, it is seen as more severe and thus more painful than the other, melancholic forms.

Damón’s claim that jealousy causes effects that then “undo” the lover adds to this sense of the lover losing his rationality. The verb Damón uses is “deshacer,” which Sebastián de Covarrubias defines, in his 1611 dictionary of the Spanish language, as “to consume, to bother…to undo, like salt does in water: undone, that which has lost its original form.” The idea of something that causes the lover to dissolve as salt does in water creates a powerful image; the lover ceases to exist entirely, totally lost to the power of his jealousy. This again brings up a form of violence in the undoing of the lover, which adds to the perception of jealousy as a choleric form of lovesickness. A mere suspicion is all it takes to undo the lover completely, because his reason has been totally consumed by his jealous feelings. His passion comes before his reason, making him irrational. Damón continues that “and

67 “consumirse, afligirse…deshacerse, como la sal en el agua: deshecho, lo que ha perdido su primera forma.” Sebastián de Covarrubias, Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española, ed. Martín de Riquer (Barcelona: S. A. Horta, 1943), 459. All citations of Covarrubias from Riquer. Hereafter Covarrubias (1943).
to all of this misfortune another is added: that with the reasons they give to him, he believes that they deceive him.” Again, the word Damón chooses here is notable: he says “disculpas,” which could signify either the plural form of “excuse” or “reason” as well as the singular of “apology.” No matter the definition chosen, the meaning of Damón’s sentence here is clear as a reference to the jealous lover’s complete refusal to hear anything outside of his own thoughts. He has convinced himself totally of his beloved’s commitment to another, and he will not hear otherwise from anyone.

Damón then says that “because no other medicine exists for the illness of jealousy than reasons, and the jealous lover does not want to admit them, it follows that this illness is without remedy, and should be placed before the rest.” Damón explicitly draws out the connection between jealousy and illness, particularly how the jealous illness exists without any remedy. The metaphor brings us to the theme of lovesickness and allows us to see this debate not just as which forms of love brings the most pain, but of which form of lovesickness is the most severe. Damón believes that jealous lovesickness must be put before all the other forms precisely because of its lack of remedy, which is caused directly by the lover’s own defiance of a remedy. The jealous lover’s refusal to hear reason or to view anything outside of his own beliefs ensures that he will never be able to break out of his jealousy. It is necessarily a vicious cycle, in which the lover perceives something that brings up his jealous feelings, someone else (either the beloved or a friend) attempts to break him of this conviction, and the lover remains convinced that even these reasons, no matter their actual intention, are meant to deceive him and move him away from the truth.
After establishing jealous lovesickness as the sickness with no remedy, Damón contends that “jealousy is not a sign of much love, but one of much impertinent curiosity.” Again, here, the Spanish usage must be discussed. Damón says that jealousy is a sign of “mucho curiosidad impertinente.” This wording brings to mind “El curioso impertinente,” a short story interpolated in the first part of the Don Quijote, which exemplifies Damón’s description of the jealous lover. In the story, the character Anselmo marries the beautiful Camila. After they are married, however, he begins to question whether she truly is as honest and perfect as he believes she is. He asks his friend Lotario to enter into a test with Camila. Lotario will be invited to dine with the couple and flirt with Camila when Anselmo leaves the room. Lotario reluctantly agrees, and they pull off the test. Camila refuses Lotario, and Anselmo is pleased, but he is not fully satisfied, and he asks Lotario to continue the charade. Eventually, Lotario and Camila become lovers, proving how Anselmo’s curiosity truly was impertinent. He was so curious to find out if Camila was true to him that he actually pushed her into the arms of another, and in so doing, he manufactured the situation that was his own downfall. The unfounded jealousy that Anselmo felt over Camila could never be satisfied, even when he was faced with proof of her rejection of Lotario. This story, which Cervantes wrote after the Galatea, upholds the description that Damón presents here for the jealous lover. With this specific choice of language (which most modern readers familiar with the Quijote would recognize), Damón says that the jealous lover will always be their own downfall, because their jealousy only demonstrates their impertinent curiosity.

Damón continues his argument, “and if [jealousy] is a sign of love, it is like a fever in an ill man, that having one is a sign of life, but a sick and ill-disposed life.” Again, there is a comparison between jealousy and illness. As a fever proves that an ill man is alive, but is still ill, so jealousy proves that “the jealous lover has love, but it is sick and badly conditioned love.” Damón consistently draws parallels between the jealous lover and the sick man in this passage, which proves the pathologization of love’s effects in this time. In this speech, Damón brings together the philosophical framework of love with its physical manifestations. If Tirsi and Lenio’s argument connects love in the *Galatea* to a neo-Platonic tradition of philosophy, Damón’s discussion of jealousy connects these philosophical understandings of love into the specific manifestation of jealousy. This discussion also involves an introduction of a different form of lovesickness than we generally see in the *Galatea*. Jealousy is a more choleric kind of lovesickness than the other forms discussed in the eclogue, which makes it stand out as the worst kind of pain a lover can face.

The sections from Tirsi and Lenio’s debate and Damón’s speech establish the framework of love in the *Galatea*, and they also set up a subtle distinction between love and lovesickness. While the two concepts may sometimes seem interchangeable, there are important differences that make love the desired end and lovesickness the unfortunate side-effect. Lovesickness is what occurs when a lover cannot keep his reason alongside his love, or who allows his passion to overpower his reason. Damón proves this in his discussion of the jealous lover, whose love is “sick and badly conditioned.” It is also demonstrated in the debate between Tirsi and Lenio, as Tirsi claims that the love that Lenio fights against is not real love, because it is unreasoned.
Lenio’s descriptions of the negative effects of love are simply descriptions of different forms of lovesickness, rather than characteristics inherent to love itself. These differences are necessary to keep in mind when analyzing the rest of the *Galatea*, because while the characters will generally only use “love” to refer to all of its benefits and detriments, this project is more focused on its negative effects, or lovesickness.

*Love as faith*

The fifth book of *La Galatea* is full of important events, but perhaps the most shocking is the discovery that the ‘desamorado’ Lenio has fallen deeply in love with the shepherdess Gelasia, who is hardened against love in a manner similar to Lenio’s previous position. In the previous book, Lenio delivered an entire argument against love, in which he says that love only causes pain and destruction. At the end of this book, Lenio apologizes to the other shepherds for his insults to love, and he asks for their forgiveness. The dramatic switch in Lenio’s treatments of love is compounded by the irony in his situation: he falls in love with a woman who has completely sworn off love, and who will never love him back. Lenio’s new lovesick state is first introduced to the audience through the shepherd Arsindo’s description:

I say, in short, shepherds, that Lenio the loveless would die for the hardened Gelasia, and for her he fills the air with sighs, and the earth with tears; and there is worse in this, for I believe that love wanted to take revenge on Lenio’s rebellious heart, surrendering him to the hardest and most aloof shepherdess ever seen, and knowing him, [love] ensured that now [Lenio] speaks and reconciles himself with love, and the same terms that he used to vilify, he now acclaims and honors; and with all of this, neither love is moved to favor him, nor is Gelasia inclined to remedy him, and I have seen it with my own eyes, for not many hours have past since, as I came with this shepherdess, we found him in the spring of the Pizarras, stretched out on the ground
with his face covered in a cold sweat and his chest breathing with a strange haste.\textsuperscript{69}

Arsindo tells the other shepherds that “Lenio the loveless would die for the hardened Gelasia, and for her he fills the air with sighs, and the earth with tears.” This reference to sighs and tears calls back to the argument Lenio makes in the fourth book, in which he says that love “produces in [the lover] sighs, tears, complaints, and depression.”\textsuperscript{70} At that point, Lenio argues that these expressions of sadness are proof that love destroys the lover and only causes him pain. Now, Lenio has taken the position of the lovesick lover, and he expresses himself through the same symptoms. It is made all the worse that Lenio the “desamorado” has fallen in love with the “endurecida,” or “hardened” Gelasia. “Endurecida” most closely translates to “hardened,” but Covarrubias makes the note that, when applied to a person, it may also refer to “the wicked/perverse, the cruel/pitiless, and the ruthless/heartless.”\textsuperscript{71} In the case of Gelasia, any of these definitions would be accurate: she has hardened herself against love and any potential lovers, and because of this she is seen by the shepherds as being cruel, heartless, and perverse. Lenio’s designation as the “desamorado” only referred to his position towards love; Gelasia’s designation seems much stronger in comparison.

\textsuperscript{69} “Digo, en fin, pastores, que Lenio el desamorado muere por la endurecida Gelasia, y por ella llena el aire de sospiros, y la tierra de lágrimas; y lo que hay más malo en esto, es que me parece que el amor ha querido vengarse del rebelde corazón de Lenio, rindiéndole a la más dura y esquiva pastora que se ha visto, y conociéndolo el, procura agora en cuanto dice y hace reconciliarse con el amor, y por los mismos términos que antes le vituperaba, ahora le ensalza y honra; y con todo esto, ni el amor se mueve a favorecerle, ni Gelasia se inclina a remediarle, como lo he visto por los ojos, pues no ha muchas horas que, viendo yo en compañía desta pastora, le hallamos en la fuente de las Pizarras, tendido en el suelo, cubierto el rostro de un sudor frío y anhelando el pecho con una extraña priesa,” Cervantes (1961), II.v.156.

\textsuperscript{70} “engendra en él los sospiros, las lágrimas, las quejas y desabrimientos,” ibid., II.iv.46.

\textsuperscript{71} “el protervo, el impío, y despiadado,” Covarrubias (1943), 517. Modernization mine.
Arsindo then says to the other shepherds, “and there is worse in this, for I believe that love wanted to take revenge on Lenio’s rebellious heart, surrendering him to the hardest and most aloof shepherdess ever seen.” The personification of love in this sentence, as a being that wants to enact revenge on Lenio’s heart, references a deeper understanding of love as not just a being capable of such an act, but as a holy agent itself. In this conception of love as god, then the act of loving becomes an act of religion. Before this point, Lenio’s heart was “rebellious”—he refused to venerate love, and instead spent his time denigrating it. Now, however, love has taken vengeance, and has given Lenio’s heart over to Gelasia, a woman who will never love him back. Arsindo says that once Lenio realized his feelings for Gelasia, he “reconciles himself with love, and the same terms that he used to vilify, he now acclaims and honors.” Essentially, Lenio has felt a revelation and has now converted completely into the religion of love. His later apology to love in front of the other shepherds also takes on a religious note. He begins his song, “sweet love, now I repent / my past stubbornness,” a take on repentance and confession that continues after the song, when he throws himself at Tirsi’s feet and tells Tirsi that he may end his life as punishment for his past mistakes. Tirsi tells him that “the worst offense of all offenses, dear Lenio, is to be persistent in them…and as you, Lenio, confess the error in which you have stayed, and now you know the powerful forces of love, and you understand that he is the universal owner of our hearts,” he may be forgiven.

The language here clearly takes on a religious tone, and plays on the Catholic rites of

72 “Dulce amor, ya me arrepiento/de mis pasadas porfias,” Cervantes (1961), II.v.163.
73 “la mayor culpa que hay en las culpas, Lenio amigo, es el estar pertinaces en ellas…y pues tu, Lenio, confiesas el error en que has estado, y conoces agora las poderosas fuerzas del amor, y entiendes dél que es señor universal de nuestros corazones,” ibid., II.v.165.
confession and forgiveness, with Tirsi taking on the role of the priest. Cervantes here performs a burlesque of the Catholic tradition, taking practices that the audience would recognize and changing them to fit into this formulation of love as god. Particularly notable is Tirsi’s reference to love as the “universal owner of our hearts,” as a more traditionally religious view would have God placed in this position.

Though Lenio has reconciled himself with love and now sings its praises, “neither love is moved to favor him, nor is Gelasia inclined to remedy him.” Here, love seems to be acting as a vengeful god. It has decided to enact revenge on Lenio’s heart, and despite Lenio’s newfound belief in its power, it will not favor him, nor will Gelasia help him. Gelasia’s refusal to remedy Lenio’s plight also references the perception that the beloved women must take some action to help the lovesick men. Gelasia, who has already been well established as someone hardened against love, would obviously never make the choice to help Lenio. The audience has already seen her reject another suitor, in the scene that introduces her, and thus Lenio’s love was clearly fruitless from the start. Even without Gelasia’s participation, however, there might still be potential for Lenio’s love to be saved, if perhaps the god love decided to take mercy on his newly-repentant heart and direct it towards someone who is more likely to remedy his lovesick state. Unfortunately for Lenio, however, love has decided against helping him, and he remains in a severely lovesick state.

Arsindo describes said state, “I have seen it with my own eyes, for not many hours have past since, as I came with this shepherdess, we found him in the spring of the Pizarras, stretched out on the ground with his face covered in a cold sweat and his chest breathing with a strange haste.” This description paints a vivid picture of just
how severe symptoms of lovesickness can become. While lovesickness may start as an illness in the brain, it easily transfers into a physically embodied illness, as Lenio’s state shows here. His face is covered in a cold sweat, and his chest struggles to get air. In addition to his physical symptoms, there are mental diversions as well: later, when the rest of the shepherds see him, he is “so transported in his imaginations” that he walked right past the other shepherds without seeing them. Lenio is presented here in a manner that appears similar to Philo’s presentation at the beginning of the third dialogue in the Dialogues of Love. There, too, Philo is so caught up in his contemplation of Sophia that he passes by her without even recognizing her presence; Lenio is similarly alienated from himself. The descriptions of Lenio’s severe lovesickness will continue into the sixth book, as will the formulation of love as faith.

In the final book of the Galatea, the group follows the instruction of the priest Telesio and attends a memorial service in the valley of the cypresses for the deceased shepherd Meliso. All of the principal characters attend and participate in first a solemn remembrance of Meliso, followed by a more joyful lunch. When they begin to look for an acceptable space to pass their siestas, a woman appears from behind a burning bush, and she is so beautiful that she cannot be from this world. She identifies herself as Calliope, the muse of poetry, and she tells them that Meliso had once been one of her favorite subjects. To honor him, she sings a song that identifies a new generation of Spaniards who are experts in composing poetry; the song names many poets and authors who were living and writing in Spanish at the same time as

74 Notably, the Spanish word here is “anhelar,” which in current Spanish may be defined as “to long for,” or “to yearn,” but which Covarrubias defines as “to breath with difficulty” (1943, 121). In this context, Lenio breathes with difficulty as a result of his intense yearning.
75 “tan transportado en sus imaginaciones,” Cervantes (1961), II.v.162.
Cervantes. After the conclusion of Calliope’s song, the group completes their memorial service and decides to pass the rest of the day together. Several of them sing a song about love, faith, and hope together, continuing the theme of love’s connection to faith.

While the characters spend a good portion of the book within a religious ceremony, the ceremonies are dedicated to Love, rather than to God. The priest Telesio leads the memorial for the deceased shepherd Meliso and lauds the shepherd’s character, yet Meliso is praised more for his devotion to poetry (a common expression of love) than for his piety to the Catholic religion. Later on, the appearance of the muse Calliope continues this alteration of religious traditions—her appearance echoes visions of God speaking to prophets, yet her song talks of those talented in the arts of poetry. Love’s religion is firmly established in these rituals, and this sets up the context for the poems on hope and faith that the shepherds later sing.

Erastro’s song in this series of poems, in particular, addresses a relationship between faith and hope that relates to a lovesick perspective:

In the wrong that hurts me
and in the good of my pain
is my faith of such esteem
that it does not flee from fear
nor latch itself onto hope.
It is not troubled nor disconcerted
to see that my pain is certain,
in its difficult ascent,
nor that they consume life,
living faith, dead hope.
Miracle this is in my wrong;
but it is so because my good,
if it comes, would be such
that, among a thousand goods, they give it
the principal palm.
Fame, with expert tongue

En el mal que me lastima
y en el bien de mi dolor,
es mi fe de tanta estima,
que ni huye del temor,
ni a la esperanza se arrima.
No la turba o desconcierta
ver que está mi pena cierta
en su difícil subida,
ni que consumen la vida,
of viva, esperanza muerta.
Milagro es éste en mi mal;
mas eslo porque mi bien,
si viene, venga a ser tal,
que, entre mil bienes, le den
la palma por principal.
La fama, con lengua experta
A further elaboration on the character of Erastro helps to understand the meaning of this poem. Erastro loves Galatea, which sets him up as a counterpart to Elicio, but it is clear throughout the narrative that Erastro will never actually challenge Elicio’s place as the true lover. Erastro is described as the rustic lover and as having less talent in composing poetry; Elicio, on the other hand, is more aesthetic and artful in his love and his poetry, which establishes him as the more successful lover. This can be seen in the differences between their lyric verses. In one of the first poems the two co-sing in the first book, Erastro sings the following:

---

While these verses express Erastro’s love for Galatea and the pain that this causes him, Elicio’s later response is more aesthetically advanced:

The white snow and red-colored rose that summer does not consume, nor winter the sun of two bright stars, where rests the tender love, and so it will be in eterno;  

The differences in the poetic expression of Elicio and Erastro explain their separation into the categories of the aesthetic and the rustic lover. Erastro’s love for Galatea is still deep and meaningful, but his character positioning within the story ensures that his love or desire will not move further than praise or expression. Erastro’s inability to enter into any reciprocal relationship with Galatea informs the repeated line in this poem: “living faith, dead hope.” His faith in love survives even as his hope for reciprocation or for the enjoyment of beauty dies.

Erastro begins his poem with a description of the pain that love has brought him: “in the wrong that hurts me / and in the good of my pain / is my faith of such esteem / that it does not flee from fear / nor latch itself onto hope.” As we have seen in many of the scenes of the Galatea, pain makes up a common symptom of love.

Erastro here sets up an antithesis, as he describes his pain as good. He upholds his pain as an example of his faith, for even in the worst of it, his faith remains unshaken. He says that his faith “does not flee from fear,” which brings in another religious

---

77 Cervantes (1961), I.i.25.
78 Ibid., I.i.26.
example of love. In the previous book, love enacts vengeance on Lenio’s heart, with an extreme result. Here, Erastro says that his faith in his beloved (and in love itself) would never flee out of fear of a similar vengeance. Erastro thus proves that he would be a more faithful subject to love’s religion than Lenio was, and so there would be no need for love to enact its vengeance upon him. Erastro then continues that his faith “is not troubled nor disconcerted / to see that my pain is certain,” which again proves his commitment to the religion of love. His dead hope and his knowledge of his certain future pain have no affect on the status of his faith to his beloved. Erastro’s conviction in his continued faith, even with the knowledge that he will never gain anything from his love, firmly establishes him as one of love’s most devoted followers.

The use of religious language continues in the second stanza, which Erastro begins, “miracle this is in my wrong; / but it is so because my good, / if it comes, would be such / that, among a thousand goods, they give it / the principal palm.” Erastro, still speaking of the pain that love causes him, calls the pain a miracle. The ‘wrong’ that Erastro suffers from is made to be a miracle by the ‘good’ of his pain. Erastro also says that his good, if it ever came (he refers here likely to a reciprocation of his feelings from his beloved), would be such a good that it would be given the principal palm over all others. The use of the palm in this context is interesting, as it may reference several different meanings. Palms were often a symbol of victory in ancient Greece and Rome, and so Erastro’s comment could continue the theme of Greek references that Calliope’s appearance begins earlier in the book. In the Christian tradition, palms are associated with Palm Sunday, in which the faithful
carry palm fronds to symbolize the palms thrown at the feet of Jesus when he rode into Jerusalem before his arrest and crucifixion. The palm then became a symbol for the martyrs, representing the victory of the soul over the flesh. This last interpretation of the palm would be the most strongly tied to a religion of love. Erastro’s use of the palm symbol when referencing his own pain aligns him with a history of martyrs killed for their spiritual beliefs. Again, Erastro’s faith in love and in his beloved is so strong that nothing could change it, and he implies that he would be martyred before his faith was shaken. The connection to the martyr’s faith in the soul over the flesh also attaches the poem to neo-Platonic ideals of love, in which the rational soul wins out over baser desires. Erastro then contends that “fame, with expert tongue / gives the world certain news / that the steady love remains / in my chest, where it has / living faith, dead hope.” Again, the listener is reassured that Erastro’s love stays firmly within him, even with this dead hope. Erastro mentions that fame would inform the world of his situation, which singles him out as one of the few who would be able to keep their faith in love without any hope. This might again reference his connection to the martyrs, as his singular status as a lover without hope demonstrates his commitment to his faith over all else.

After this, the poem switches into a direct address of Erastro’s beloved Galatea. In this scene, unlike many other points when the shepherds sing poetry directed to their beloveds, Galatea is actually nearby and listening to the poems. Because the male shepherds compose this song as part of a long day spent with the shepherdesses, Galatea and the other women sit by as the men sing. Erastro sings, “your rigorous disdain / and my humble merit / has me so scared / that, though I know
already that I love you / I cannot speak to you, nor dare.” Though Erastro claimed earlier that his faith would not run from fear, here he says that his fear is such that he cannot even dare to speak to Galatea. This implies that while Erastro’s faith may not be afraid of love’s vengeance, he still fears Galatea’s disdain. Ironically, he says he is unable to speak to her, though she can hear him sing, and it is likely he is singing directly to her in this moment. He then says that “I see the continuous opening / of the door to my misfortune / and it ends little by little / because to you it matters little / living faith, dead hope.” Despite Erastro’s dedication to the religion of love, Galatea’s disdain and rejection still causes him pain. Thus, in a way, Galatea becomes the most powerful actor in the relationship. Even love, which takes the position of God, cannot prevent the pain Erastro feels from Galatea’s rejection.

The final stanza of the poem continues the address to Galatea as Erastro sings, “it doesn’t come to my fantasy / such a crazy flirtation / like it is to think that I could / the small good that I desire / to reach for my faith.” In this section, Erastro seems to be reassuring Galatea that his faith will remain without hope. He continues, “you can, shepherdess, be certain / that the devoted soul was right / to love you which you deserved / and forever in it you will find / living faith, dead hope.” The conclusion of the poem shows Erastro’s dedication to a rational love, which may continue without hopes of reciprocation or physical gratification. He tells Galatea that his love for her will remain without her intervention, so strong is his faith in the religion of love. Erastro is definitely still lovesick over Galatea, but this poem speaks of a fate to which he is resigned, rather than something he feels he needs to challenge. This gives another example of a melancholic lovesickness, in which the lover accepts his fate. A
choleric lover, on the other hand, may see this fate and attempt to confront it through violence. Erastro is saddened by his situation and his unchanging fate, yet he accepts it as his own.

The comparisons between love and faith, and indeed the replacement of God with love, are present throughout the *Galatea*. While the shepherds in the novel may worship love as a god, this does not help to alleviate many of their sorrows caused by lovesickness. Though Lenio atones for his sins against love, he remains in a dire state of lovesickness. Erastro seems to be able to momentarily overcome his suffering during his poem, but this is only a temporary reprieve from his sorrow over his unreturned feelings for Galatea. The slight recovery from suffering through the expression of poetry is something that G. Yuri Porras brings up in his article on the use of song in *La Celestina*. He writes that “a circle is produced in the emotional state of Calisto: he intends to alleviate his illness through music, but because he is ‘off-key,’ he cannot establish a harmony between his melancholic imbalance and the celestial spheres.”79 The connection between music and harmony with the celestial spheres also ties into a conception of love as faith. Erastro’s expression through poetry only temporarily alleviates his pain. Others in the story, as well, continue to suffer lovesickness despite their dedication to love. While love as faith is an extremely useful lens through which to analyze love in the *Galatea*, it does not function as an antidote to lovesickness. In fact, the god love appears to cause lovesickness more often than it remedies it. When the men in the *Galatea* are unable

---

79 “se produce un círculo en cuanto al estado anímico de Calisto: intenta aliviar su enfermedad a través de la música, pero por estar ‘destemplado,’ no puede establecer una armonía entre su desequilibrio melancólico y las esferas celestiales,” Porras (2008), 142.
to turn to their god of love to remedy their pain, their next recourse seems to be to turn to their beloveds themselves and ask them to help soothe their lovesickness.

Women’s role

La Galatea, like many pastoral novels, often involves different speakers taking over the narrative in order to share their life story. In the first book, two interpolated stories take up large portions of the narrative: one told by the shepherd Lisandro and the other by the shepherdess Teolinda. Teolinda’s story in particular constitutes much of the text of the first book, and her story is central to the rest of the Galatea as well. When Galatea and Florisa find her, she is “so absorbed and transported in her thoughts, that she hadn’t seen them…for the extremes of pain that the shepherdess made, Galatea and Florisa recognized that she carried the soul occupied from some internal pain.”⁸⁰ While my focus in this project centers around male lovesickness, Teolinda’s suffering is central to her character, evidenced by the fact that in the first moment we see her she is completely alienated from herself. She is consumed by thoughts of Artidoro, the man she loves and who she had lost after a misunderstanding with her sister. Teolinda is one of the most passionately lovesick characters in the Galatea, and her introduction in the first book shows the ways the soul’s pain is expressed through external manifestations—for Teolinda, it is “such painful sighs” and the “tears running down her cheeks” as well as her alienation.⁸¹ This is another example of the kind of alienation that Philo suffers in the Dialogues, and that the ‘desamorado’ Lenio faces after he falls in love with Gelasia. In fact,

---

⁸⁰ “tan embebida y transportada en sus pensamientos, que nunca las vio…por los extremos de dolor que la pastora hacía, conocieron Galatea y Florisa que de algún interno dolor traía el alma ocupada,” Cervantes (1961), I.i.59.
⁸¹ “sospiros tan dolorosos,” “correr por sus mejillas algunas lágrimas,” ibid., I.i.59.
Teolinda and Lenio follow similar trajectories in their relationships with love. Teolinda informs Galatea and Florisa that she had scorned love in the past, which caused “the vengeful Love [to come] to me to take account of the little that with it I had, and it reached me in the way that I remained its slave.”

She and Lenio share similar painful fates from their initial rejection of the god love.

After Teolinda returns to consciousness of her surroundings, the other shepherdesses approach her, and she shares her story with them. Before Artidoro leaves her village, they are able to spend some time together, and one of these conversations stands out as a look into the interactions of lovesick people. The conversation Teolinda recounts here takes place at a festival in her village, which Artidoro also attends. Teolinda describes not only her own feelings of lovesickness for Artidoro, but also shows Artidoro’s suffering (and thus the experience of male lovesickness) through his half of their conversation:

> I do not know how to contend to you, friends [Galatea and Florisa], what I felt at that point, if it is not to say that it disturbed me so much that I could not give the correct step in the dance, such that it made Artidoro take me with force along with him so as not to break, releasing me, the strand of the arranged dance. And taking the occasion, I said to him, ‘what has my hand done to offend you, Artidoro, that makes you squeeze it so tight?’ He responded, in a voice that no one else could hear, ‘But what has my soul done to you, that you mistreat it this way?’ ‘My offense is clear,’ I responded shyly, ‘but yours I cannot see, nor can you see it yourself.’ ‘And there is the hurt,’ replied Artidoro, ‘that you would have the sight to do the damage, and you lack it to heal me.’ In this our reasonings ended because the dances ended, leaving me content and pensive over what Artidoro had said to me. And although I considered them enamored reasons, I was not assured that they came from an enamored person.

---

82 “el vengativo Amor me vino a tomar estrecha cuenta de la poca que con él tenía, y alcanzóme en ella de manera que, con quedar su esclava,” Cervantes (1961), I.i.67.

83 “No sé cómo os encarezca, amigas, lo que en tal punto sentí, si no es deciros que me turbé de manera que no acertaba a dar paso concertado en el baile, tanto, que le convenía a Artidoro llevarme con
In the beginning of the passage, she tells Galatea and Florisa, “I do not know how to contend to you, friends, what I felt at that point, if it is not to say that it disturbed me so much that I could not give the correct step in the dance.” A consistent theme in Teolinda’s narration of her story is the inability to describe something. The phrase at the beginning of this passage, “I do not know how to contend to you, friends,” (or a phrase similar, such as “I do not know what to say,”) is repeated several times in the story, most commonly at moments when she describes her feelings for Artidoro. The lack of words she has to speak of these events proves the strength of her feeling for Artidoro; she cannot think of human words to describe the extent of her love. These phrases often also parallel moments in the story where she is unable to speak to her beloved, such as this moment at the dance. The loss of expression is a common symptom of lovesickness and is a feature that perhaps prolongs the suffering. In Teolinda’s case, her inability to express her feelings to Artidoro is what leads to him believing that she does not have reciprocal love for him. This will later contribute to his departure and to her subsequently worsened melancholy. Other characters in the Galatea also experience struggles with failure of expression that may exacerbate their lovesickness.

The event that disturbs Teolinda so much prior to the beginning of this passage is that she has been paired with Artidoro for one of the festival’s dances, and

---

fuerza tras sí, porque no rompiese, soltándome, el hilo de la concertada danza. Y tomando dello ocasión, le dije: ‘¿En qué te ha ofendido mi mano, Artidoro, que así la aprietas?’ Él me respondió, con voz que de ninguno pudo ser oída: ‘Mas ¿qué te ha hecho a ti mi alma, que así la maltratas?’ ‘Mi ofensa es clara —respondí yo mansamente—; mas la tuya, ni la veo ni podrá verse.’ ‘Y aun ahí está el daño —replicó Artidoro—: que tengas vista para hacer el mal, y te falte para sanarle.’ En esto cesaron nuestras razones porque los bailes cesaron, quedando yo contenta y pensativa de lo que Artidoro me había dicho. Y aunque consideraba que eran razones enamoradas, no me aseguraban si eran de enamorado,” Cervantes (1961), I.i.75-76.
she is so in love with him that it drives her to distraction. Her distraction in this scene with Artidoro, which leaves her unable to participate in the dance, is seen again in her alienation when she first meets Galatea and Florisa. Because of this distraction, Artidoro must “take me with force along with him” in the dance, so as “not to break, releasing me, the strand of the arranged dance.” Teolinda in this moment is struck, much like she had been when she first saw Artidoro. The proximity required for the dance, and the luck that she was paired with Artidoro for it and not with another man, gives her an indescribable feeling that stops her from moving. This scene also reminds the reader of Teolinda’s description of the first time she saw Artidoro, in which she says that “an ice that burned me began to run throughout my veins.”

This is one of the most vivid descriptions of what happens to the lover upon seeing the beloved. Teolinda feels her love through an intensely physical experience, and afterwards she says that “I felt that my soul was happy to have the eyes placed on the handsome face of the unknown shepherd.” Teolinda’s experience with Artidoro is an example of lovesickness in the woman; such presentations of female lovesickness have often been conceptualized as precursors to the concept of female hysteria. Notably, however, lovesickness as an illness was not gendered, and so lovesickness in the woman was not severely pathologized in the way that hysteria was. Teolinda is free to express her lovesickness and not forced to repress her desires, though the hysterics of the 19th century were expected to do so.

84 “comenzó a discurrir por todas mis venas un hielo que me encendía,” Cervantes (1961), I.i.68.
85 “sentí que mi alma se alegravaba de tener puestos los ojos en el hermoso rostro del no conocido pastor,” ibid., I.i.68.
While Teolinda is initially dumbstruck during her dance with Artidoro, she recovers her speech when he grips her and moves her with him, and she asks, “what has my hand done to offend you, Artidoro, that makes you squeeze it so tight?” He responds, “But what has my soul done to you, that you mistreat it this way?” While Teolinda’s question is a joke or mild flirtation—perhaps an attempt to cover up the extent to which she was affected by Artidoro’s proximity—Artidoro’s response, spoken “in a voice that no one else could hear,” brings the couple into a more serious discussion of his lovesick feelings for her. He twists Teolinda’s joke of him squeezing her hand into an internal question of her mistreatment of his soul. Within this question, Artidoro articulates a common trouble amongst lovesick lovers: the idea that their beloved is purposely causing them pain. Earlier in the first book of *La Galatea*, Elicio similarly accuses Galatea of damaging his soul, rather than curing it. Teolinda responds to Artidoro in a manner similar to Galatea’s response to this accusation: “my offense is clear,” she says, “but yours I cannot see, nor can you see it yourself.” Her response seems to deflect Artidoro’s question; though at this time she knows she is in love with him, she is not yet ready to admit this to him.

Artidoro then says: “and there is the hurt, that you would have the sight to do the damage, and you lack it to heal me.” This, again, calls back to the conversation Elicio and Galatea have shortly before Galatea meets Teolinda. Artidoro’s conviction that Teolinda refuses to see the pain he is feeling tracks with what many of the other shepherds in the *Galatea* say about their beloveds. His accusation of Teolinda lacking sight taps into a long tradition of the connection of vision to love. Socrates speaks of this in Plato’s *Phaedrus* when he argues that “vision, of course, is the sharpest of our
bodily senses…but now beauty alone has this privilege, to be the most clearly visible and the most loved.” Cervantes consistently follows this formation and uses the eyes or the power of vision as a metaphor in the *Galatea*. The eyes are often the most powerful organ; their beauty belies the internal beauty of the beloved, and they capture the lover. The ‘desamorado’ Lenio disparages the eyes in one of his arguments against love, because he believes that the “corporeal eyes” can only perceive “corporeal beauty,” which will only destroy them, not benefit them. Ironically, it is Artidoro’s eyes that first capture Teolinda’s desire and which catalyze the beginning of her lovesick feelings, yet he accuses her of not having the vision to help his suffering. This quote also brings up the idea that Teolinda could see right into Artidoro’s soul and understand its pain. “The eyes are the window to the soul” may now be a trite cliché, but the lovesick characters in the *Galatea* certainly believe that is true. Because looking into another’s eyes can prove one’s internal qualities, the beloved should be able to see the lover’s anguished soul in their eyes.

Another irony in Artidoro’s statement is that Teolinda likely does have the sight to cure his pain, if she were to inform him of her reciprocal love. Because the audience hears this story from Teolinda’s perspective, we are already informed of her intense love for Artidoro, but we also see her internal questions in this scene of how she should respond. After Artidoro accuses Teolinda of lacking sight, their conversation ends, “because the dances ended, leaving me content and pensive over what Artidoro had said to me. And although I considered them enamored reasons, I was not assured that they came from an enamored person.” The Spanish here plays on

88 Cervantes (1961), II.iv.45.
the repetition of the word “enamorado,” (meaning, literally, ‘in love’) first as an adjective, “razones enamoradas,” and then as the noun “enamorado.” While the reasons given by Artidoro seemed to Teolinda to be enamored reasons, she could not be sure if they came from an enamored person (the lover). It leaves her unsure of her status with Artidoro, though she is perhaps more confident than before about the potential for her feelings to be reciprocated.

This passage, though told through Teolinda’s perspective, encompasses much about the experience of the lovesick male in the *Galatea*. Artidoro’s expression of pain to Teolinda, his accusation that she purposefully mistreats him, and his reference to the importance of sight all make up central characteristics of many of the lovesick shepherds. The fact that the entire conversation is recounted within Teolinda’s speech also showcases a notable theme of the pastoral novel in general: the interpolated story. By the end of the first book, neither the shepherdesses nor the larger readership knows what will happen to Teolinda to bring her from the moment of happiness dancing with Artidoro to her intense sadness when Galatea and Florisa encounter her. Her story continues as a central thread throughout the novel, bringing together the narrative form of the pastoral with the theme of love and its effects.

In the second book of the *Galatea*, the group of shepherds discover a reclusive man singing a tragic poem. He is so overcome by his sad memories that he faints; the shepherds revive him and ask him to share his story. His name is Silerio, and he and his dear friend Timbrio traveled together to Naples, where Timbrio fell in love with a woman named Nisida. Timbrio is so taken with Nisida that he falls ill and is almost on the brink of death when Silerio offers to help Timbrio woo her. Silerio goes to
Nísida’s house and sings a song that so pleases Nísida’s parents they ask him to visit them every day to entertain them. Silerio agrees, but he also fell in love with Nísida as soon as he saw her. Silerio befriends Nísida and her sister Blanca, and he discusses Timbrio’s situation with them, though he doesn’t reveal that Nísida is the woman Timbrio loves. Silerio is torn: he wishes to help his friend, but he also loves Nísida deeply. Timbrio eventually begins to suspect that Silerio loves Nísida and isn’t helping Timbrio’s cause but only advancing his own. Silerio denies this by claiming that he is really in love with Blanca, Nísida’s sister, and sings a love poem written for Nísida but with the name changed to Blanca. Silerio’s story is cut off here by the return of the ‘desamorado’ Lenio, who once again argues with the shepherds about the worthlessness of love. The book ends with a song sung by Erastro, inspired by the sight of Galatea approaching with Florisa and Teolinda.

The second book introduces us to Silerio, whose interpolated story, like Teolinda’s, will take up much of the continued plot of the Galatea. At one point in the story, Silerio tells of a conversation between him and Nísida, much like Teolinda shared her conversation with Artidoro. The layers of the scene can be confusing to parse out: Silerio is in disguise as “Astor,” and has by this point befriended Nísida and her family in order to better advocate for Timbrio as a suitor. He describes Timbrio to Nísida and Blanca, though he does not reveal Timbrio’s true identity either. While he describes Timbrio’s symptoms of lovesickness, he cannot tell the women that the cause of Timbrio’s pain is actually Nísida, and instead only names her as a “principal woman” in the city. Adding to different layers of the conversation is the fact that at this point Silerio has also fallen in love with Nísida, though he keeps
this secret from everyone around him to keep both Timbrio and Nísida’s trust and friendship. The fact that many of the characters in Silerio’s story are at various points ignorant of the truth of others’ identities and feelings means that the story is rife with moments of irony, and this conversation is no exception. Part of the conversation involves a description of his friend Timbrio’s suffering:

I know well that you desire to know, ladies, who the enemy is that places such a valiant gentleman in the extreme that I have painted for you… his enemy is love, universal destructor of our peace and happiness. This fierce enemy has taken control of [Timbrio’s] insides. In entering this city, Timbrio saw a beautiful woman, of singular value and beauty, but so principal and honest that the miserable man never tried to discover her thoughts.

To this point I arrived, when Nísida said to me: ‘Certainly, Astor,’ for this was my name, ‘I don’t know if I believe that this gentleman is truly so brave and discreet as you say, if he so easily has allowed himself to be defeated by a bad desire so recently born, surrendering himself without reason into the arms of desperation. And although these amorous effects affect me so very little, it still seems to me that it is simplicity and weakness for the one who is fatigued by them to give up finding out the thoughts of the one who causes it… would you call cruel the woman [Timbrio] loves? Certainly not: no one can remedy the hurt that has not fallen into their notice, nor does it fall into their obligation to attempt to find out about it in order to remedy it.”

The passage begins with Silerio describing the extent of Timbrio’s lovesickness, knowing that Nísida and Blanca would want to know “who the enemy is that places such a valiant gentleman in the extreme that I have painted for you.” He reveals to

89 “Bien sé que desearéis saber, señoras, quién es el enemigo que a tan valeroso caballero como es el que os he pintado tiene puesto en tal estremo…su enemigo es amor, universal destruidor de nuestros sosiegos y bien andanzas. Este fiero enemigo tomó posesión de sus entrañas. En entrando en esta ciudad, vio Timbrio una hermosa dama, de singular valor y hermosura, mas tan principal y honesta que jamás el miserable se ha aventurado a descubrirle su pensamiento. A este punto llegaba yo, cuando Nísida me dijo: ‘Por cierto, Astor –que entonces era este el nombre mío—, que no sé yo si crea que ese caballero sea tan valeroso y discreto como dices, pues tan fácilmente se ha dejado rendir a un mal deseo tan recién nacido, entregándose tan sin ocasión alguna en los brazos de la desesperación. Y aunque a mí se me alcanza poco destos amorosos efectos, todavía me parece que es simplicidad y flaqueza dejar, el que se ve fatigado dellos, de descubrir su pensamiento a quien se le causa…¿llamarías tu cruel a la dama de quien estaba enamorado? No, por cierto: que mal puede remediar nadie la necesidad que no llega a su noticia, ni cae en su obligación procurar saberla para remediarla,’” Cervantes (1961), I.i.148-149.
them that “his enemy is love, universal destructor of our peace and happiness.”

Silerio casts love as the enemy, a common trope among lovesick lovers. For many in the *Galatea*, love is simultaneously that which runs the universe and makes everything good and that which destroys their happiness and subjects them to eternal suffering. This suffering should never end, though, because this would mean a loss of the love within them, and love’s good outweighs whatever personal bad it may cause them. We also see a similar usage of Silerio’s accusation of love as the “universal destructor” of happiness in de Zayas’ *Novelas*, when the character Laura calls love the “mortal enemy of all people.” Laura calls love this after her husband, Diego, stops loving her and instead abuses her severely. Laura’s perspective is looking back on and regretting her past decisions, while Timbrio and Silerio are both in earlier stages of their lovesicknesses. While Timbrio’s (and Silerio’s) particular sufferings may differ greatly from Laura’s, they both single out love as a large cause of such pain.

Silerio says that the “fierce enemy” that is love “has taken control of [Timbrio’s] insides.” It is this capture of Timbrio’s insides that creates an external suffering and illness in Timbrio. Lovesickness in its most basic form is just this: an internal suffering at the hands of love that turns into an externally manifested illness. When Silerio first sees Timbrio after he has been struck by Nísida’s beauty, he sees him “very poorly, and with a strange illness, so that if I had not arrived at that moment, he may have arrived at the point of making the honors of his death.”

---

90 “enemigo mortal de las gentes,” de Zayas (2010), 363.
91 “tan malo, y de una enfermedad tan extraña, que si yo a aquella sazon no llegara, pudiera llegar a tiempo de hacerle las obsequias de su muerte,” Cervantes (1961), I.ii.139.
Silerio’s description of Timbrio’s illness as “estraña,” meaning “strange” or “foreign,” when he first sees him is a description of lovesickness different from others we have seen. Most characters will comment on the force of one’s illness, or on its particular symptoms, but rarely do they question the illness’s origin. Silerio’s lack of knowledge of Timbrio’s illness may come from a lack of knowledge about love itself, and thus an unfamiliarity of its effects. Silerio later learns that Timbrio has fallen in love with Nísida, and that this has caused his extreme state. Silerio also soon falls for Nísida himself and experiences similar symptoms to Timbrio, and the illness is likely less strange to him then. When Silerio first enters Nísida’s house, though he was there on Timbrio’s behalf, he tells the shepherds that “I saw Nísida, Nísida I saw, to see nothing more, nor is there more to see after having seen her.” Silerio’s love for Nísida after seeing her for the first time is similar not only to Timbrio’s experience, but to the experiences of Teolinda and Artidoro in the previous book. Here again the importance of sight and vision is brought up, as Silerio does not understand the purpose of Timbrio’s suffering until he sees Nísida, and after this he understands because he feels the same love (and lovesickness).

Silerio then says that “in entering this city, Timbrio saw a beautiful woman, of singular value and beauty, but so principal and honest that the miserable man never tried to discover her thoughts” about him. This provides another example of the lover’s failure of expression when faced with the beloved, similar to Teolinda’s story. At this point, Nísida interrupts Silerio to protest his presentation of Timbrio’s personality. “Certainly, Astor,” she says, using Silerio’s fake name, “I don’t know if I

92 “vi a Nísida, a Nísida vi, para no ver más, ni hay más que ver después de haberla visto,” ibid., Lii.143.
believe that this gentleman is truly so brave and discreet as you say, if he so easily has allowed himself to be defeated by a bad desire so recently born.” She believes that it is Timbrio’s weakness that causes him to “surrender himself without reason into the arms of desperation.” To her, it is not strong or noble for Timbrio to have allowed himself to succumb so easily to love. She admits that “these amorous effects affect me so very little,” but she maintains that “it is simplicity and weakness for the one who is fatigued by them to give up finding out the thoughts of the one who causes it.” This is a critique of Timbrio’s failure of expression, as Nísida takes issue with the fact that Timbrio would never attempt to discover if his feelings are reciprocated. Though she acts as though she does not know that Silerio is speaking about her, it is very likely that she knows and is unhappy with the characterization of herself in Silerio’s account. She doesn’t understand why one would surrender themself totally to suffering without even trying to find out how their beloved feels in return. Ironically, though, she admits to never feeling the effects of love’s strength, which at this moment seems to confirm that if Timbrio asked her for her feelings, they would not be returned.

Nísida continues her argument, asking Silerio, “would you call cruel the woman [Timbrio] loves? Certainly not: no one can remedy the hurt that has not fallen into their notice, nor does it fall into their obligation to attempt to find out about it in order to remedy it.” She is again defending her own position in relation to Timbrio, though she does not know it. She cannot be called cruel, for she does not (or pretends not to) know that Timbrio’s pain is caused by her hands. She also does not know Silerio’s feelings for her (though she perhaps suspects them, as she suspects
Timbrio’s love is for her), so she cannot be called cruel for whatever pain he feels, either. She also argues that it is not the responsibility of the woman (so, her responsibility) to remedy this pain or even discover what the pain is since she has no reason to know of it. Without the lover informing the beloved of his pain, the beloved has no obligation to help him, and thus cannot be blamed for his pain. Niśida’s logic protests the common trope of the beloved woman being blamed for the lover’s pain when the lover has made no attempt to speak to the beloved about his feelings. She speaks generally, for all women, but she also speaks for herself, as she too has no idea that she is the cause of Timbrio’s pain and cannot be expected to remedy it.

In her response to Silerio’s description of Timbrio’s experience, Niśida joins the group of women in the Galatea who refuse to be blamed for the suffering of the men who love them. We have already discussed Galatea’s response to Elicio’s accusation, and Teolinda’s response to Artidoro. All three of these women recognize that while their beauty may have inspired the love in these men, they do not recognize the responsibility for their sufferings. While these three may be deferring the blame as a cover for their own feelings towards these men, we also meet a woman who denies responsibility because of her denial of love. The “endurecida,” or “hardened” Gelasia is first seen in the fourth book of the Galatea, when an enamored shepherd is on his knees before her with a dagger to his throat, prepared to kill himself if she denies him. However, Gelasia “showed a furrowed brow on her face, and was disgusted that the shepherd had detained her there with force.”

It is then revealed that Gelasia’s “intention was to be mortal enemy of love and of all enamored people, for many

---

93 “mostraba la pastora ceño en su rostro, y estar disgustada de que el pastor allí por fuerza le detuviese,” Cervantes (1961), II.iv.78.
reasons that moved her to this, and one of these was that from her youth she had
dedicated herself to follow the exercise of the cult of Diana." Gelasia continues to
deny love throughout the book, including her rejection of the ‘desamorado’ Lenio
when he falls in love with her.

Gelasia’s dedication to the cult of Diana, the virgin goddess of the hunt, and
her refusal of love aligns her with a character that Cervantes introduces in Don
Quijote. Marcela, a beautiful woman loved by many men, decides to leave her town
behind and enter the pastoral, dedicating her life to a life of shepherding as Gelasia
dedicates her life to hunting. She appears at the funeral of Gristóstomo, a man who
killed himself because of the suffering he faced from his love for her, and she denies
that his death is her fault. In her speech, she explains her choice of the pastoral life as
she says, “I was born free, and to be able to live free I chose the solitude of the
pastures.” She also asks the men at the funeral, “if [Grisóstomo’s] impatience and
brave desire killed him, why has my honest behavior and modesty been blamed?”
Her defense of herself and her choice to remove herself from society and the
expectations it places on her can be read as an extension of the defenses that the
shepherdesses in the Galatea express to the men that love them.

The passages selected from the stories of Teolinda and Silerio demonstrate
several themes of lovesickness central to the Galatea. One of these is the failure of
expression, and the particular dangers that this brings. They also show the common
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94 “su intención era de ser enemiga mortal del amor y de todos los enamorados, por muchas razones
que a ello la movían, y una dallas era haberse desde su niñez dedicado a seguir el ejercicio de la casta
Diana,” ibid., II.iv.80.
95 “yo nací libre, y para poder vivir libre escogí la soledad de los campos,” Cervantes (1995), 197.
96 “si a Grisóstomo mató su impaciencia y arrojado deseo, ¿por qué se ha de culpar mi honesto
proceder y recato?” ibid., 197.
occurrence of the lover accusing the beloved of knowing his pain and purposefully ignoring it. In both of these stories, the women in question refuse to be placed into that position, exercising their choice in how they are represented in these matters of love. They reject accusations of cruelty and make the lovers recognize their own responsibility for their feelings. The women in the Galatea are able to express themselves in the ways that they desire and to choose exactly how the men in their lives treat them. Unfortunately, however, this experience is not shared by the women whose stories are told in the Novelas amorosas y ejemplares.

Conclusion

The Galatea is a book that shows us several methods of expression of lovesickness. Through both physical manifestations and the composition of poetry, the shepherds are free to express their love and their lovesick symptoms. The times in which these expressions fail, and the characters face the ineffability of their feelings, often cause even more pain than before. Expression of pain or sorrow is thus a necessary aspect of attempting to remedy lovesickness, though we also see how these expressions can extend one’s suffering, rather than remedy it. The women, though often blamed for causing harm to the men who love them, are also able to express themselves in ways that their urban counterparts would be unable to do. While the pain felt by the lovesick characters in the Galatea is very real, the space of the novel is idealized and allows these characters a freedom of expression that is not as open in later works.

In the readings above, I have drawn out several important characteristics of lovesickness that the characters in the Galatea show us. One of these is the
melancholic form of lovesickness, of which most of the characters in the novel suffer. This melancholic form manifests into the physical symptoms of crying, fainting, depression, and similar experiences. Because almost all of the lovesickness in the Galatea comes from this melancholic impetus, the kinds of violence that we see in the story are very different than what occurs in de Zayas’ Novelas. Violence between two characters is mostly absent from the novel, and when it does appear it is usually from characters who have left an urban space to enter the pastoral setting. Internal violence, on the other hand, is mentioned throughout the novel as a means of describing the effects of lovesickness. The shepherds speak of their pain, their deep sorrow, and the violence that love enacts on their minds. The pastoral setting of the novel removes most of the external violence, which contributes to its place as an idealized space for the expressions of love and lovesickness.

Even though the Galatea mostly presents melancholic forms of lovesickness, there are moments in which this is complicated. Notably, Damón’s introduction of jealousy as the most painful form of lovesickness seems to introduce more choleric ideas into the text. In the treatment of jealousy, we see a theme that will be expanded upon greatly in the Novelas, namely that of the tension between reason and passion. This division seems to track along with the distinction that Tirsi (and by extension, Lenio and Sophia in the Dialogues of Love) make between love and desire. Love is reasoned, whereas passion comes from desire. Love wishes for a rational union between the lover and the beloved, while desire’s goal is of passionate possession. While these distinctions are accepted and supported by the shepherds in the Galatea, they are less significant for many of the male characters in the Novelas.
Chapter 2: Novelas amorosas y ejemplares

In the fifth Novela of María de Zayas’ Novelas amorosas y ejemplares, the narrator Nise comments on the suffering of the main character Laura, “if the remedy did not come from the part that does the harm, there is not a cure in such a great pain, and for the most part the sicknesses of love little or never desire to be healthy.” Nise names the “sicknesses of love” directly, and she notes that these illnesses are usually incurable. She credits the illnesses themselves with not wanting to be cured, rather than those suffering, which establishes a complicated framework of choice when considering those afflicted with lovesickness. While these topics were also brought up in the Galatea, they take on a different connotation here as the character Laura attempts to leave her abusive husband, whom she still loves. Nise’s comment on the uncontrolled, unhealthy nature of lovesickness gives a look at the functions of lovesickness within the Novelas and how the characters attempt to deal with their pain. The Novelas consistently address these questions, as well as how they intersect with gender.

María de Zayas y Sotomayor was born in 1590 in Madrid to a noble family, which helped her gain the education that would later allow her to write several important texts of the Spanish early modern. Little is known of her biographical life, but we know that she spent a portion of her youth living in Naples, then a viceroyalty of Spain. Her experiences in Naples likely influenced her later writings, similarly to how Cervantes’ time in Italy influenced him. She published the Novelas amorosas y ejemplares in Zaragoza in 1637, and then published her second frame novel, the

97 “si el remedio no viene de la parte que hace el dano, no hay cura en tan grande mal, y por la mayor parte los enfermos de amor pocos o ningunos desean ser sanos,” de Zayas (2010), 355.
Desengaños amorosos, in 1647 in Madrid. She is best known for these two works, though she also published a play in 1632, entitled La traición en la amistad. The exact date of her death is unclear, but most place it in 1661. Because of her status as a successful woman author in her time, and because her work often centered the lives and experiences of women, many view her as an icon of proto-feminist thought.

This chapter will look at the other half of the thematic dichotomies I established in the introduction. These will be the urban setting, choleric lovesickness, and the female authorial perspective. Like in the previous chapter, these dichotomies are not strict boundaries, and the Novelas do not always stay within the distinctions. As with my analysis of La Galatea in Chapter 2, I have selected several notable passages from the Novelas to analyze. There are ten stories told within the Novelas, and each of them could have its own extended analysis. For the sake of brevity, I have chosen four of them to work with—the second, the fourth, the fifth, and the seventh. I selected these four stories because they best exemplify lovesickness and its effects on men and women. These stories also make important commentaries on gender, honor, and violence, all of which I will treat in my analysis. I have grouped them together here (the second and the seventh, followed by the fourth and the fifth) to bring out some of the thematic links of the text.

María de Zayas’ Novelas amorosas y ejemplares is a frame novel: a text in which shorter stories are presented within a wider ‘frame’ story. The format of the frame novel has traditionally been utilized by women, especially in the early modern

---

98 While some would claim that de Zayas promoted feminist ideals, I am reluctant to use the word ‘feminist’ to refer to a woman working before a conception of feminism arose historically. De Zayas certainly presents examples of the empowerment of women in her works, but to use the term ‘feminist’ to describe them would be ahistorical.
period. Josephine Donovan identifies the frame novel as “the first identifiable tradition in Western women’s prose literature, but one that has never been recognized as such nor studied as a separate tradition.” 99 Though left unanalyzed by many literary scholars, the frame novel form is unique because of its dialogic structure—while “the classic novel as it finally took shape in the eighteenth century is characterized by its focus on one or a group of individuals whose voice dominates,” in the frame novel “the inset narratives exist in dialogical counterpoint with the frame narrative and the frame voices exist in dialogical relationship with one another.” 100 Two early masters of the frame novel were Giovanni Boccaccio and Marguerite de Navarre, and de Zayas follows in this tradition. In the Novelas, the frame characters consist of the lady Lisis, “beautiful miracle of nature and prodigious surprise of this court,” and her friends, who attempt to distract her from an illness by telling stories. 101 The friends are a mixture of men and women; in keeping with the theme of love, many of the frame characters are in love with other characters, with varying levels of reciprocation. Lisis, the host of the party, is in love with a man named don Juan. However, he is in love with her cousin Lisarda, and Lisarda seems to love him back. This causes Lisis’ soul to “cry out with brutal imaginations, giving motive for her illness and reason for her sadness.” 102 The illness from which her friends attempt to distract her is likely a form of lovesickness caused by the fact that Juan loves Lisarda. The relationships between the frame characters mirror those of the characters.

100 Ibid., 952.
102 “llorando mortals sospechas, había dado motivo a su mal y ocasión a su tristeza,” ibid., 168.
within the stories told, which demonstrates de Zayas’ control of the dialogical structure of the frame novel.

Donovan argues that “women writers were drawn to the framed-novelle format in part because of its roots in oral culture and in a gift economy—the socioeconomic habitat of nearly all women in the early modern period.” Her identification of the frame novel as a format most often utilized by women authors allows for analysis of the exact messages women were promoting through the frame novel. Some of these themes included “greater educational opportunities, protest[ing] against male violence against women and misogynist ideologies…[and] reject[ing] conventional roles, in particular such domestic roles as sewing, which were seen as precluding women’s participation in such traditionally male roles as writing for circulation.” De Zayas expresses much of the same in her note to the reader at the beginning of the Novelas, which opens, “who would doubt, my reader, that it would cause you admiration to see that a woman had the space not only to write a book, but to print it as well.” De Zayas continues to play on assumptions about women’s ability, writing that “souls are neither men nor women: what reason is there to prove that the souls of men are knowledgeable and to presume that the souls of women couldn’t be?” In this context, “soul” refers to an intellectual capability rather than a religious concept, and de Zayas questions the ways in which society assumes men are naturally smarter and more capable than women. Her words are repeated within one
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103 Donovan (1997), 953.
104 Ibid., 954.
105 “quién duda, lector mío, que te causará admiración que una mujer tenga despejo no sólo para escribir un libro, sino para darle a la estampa,” de Zayas (2010), 159.
106 “las almas ni son hombres ni mujeres: ¿qué razón hay para que ellos son sabios y presuman que nosotras no podemos serlo?” ibid., 159.
of the stories told within the frame, when the character Laura asks, “are our souls not the same as men’s? If it is [the soul] that gives courage to the body, then who compels our [bodies] to be so full of cowardice?”  

By repeating her own words through Laura’s character (which also means employing the voice of Nise, who narrates the story), de Zayas utilizes the dialogic nature of the frame in order to challenge the idea that women are naturally lesser than men. De Zayas consistently uses the frame’s dialogic structure in order to critique society’s treatment of women.

Another characteristic of the frame novel that Donovan points to is that the genre “is inherently torn between two conflicting formal organizational modes, hypotaxis and parataxis.”  

She defines each of these: “hypotaxis ‘looks at and organizes things from above,’ whereas parataxis entails a lateral, conjunctive but nonsubordinative arrangement. It stems from the Greek *paratassein* (to place side by side), where hypotaxis derives from *hypotassein* (to arrange under)... the rhetorical logic of hypotaxis is thus a causal, ‘hence’ narrative, sequence, whereas parataxis proceeds by a series of ‘and-thens.’”  

In the frame novel, the short stories or novellas told within the frame structure follow a paratactic structure, whereas the frame story is often hypotactic and “subordinat[es] the stories to its unifying idea.”  

De Zayas’ *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* takes love as its central theme, and this theme ties together all of the novellas told within the wider frame story. In addition to the love theme, the stories in the *Novelas* also uphold the themes of promoting
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107 “¿El alma no es la misma que la de los hombres? Pues si ella es la que da valor al cuerpo, ¿quién obliga a los nuestros a tanta cobardía?,” de Zayas (2010), 364.
108 Donovan (1997), 955.
women’s liberation and protesting male violence against women. Many of the stories told involve a wronged woman seeking (usually violent) revenge against the man who dishonored her. A later frame work of de Zayas’, the Desengaños amorosos, continues this theme, but focuses more on the ‘desengaños,’ the deceptions or disillusionments, of love, which again brings up the ways men mistreat women in the name of love. Both of these works respond to a popular theatrical construct of the time, the Spanish wife-murder plays. In this genre, as the name suggests, a husband kills his wife, often because the wife has wronged him in some way. In many of the wife-murder plays, the husband is held up as honorable for killing his wife and thus undoing her insult against him.\footnote{For more on wife-murder plays, see Matthew D. Stroud, “The Wife-Murder Plays,” in \textit{A Companion to Early Modern Hispanic Theater}, ed. Hilaire Kallendorf (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill), 2014.} The women in the Novelas reverse this representation as they enact violent revenge on the men who abuse them, frequently in the name of restoring their honor. The individual stories are the paratactic tellings of these women’s actions, but they also support the hypotactic themes of love, violence, gender, and honor that de Zayas chooses to address throughout the frame novel, which demonstrates Donovan’s theory of the mixture of hypotaxis and parataxis within the frame novel.

Donovan identifies the frame novel as a medium most commonly utilized by women authors in the early modern period, and de Zayas’ mastery of the form supports this claim. However, women were not the only authors who made use of varying narrative styles. \textit{La Galatea} is not a formal frame novel, but Cervantes’ use of narrative interlacing and weaving allows for different characters to narrate their
stories in a similar manner as the frame novel. Like in de Zayas’ Novelas, the overarching theme of love takes center stage in the stories of the characters in La Galatea. In this way, Cervantes employs a framing technique: the shepherd characters walking through the countryside make up the frame, and the stories of the characters they come across (most prominently the characters of Teolinda and Silerio) could be considered the shorter stories that support the frame. Both de Zayas and Cervantes employ framing techniques in their works, and while they both choose love as an overarching theme, the effects of the framing are very different. De Zayas utilizes the theme of love as a way to also address themes of the abuse women suffer at the hands of a male-dominated society. Cervantes’ use of the pastoral shies away from a critique of this nature, as the pastoral setting removes (for the most part) the characters from the constraints of society. While the pastoral moves away from the strict class society of the urban, the hierarchies that remain come out of a sense of reason and wisdom. The characters who suffer their lovesicknesses rationally, without violence, are more respected than those who commit violence. These ideas of adequate behavior for the lover present in the Galatea are also explored by de Zayas in the Novelas.

I analyze four of the Novelas in this chapter: “La burlada Aminta y la venganza del honor,” “Al fin se paga todo,” “El prevenido engañado,” and “La fuerza del amor.” Each of these treats violence against women, most frequently through physical abuse. There are plenty of examples of men acting lovesick, but they express these feelings through violence, a contrast to the melancholic shepherds of the Galatea. With these violent behaviors, de Zayas addresses the life after lovesickness
is cured: the protagonists of both “La burlada Aminta” and “La fuerza del amor” experience abuse and disdain from their lovers after their relationships are consummated. The women in “La burlada Aminta” and “Al fin se paga todo” return the violence by enacting violent revenge against their abusers. “El prevenido engañado” presents the perspective of a man who distrusts women and is at times violent towards them, showing the audience the other side of this gendered divide of violence. I have paired and divided the four stories into thematic sections of honor and rationality and choleric lovesickness and gender. The first two stories that I will discuss treat the topic of the rational lover and the conception of honor in the Novelas.

Honor and Rationality

On the first night of Lisis’ party, Matilde tells the second story of the night (and of the Novelas). Matilde is a friend of Lisis, and her story follows a story told by Lisarda, Lisis’ cousin. Matilde says that, “as the beautiful Lisarda has proved in her story the strength of women…and it would be reasonable that, following her style,” Matilde’s story also proves this.112 She later continues that women must “know to search for revenge, for the stain of honor will only come out with the blood of the one that offended it.”113 From the beginning, we know that this story will discuss the themes of women’s ability and of honor, and Matilde also tells the audience that the story is true and about a woman in the court. Her identification of the themes at the beginning of the story and her assurance of the validity of the story both follow common frame novel techniques. Matilde’s story tells of the lady Aminta, who is the
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112 “ya que la bella Lisarda ha probado en su maravilla la firmeza de sus mujeres…razón será que, siguiendo yo su estilo,” de Zayas (2010), 212.
113 “saber buscar la venganza, pues la mancha del honor solo con sangre del que le ofendió sale,” ibid., 212.
most beautiful woman in the city of Segovia, but she is pledged to marry a cousin. Her betrothal saddens many of the men in the city who admire her beauty and love her. One day, a man named don Jacinto travels to Segovia, where he sees Aminta and immediately falls in love. He has to take to his bed because he is so overcome with lovesickness. Flora, a woman who travels with Jacinto pretending to be his sister, thinks up a plan to bring Jacinto and Aminta together, despite the fact that she is Jacinto’s mistress. Flora meets Aminta one day in church and plants the idea that Jacinto loves Aminta. With the assistance of Flora and a servant of Aminta’s named Elena, they begin to exchange letters and meet in secret, and Aminta quickly falls in love with Jacinto. After a few such meetings, Flora suggests that Aminta and Jacinto marry in secret, and they elope. After their elopement, Jacinto kills Elena to remove any witnesses to the marriage, but this also places Jacinto in the position of covering up both the murder and the elopement. He takes Aminta to a house on the edge of town, owned by a woman named doña Luisa. Aminta is already saddened by her situation and by the death of Elena, but her love for Jacinto continues to influence her decisions. At the house, Aminta discovers from doña Luisa and her son, don Martín, that Jacinto is not who he says he is, that Flora is his mistress, and that he is already married to a woman in Madrid. Aminta, dishonored, first attempts to take her own life, but is foiled by Martín, who professes his own love for her, which had struck him from the moment he saw her. Aminta agrees to marry Martín, but only after she avenges her honor. She travels with Martín to Madrid, where she dresses as a man and poses as a servant to Jacinto and Flora for a month. At the end of the month, she
reveals her true identity and kills both of them, completing her quest to avenge her honor. The story concludes with Aminta and Martín living in Madrid as spouses.

Aminta delivers the following speech after she discovers don Jacinto’s treachery, shortly before she attempts suicide:

Oh unfortunate me, and how easily I caused such scandals and misfortunes! Oh, who saw me three days ago, with honor, taste, and wealth, adored by my aunt and uncle and respected by the entire city, and now sees me as just a myth and shadow of that girl? Oh beloved uncle! And what satisfaction could I give you from the shames and dishonors that have befallen me? And what will happen to you when you find out the extent of my misfortune? Oh doña Elena, the creator of my labors, I curse the heavens in your name, like it did to your body, my perdition! Oh cruel Flora! more traitorous and deceitful than the one before, for whom in Rome they have such little regard for those with your name! Oh don Jacinto! how could you have the heart to trick a woman of my stature, without seeing that you have been the cause, not only of my death, but of your own? For my uncle, when he learns of what you have done, if his death does not stop him, he will work to procure yours. And when he is gone, there is still my cousin left in the world, who, when he hears of my injury, will feel it not just as a relative, but also as a spouse. But how can I have the patience to wait for this [Jacinto’s death], having the hands and the strength with which to end my life? It would be better if when they hear of my crime, it arrives with news of my death. It cannot be argued: who has lost honor loses their life!114

Aminta’s speech addresses one of the important themes that de Zayas evokes in the Novelas: the vital significance of honor, and especially what happens after the loss of honor.
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114 “¡Ay desventurada de mí, y cómo por ser fácil he sido causa de tantos escándalos y desdichas! ¡Ay!, ¿quién me vio tres días ha con honra, gusto y riqueza, adorada de mis tíos y respetada de toda la ciudad, y me veo hoy ser fábula y asombro de ella? ¡Ay querido tío!, ¿y qué satisfacción podrá dar de las penas y deshonras que por mí pasas? ¿Y qué será de ti cuando sepas por entero de mi desdicha? ¡Ay doña Elena, inventora de mis trabajos, castigue el cielo en tu alma, como lo hizo en tu cuerpo, mi perdición! ¡Ay Flora cruel, más traidora y engañosa que la pasada, por quien en Roma tienen en tan poco las de tu nombre! ¡Ay don Jacinto!, ¿y cómo tuviste corazón para burlar de una mujer de mi estado, sin mirar que has de ser causa, no solo de mi muerte, mas de la tuya?, pues en sabiendo mi tío lo que has hecho, si su muerte no le atajá, ha de procurar la tuya. Y cuando él falte, queda en el mundo, mi primo, que en fin ha de tomar por su cuenta mi agravio, no sólo como deudo, mas también como esposo. Mas ¿cómo podrá yo tener paciencia ni aguardar a tal, teniendo manos y valor con que quitarme la vida? Pues será mejor que cuando se sepa mi delito, llegue con las nuevas de mi muerte. No hay que replicar: ¡pierda la vida quien perdió el honor!” de Zayas (2010), 233-234.
honor. Aminta begins the speech as a lament of her misfortune, a common trope in many of the speeches delivered in the Novelas. She wonders at how she made it to this point: “who saw me three days ago, with honor, taste, and wealth, adored by my aunt and uncle and respected by the entire city, and now sees me as just a myth and shadow of that girl?” She notes that three days prior, before her secret marriage to Jacinto, she had honor, taste, and wealth—three things that would give any person a high position in society but were especially important to a woman’s standing. A woman with honor, taste, and wealth is in much better standing than one without, because she has the hope for an honorable marriage, which would keep her position stable within the society. Aminta, in the aftermath of the discovery that Jacinto lied to her and tricked her into an illegitimate marriage, sees herself as fallen from her former position and unable to reattain it.

After she mourns the loss of her former status, Aminta addresses her uncle through an apostrophe: “oh beloved uncle! And what satisfaction could I give you from the shames and dishonors that have befallen me?” This is the first of several apostrophes Aminta uses in the speech, through which she addresses people who are not present with her. The consistent use of apostrophe in the speech highlights her desperate state as she rebukes several of the people she addresses, while asking questions of others. It is also an important external expression of her pain, through which she can attempt to make sense of her situation. Though her speech is a soliloquy, she brings others into her dishonored state through the apostrophes, and in

---

115 Apostrophe is defined as “poetic address, esp. to unhearing entities, whether these be abstractions, inanimate objects, animals, infants, or absent or dead people,” by the Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, 4th edition (2017), ed. Roland Greene.
this way she externalizes her dishonor. Each apostrophe begins with an ‘ay!’ that declares her sadness, regret, and frustration, an interjection typical to the apostrophic form. The sentence addressed to her uncle touches on a sense of duty that Aminta feels towards him, and she expresses sorrow that she is no longer able to bring him the satisfaction he once felt towards her. She believes that her uncle could no longer feel pride in her after she has committed such a shameful act, and she hates that she cannot fulfill her role as the dutiful niece. She then questions, “what will happen to you [uncle] when you find out the extent of my misfortune?”

Later in the passage, she mentions her cousin, to whom she was betrothed, and she decides that “it would be better if, when they find out the news of my crime, it comes with the news of my death.” In her relationship with her cousin, as well, Aminta is unable to fulfill her duty as fiancée, and she regrets this. She refers to her secret wedding to Jacinto as her ‘crime,’ though she blames Jacinto for luring her into the dishonorable marriage. Although she operated under misinformation from Jacinto when she decided to marry him, she still takes responsibility for the decision and believes that her death will rectify the situation. Aminta knows at this point that violence is the only solution for her dishonor, but she currently believes that her own death would be the best course of action. She has fallen so far from her prior status that she knows the news of her actions with Jacinto would be devastating to her family, but she also knows that it would be eclipsed by the news of her death. Her suicide would communicate her regret to her uncle and cousin and would thus remove the stain of her dishonor.
After the address to her uncle, Aminta then turns her attention to the people she blames for putting her into her situation: Elena, Flora, and Jacinto. She calls Elena, the servant who had helped her meet with Jacinto in secret, “the creator of my labors,” and curses her soul. Jacinto killed Elena before taking Aminta out of the city, out of fear that Elena would inform Aminta’s family of their relationship. Though Aminta initially mourned Elena’s death, after she learns of Jacinto’s treachery, she counts Elena as one of those who worked to bring about “my perdition.” Though she partly blames Elena, she blames Flora even more—Flora is “more traitorous and deceitful than the one before.” Flora first proposed the plan to bring together Jacinto and Aminta, despite her own intimate relationship with Jacinto and her knowledge of Jacinto’s marriage to another woman in Madrid, and for this she takes a large part of the blame from Aminta. Aminta says that those in Rome “have such little regard for those with your name.” The reference to Rome in this section perhaps continues the religious rhetoric she began when she cursed Elena’s soul, as Rome is the home of the Pope and the seat of the Catholic religion.

After Aminta curses Elena and Flora, she moves onto Jacinto, on whom she lays most of the blame of her dishonor. She asks, “how could you have the heart to trick a woman of my stature, without seeing that you have been the cause, not only of my death, but of your own?” Here, again, she brings up the importance of her prior stature, and how her loss of this influences her wish to commit suicide. In her apostrophe to Jacinto, she speaks of her uncle and her cousin, who she believes will avenge her dishonor. She knows that her uncle, “when he learns of what you have done, if his death does not stop him, he will work to procure yours,” and if he cannot
do it, “there is still my cousin left in the world, who, when he hears of my injury, will feel it not just as a relative, but also as a spouse.” Though Aminta believes that she has disappointed her family by failing to complete her duty, she knows that her uncle and her cousin would still avenge her, especially if they learn of her death along with the news of Jacinto’s trickery. Their vengeance might not be able to restore her honor, but it could potentially restore their own. Aminta’s uncle and cousin are dishonored by Aminta’s dishonor, but for different reasons. For them, Aminta herself is a source of honor—her uncle takes pride in having such a good niece, and her cousin will one day marry her and gain an honorable wife. Thus, if they took their revenge on Jacinto, it would be for their own honor, rather than Aminta’s.

At the end of the speech, Aminta realizes that she shouldn’t make these claims, because with the death of Elena it is unlikely her family would ever discover the truth of her dishonor. They would know of her disappearance but with no knowledge of her relationship with Jacinto, they would probably not be able to connect the dots. She says, “but how can I have the patience to wait for this [Jacinto’s death], having the hands and the strength with which to end my life? It would be better if when they hear of my crime, it arrives with news of my death.” As mentioned above, Aminta believes that her family would react better to the news of her dishonor if they also hear of her death. In that situation, their grief would overcome whatever anger or disappointment they hold, and their focus would turn to punishing whoever caused Aminta’s dishonor and her death. They would also be relieved of the burden of a dishonored niece, and this would make their lives easier, which Aminta knows. She concludes with the exclamation: “it cannot be argued: who
has lost honor loses their life!” The connection between honor and life is again brought up here; Aminta believes that she cannot live on without honor, and she thinks that this logic cannot be argued against.

After she completes her speech, Aminta pulls out a knife and intends to use it to slit her wrists, but before she completes her plan, don Martín comes out from his hiding place and stops her. When Aminta sees him, she says, “return to your room and leave me, because with the death of just one woman the honors of so many men are restored.”

The men she refers to here include her cousin and her uncle, who would be subject to gossip and insult in the city when the news of Aminta and Jacinto’s relationship becomes public. Martín refuses to leave her, telling her that “from the moment I first saw you, I have adored you,” and that he would take his life as well if she kills herself.

Martín is not the first man to be so overcome by Aminta’s beauty; in fact, the language used to describe his love repeats the language used when Jacinto first sees Aminta. When Martín first sees Aminta, “he was left outside of himself, seeming to him to have in front of his eyes some angel.” Jacinto’s reaction to seeing Aminta similarly follows the common pattern of lovesickness descriptions, and utilizes the same language:

Don Jacinto began to feel bad from the wound that the beauty of Aminta had placed in his heart; and considering her nobility, wealth, and honesty, of which everyone knew, his thoughts were impossible, because Aminta being who she is and her stature complicated everything for him, he was taken so far outside himself that he no longer seemed a man with a soul but instead a body or ghost without one. His passion came to put him in such care that from barely eating

---

116 “volveos a vuestro aposento y dejadme, pues con la muerte de sola una mujer se restauran las honras de tantos hombres,” de Zayas (2010), 235.
117 “yo desde que os vi, os adoro,” ibid., 235.
118 “quedo fuera de si, pareciéndole tener delante de sus ojos algún ángel,” ibid., 230.
and badly sleeping he came to lose his health, so that he fell in his bed with a profound melancholy.\textsuperscript{119}

At the moment when Jacinto first falls in love with Aminta, he believes that his love is hopeless because of her status: “considering her nobility, wealth, and honesty, of which everyone knew, his thoughts were impossible, because Aminta being who she is and her stature complicated everything for him.” The same honor that Aminta mourns in her speech initially prevented Jacinto from even attempting to act upon his feelings. It is only after encouragement from Flora that he pulls himself out of his melancholy and begins to seduce Aminta. While Jacinto’s initial reaction to seeing Aminta results in symptoms that fit in with common understandings of lovesickness (and particularly a melancholic lovesickness), his affliction at the beginning of the story masks the deceit he commits against Aminta afterwards. The storyteller, Matilde, likely knew that this description would fool her audience, and thus later align them with Aminta’s surprise when she discovers the truth of Jacinto’s identity. The validity of Jacinto’s lovesickness creates an illusion of true love between the two main characters, only for the illusion to be shattered when Martín and Luisa tell Aminta the whole story.

The theme of disillusionment, or in Spanish “desengaño,” is one that flows throughout this story and one that de Zayas employs several times over in her work. Her second frame novel is titled the Desengaños amorosos, or the tales of love’s disillusionments—each of the stories told in this frame center around this theme of

\textsuperscript{119} “Empezó don Jacinto a sentirse mal de la herida que le había dado en el corazón la belleza de Aminta; y considerando su nobleza, riqueza y honestidad, que de todo se informó, ser imposible sus pensamientos, pues el ser quien era Aminta y su estado de él lo dificultaba todo, le traía tan fuera de sí que no parecía hombre con alma sino cuerpo o fantasma sin ella. Vínole a poner en tal cuidado su pasión que del poco comer y mal dormir vino a perder la salud, de suerte que cayó en la cama de una profunda melancolía,” de Zayas (2010), 216-217.
deception, and all of the stories are told by women. Within the *Novelas amorosas*, the theme is less developed, but the story of Aminta consistently utilizes it. Jacinto hides his real identity from Aminta, who then has to conceal her identity several times over. She is first disguised when she leaves the city with Jacinto, and she then re-disguises herself to finish out her act of revenge against Jacinto. The moment in which Aminta discovers Jacinto’s treachery is later mirrored in Aminta’s reveal of her true identity before she kills him. In using a disguise to restore her honor, she seems to invert the trick played on her by Jacinto. She takes her honor back through the same disguise that Jacinto uses to trick her.

Aminta removes another layer of illusion when, after Martín’s admission of love for her, she reveals her own true identity: “I am Aminta…the one who just tonight you said was the cause of the scandal and uproar in this city, and the misfortune of the captain don Pedro, my sad and hurt uncle.” She tells Martín her full story, which serves to further enamor him with her. When he hears of her suffering, he wants to help her in any way that he can, proving his position as a better lover than Jacinto. In an effort to remedy some of her pain, Martín proposes to her, and Aminta accepts. Afterwards, however, she says that “this cannot be my vengeance, because as I have been the victim, and not you, I am the only one who can avenge myself, and I will not be content if my hands do not restore what my insanity lost. And so, though I give you my word as your spouse, you will not fulfill your desire until I have ended the life of this traitor.”

---

120 “yo soy Aminta…esa de quien esta noche dijistes que era el escándalo y alboroto de esta ciudad, y desdicha del capitán don Pedro, mi triste y lastimado tío,” de Zayas (2010), 236.
121 “no ha de ser así mi venganza porque supuesto que yo he sido la ofendida, y no vos, yo sola he de vengarme, pues no quedaré contenta si mis manos no restauran lo que perdió mi locura. Y así, aunque
hopeless and believed that her death was the only way to restore honor, she now finds within herself the strength to enact revenge on Jacinto. Her shift from the decision to commit suicide to the decision to avenge her own honor occurs somewhat suddenly, but also occurs after she now sees herself with future options. The prospect of a love, one more true than the one she shared with Jacinto, removes her from the state of dejection she was in before. Her marriage to don Martín, a man of good standing in society, would successfully restore her honor, wealth, and position. With a future ahead of her, Aminta now finds the strength to remove the one person still preventing her from reaching future happiness: don Jacinto.

Aminta’s dedication to revenge, even after Martín’s proposal, gives an interesting look at her personal conception of honor. In a world where honor is solely determined by society, the opportunity for Aminta to marry Martín would restore her honor. Aminta and Martín could easily conceal her relationship with Jacinto from the rest of the world, but Aminta insists that she cannot marry Martín until she has killed Jacinto. This shows that she conceives of honor as something internal to herself, rather than something that is socially located and external. Earlier, she placed her trust in her uncle and her cousin to avenge her honor and her death. Her uses of apostrophe seemed to follow a conception of honor as external, as she blamed others for her dishonor and relied on her uncle and cousin to restore her honor. At the end of the section, she finds the strength within herself to avenge her honor. While her earlier speech implies that she follows the traditionally external conception of honor, by the end of the story she has moved into an honor that is held internally. This

os doy palabra de esposa, no se ha de conseguir vuestro deseo hasta que yo quite la vida a este traidor,”
de Zayas (2010), 236.
concept of honor as an internal/external experience also relates to the internal/external experience of love. Lovesickness is generally the external manifestation of an internal feeling; honor is the internal manifestation of an external impetus.

Aminta and Martín travel to Madrid, where Jacinto and Flora returned after their deception of Aminta. In yet another example of disguised identity, Aminta dresses as a young man and finds Jacinto (now going by his true name, Francisco). She secures a position as a servant in the house of Francisco and uses the name Jacinto as her alias. In choosing the name “Jacinto” to disguise herself in his house, Aminta is reversing the same ‘desengaño’ that he used to dishonor her. While Francisco does not suspect her true identity, Flora believes she recognizes Aminta in the face of the young servant but does not bring it up with Francisco “to not bring Aminta to his memory, seeing her so forgotten by him.”

Francisco never questions the similarity of the name to the one he used to seduce Aminta, and he accepts the servant Jacinto as a close confidant in his house. Both Francisco and Flora begin to trust the servant Jacinto, and one day they request that he sing them a *romance* (ballad) while they eat. Aminta (as Jacinto) obliges, and she sings a song that concludes with the stanza: “For what, ungrateful Jacinto / cause of my eternal shame / with false and feigned love / did you fool my innocence?”

She claims that the poem is based on a former love of the servant Jacinto, from which “I have understood to love and to detest, and I also know to give annoyances and feign cares, because I

122 “por no traérsela a la memoria, viéndole tan olvidado de ella,” de Zayas (2010), 240.
123 “¿para qué, Jacinto ingrato,/causa de mi eterna pena,/con falso y fingido amor/engañaste mi inocencia?” *ibid.*, 241.
am more manly than what my beard shows.”

Here, Aminta plays with Francisco’s own past behavior, though he does not realize it. Her suggestion that she is “manly” because of her ability to feign feelings for a woman insults the way that Francisco himself acts, as he lives happily in a house with Flora with no thoughts for Aminta, who he abandoned after satisfying his desire for her.

Aminta remains in the house of Jacinto and Flora for a month before she hears news from Segovia that her uncle was imprisoned for her disappearance. After returning to his house on bail, he collapsed and died. His final words are reminiscent of Aminta’s earlier speech: “my lost honor.”

Here again, there is an ambiguity as to what exactly his lost honor is—it could be the loss of Aminta or it could be that he has lost his honor as a result of his imprisonment. Either way, his immediate death seems to prove Aminta’s final statement, that “who has lost honor loses their life.”

The news of her uncle’s death furthers Aminta’s rage towards Jacinto and Flora, and she saw that “it was not the time of complaints but for revenge.”

This presents another reversal for Aminta—as she had earlier believed that the news of her own death would spur her uncle and cousin to revenge, the news of her uncle’s death now moves her to finish her act of revenge. She enters the house of Jacinto and Flora one night with a dagger and stabs each of them several times over. After, she goes to Martín’s lodging and removes her disguise, and the two live the rest of their lives as

---

124 “he sabido querer y aborrecer, y que también se dar disgustos y fingir cuidados, porque soy más hombre de lo que mis barbas dan muestra,” de Zayas (2010), 240.
125 “mi honra perdida,” Ibid., 244.
126 “no era tiempo de quejas, sino venganzas,” Ibid., 244.
husband and wife. Matilde concludes the story, “so you all see the value of The tricked Aminta and revenge of honor in this second marvel.”

Matilde’s expressed goal in telling the story of Aminta was to prove the strength of women and to demonstrate that dishonor can only be rectified through violence. Aminta’s discussion of honor after her discovery of Jacinto’s lies proves the second point, but she is at first reluctant to perform the violent revenge herself. Instead, she believes that she must kill herself, which would move her uncle and cousin to avenge her through violence against Jacinto. Later, after Martín’s proposal, she finds the strength within herself to seek her own revenge, rather than relying on others. This action proves Matilde’s first point, and it also serves to place Martín in a privileged place as a lover of Aminta. His belief in her and his willingness to allow her to fulfill her desire for violent revenge before marrying him sets him up as a foil to Jacinto, who only cared to enjoy Aminta’s physical beauty. Aminta’s recovery of her honor is made possible through her love with Martín, demonstrating the strength of the rational lover.

The primacy of the rational lover is proved again in the seventh story from the Novelas amorosas y ejemplares, which is titled “Al fin se paga todo,” or “Everything is repaid in the end.” Like the story of Aminta, this novela (given at the party by don Miguel) tells of a dishonored woman who regains her honor through violence and the support of a rational lover. The story begins with a man named don García, who is walking in the streets of Madrid one night when he sees a woman fall into the street, beaten badly. He helps the woman, named doña Hipólita, and is struck by her beauty.

---

127 “para que vean todos el valor de La burlada Aminta y venganza del honor en este segunda maravilla,” de Zayas (2010), 247.
Hipólita then begins to tell García the story of how she ended up in such a situation, and her interpolated story takes up the majority of the novel. She is a noblewoman and had several offers of marriage when she came of age, including from both brothers of the family that lived next door to her. She married don Pedro, the eldest brother, though his brother don Luis remained in love with her. After her marriage, she met a man named don Gaspar and fell madly in love with him. She and Gaspar began an affair, which culminated in Hipólita believing she had killed Gaspar when she hid him in a small trunk in her closet while her husband was home. She then asked Luis to help her to dispose of Gaspar’s body, and Luis then used the knowledge of her affair to his advantage as he attempted to get her to sleep with him.

Hipólita tried earnestly to resist Luis’ advances, but one night he snuck into her bedroom, pretending to be her husband, and raped her. After discovering that she had slept with Luis and not her husband, Hipólita swore revenge. The next night she entered his house with a dagger and killed him. She then left her home and attempted to ask Gaspar (who survived the trunk event) for help, but he refused and beat her, because Luis had convinced him that Hipólita was truly in a relationship with him and that she had tricked Gaspar in their affair. After beating her badly, Gaspar ripped off her clothing and thrust her outside, where García found her. After the conclusion of Hipólita’s explanation, García takes her to a convent for protection while they figure out how to solve the situation of Luis’ death. At the convent, Hipólita tells the king’s magistrate her whole story, and the king acquits her of the crime. However, she doesn’t want to return to her husband’s house and lives in the convent until he dies.
After he dies, Hipólita leaves the convent and marries García, and they live happily for the rest of their lives.

The novel presents several layers of a frame novel: the overall story is told at the party by don Miguel and initially follows García’s perspective. After García brings Hipólita to his lodging and offers her help, she tells him her story, and her voice takes over the narrative. Within her story, she often quotes others directly, including her conversations with don Gaspar and don Luis. The shift between García and Hipólita in the main narrator position deepens the separation between the narrator Miguel and the characters, and it adds distance between the author de Zayas and her characters. This narrative shift is gendered and eroticized: the central narrator of the text changes from a man to a woman, and from the lover to the beloved. The move from a third person limited narration focused on García to a first-person narration told by Hipólita inverts the standard of the lovesick man holding the narrative role. It also serves to highlight the explicitly oral tradition of the frame novel: Miguel recounts the interactions between García and Hipólita, which also includes retelling Hipólita’s prior interactions with the people in her life. Hipólita shares her story with García, but her story is also shared with the guests of Lisis’ party and with the audience of the Novelas. The setting of the story thus changes as well; while Hipólita tells her story in a matter of hours, the events occur over her entire life. She recounts the past, taking García and the audience with her, only to be returned to the original time and place when she concludes. In this way, de Zayas employs narrative techniques similar to those used in La Galatea, in which each character is given the space to share their history with the audience of the other shepherds as well as the readership of the novel.
Before this shift in narration occurs, García assists the beaten Hipólita to the room he is renting in a boarding house, and the passage that follows gives us an example of a man immediately taken by a woman’s beauty. Before this point in the story, García had yet to see Hipólita in the light; he helps her off a dark Madrid street and brings her to the room in the boarding-house, where he sees her fully for the first time. It is a section that presents a classic look at lovesickness:

Thus, don García helping her, they arrived to his lodging; and as he would have left light [dejado luz], I mean to say in the room where he slept, for in the rest lived the landlady and the other guests, entering inside he had place to see the discovery that he had found, and looking at his new companion, he believed without a doubt that she was not a woman but an angel, such was her beauty and the integrity and composure of her face. She appeared to be around 24 years old, and so beautiful that, before he could protect himself, she stole his soul with the beauty of her eyes, such that if he did not put first the faith that he should protect the one who has trusted him, he might have dared to be Tarquin to such a divine Lucretia; but favoring his nobility more than his love, and his modesty over his desire, and his reason more than his appetite, he procured with many caresses the repose of that beautiful woman; to whom, for being battered and undressed, and since don García did not at that time have clothing for her, and with it being the hour for turning more to calmness than to insomnia, he begged her to lie down in his bed.  

Miguel makes the point to describe their exact location within the boarding-house: “I mean to say in the room where he slept, for in the rest lived the landlady and the other guests,” thus letting the audience know of this semi-public, semi-private place. While

---

128 “De esta suerte, ayudándola don Garcia, llegaron a su posada; y como en ella hubiese dejado luz, quiero decir en la cuadra donde dormía, que en lo demás vivía la dueña de casa y otros huéspedes, entrando dentro tuvo lugar de ver el hallazgo que se había hallado, y mirando su nueva camarada creyó sin duda que no era mujer sino ángel, tanta era su belleza y la honestidad y compostura de su rostro. Era al parecer de veinticuatro años, y tan hermosa que, sin ser parte el guardarla, le robó el alma con la belleza de sus ojos, tanto que si no se le pusiera por delante la fe que debía guardar a quien se había fiado de él, casi se atreviera a ser Tarquino de tan divina Lucrecia; mas favoreciendo don García más a su nobleza que a su amor, a su recato que a su deseo, y a la razón más que a su apetito, procuró con muchas caricias el reposo de aquella hermosísima señora; a la cual, por estar mal tratada y desnuda, como don García no tenía por el presente vestidos, y ser hora de acudir más a la quietud que al desvelo, la suplicó que se acostase en su cama,” de Zayas (2010), 415-416.
Hipólita and García may be alone in his bedroom, they are not alone in the house. The boarding-house inhabits an interesting in-between space between the private and the public. Hipólita has just left her private, domestic space, a space that was meant to protect her from violence but failed. The semi-public boarding-house is the place where Hipólita will find the safety she did not have in her own home. The setting of the boarding-house for this scene of pure love is surprising, as the location of the boarding-house was illicit in the time and normally associated with sexual encounters. A woman of Hipólita’s status would likely never set foot in a boarding-house and being seen there might affect her honored position. Now, however, she has been dishonored by several different men, and this place of supposed dishonor brings her closer to the man that helps her restore her honor.

The text reads that, in García’s bedroom, “hubiese dejado luz.” This phrase is ambiguous and could be read with several different meanings. “Hubiese” is the imperfect subjunctive of the verb “haber,” which in this case is used in its perfect formation meaning “have.” “Dejado” is the participle of “dejar,” which has several definitions but is principally used for either “to allow” or “to leave.” Finally, “luz” means “light.” The phrase could mean that García “would have left light” in his room, thus making it easier to see Hipólita’s beauty. However, there is a commonly used phrase in Spanish, “dar a luz,” which means “to give birth.” With the similarity between the words “dar” (to give) and “dejar,” this could also perhaps make some reference to Hipólita giving birth—in the bedroom “she would have given birth.” This meaning, when combined with the pure and honest description of Hipólita that
follows, places Hipólita as a Mary-like figure. Her virtue, though insulted by Luis’ and Gaspar’s actions, remains intact in the eyes of García.

Here García is able to see Hipólita for the first time: “entering inside he had place to see the discovery that he had found, and looking at his new companion, he believed without a doubt that she was not a woman but an angel, such was her beauty and the integrity and composure of her face.” Notably, García is not just taken with Hipólita’s physical beauty but with the characteristics he can read on her face: integrity and composure. This admiration of the inner qualities of the beloved, not just her physical attributes, sets García’s lovesick experience apart from others: he operates under the influence of a reasoned love, rather than a pleasurable one, and thus he is set up to be the most valid lover in Hipólita’s story. His dedication to reason over pleasure aligns him with the qualities of a good lover proposed in both the Dialogues of Love and the Galatea. García’s admiration of Hipólita’s beauty continues, “she appeared to be around 24 years old, and so beautiful that, before he could protect himself, she stole his soul with the beauty of her eyes.” This phrasing of “she stole his soul,” or in Spanish “le robó el alma,” is commonly used in descriptions of lovesickness. The mention of Hipólita’s eyes also references the importance of vision and sight in lovesick descriptions; the quote is reminiscent of the story of Teolinda and Artidoro in the Galatea. Hipólita now owns García’s entire life, which in an unreasoned lover could inspire violence—don Luis, who raped Hipólita, and don Gaspar, who beat her, also had souls taken by Hipólita. García, however, has already been established as the rational lover, which shows the reader that his love is genuine. This language again parallels language utilized to describe the lovesick
shepherds in *La Galatea*, who often express that their beloved owns their heart, soul, or life.

García’s soul is so taken by Hipólita that “if he did not put first the faith that he should protect the one who has trusted him, he might have dared to be Tarquin to such a divine Lucretia.” Here we see the first mention that García may be a unique kind of lover. He puts “first the faith that he should protect the one who has trusted him,” over the desire that he has for Hipólita’s physical beauty. Thus, even before we have thorough description of García’s own noble characteristics, we see his good character in the value he places in the trust Hipólita has in him. The reference to Tarquin and Lucretia calls back to the story told by Livy in his *History of Rome*. In the story, the king’s son Sextus Tarquinius (Tarquin) is welcomed by the regional governor Tarquinius Collatinus, whose wife Lucretia is known for her beauty and virtue. When Tarquin sees Lucretia, “inflamed by the beauty and exemplary purity of Lucretia, formed the vile project of effecting his dishonour.”129 A few days later, Tarquin returns to the house of Lucretia and her husband and enters Lucretia’s bedroom with the intent to dishonor her fully. After she is raped, Lucretia goes to her father and her husband and informs them of the offense, and she asks them to seek revenge against Tarquin, before she pulls out a knife and kills herself. Her death inspires the shift from a monarchy in Rome to the republic. García’s thoughts about Hipólita could have led to a similar result: he too could have used his desire of her beauty and integrity to violate her. This actually would have been easy for García, as Hipólita has fallen from her former status and is in a vulnerable position with him.

However, his sense of loyalty towards her and because he “favor[ed] his nobility more than his love and his modesty over his desire, and his reason more than his appetite” stop him from completing this action. Here again García’s character is proven, and he easily overcomes his desire for Hipólita’s physical beauty through his own integrity and his love for rationality. Though we have yet to learn Hipólita’s story, the example of Tarquin and Lucretia references her experience with her brother-in-law, don Luis, who sneaks into her bedroom and rapes her while her husband is out. Even without this knowledge, the audience knows that Hipólita has been beaten in a manner that also suggests sexual violence (she has been stripped of her clothing as well), and don García’s loyalty to reason and nobility positions him as a valid lover to Hipólita.

This is further proved by his actions immediately after, when he “procured with many caresses the repose of that beautiful woman; to whom, for being battered and undressed, and since don García did not at that time have clothing for her, and with it being the hour for turning more to calmness than to insomnia, he begged her to lie down in his bed.” While this moment again brings up the possibility of a violation, with Hipólita undressed and injured in García’s bed, his level of respect for her prevents any such violence from happening. The text says that he ensured her relaxation with “muchas caricias,” or many caresses. The language of a caress initially seems foreign in this context, as García has now shown Hipólita how much respect he has for her, and it seems unlikely that he would then touch her in the sensual way that a “caress” implies. However, the use of physical touch in this situation actually further proves his rational love. He is able to touch his beloved,
while she is nude, and the touch is not sexual nor violating. García in this moment may achieve the neo-Platonic ideal of a lover, one who fully puts rationality before all else, and especially before any physical desires. He asks her to lay in his bed not to attempt to have sex with her, but instead to preserve her modesty. In the scene, the space of García’s bedroom at the boarding-house becomes a safe space for Hipólita, a contradiction to de Zayas’ general depiction of the domestic space as hostile to the woman. Indeed, in Hipólita’s past this was true: her home was the site of her affair with Gaspar, which culminated in his presumed death after he is locked in a trunk in her closet. Her house was also directly connected to the house of Luis, who took advantage of this connection to rape her; she later uses the same connection to murder him in revenge. For most of her story, the domestic space is hostile and violent for Hipólita, and García provides an alternative in his room. After he ensures that she can rest in his bed, he leaves and sleeps in the room of another guest in the boarding-house, which again proves his integrity. Because García treated her so well, Hipólita decides to tell him her story, and she then takes control of the narrative.

Throughout this scene, de Zayas plays with common tropes of the lover, all of which are frustrated by the character of García. Though he is immediately captured by Hipólita in an experience similar to that of other lovesick men in these texts, his dedication to rationality proves him as the true, noble lover to Hipólita. Other men might have followed their desire for Hipólita’s physical beauty and attempted to achieve sexual pleasure. Indeed, the beginning of the story seems to be set up for this result—García finds Hipólita naked in the street, takes her to his room at a boarding-house (a classic location for sexual relationships), and then sees her beauty and covets
it. Hipólita’s dishonored status would further push these events, as it would be easy for García to take advantage of a woman already removed from her once honorable status. However, before any mention of love is made in the text, we see García’s dedication to the trusting relationship he has with Hipólita. Instead of a lover who sees beauty and wants to enjoy that, García sees the beauty and holds his reason close. This is what separates him from the other lovers we see in either the Galatea or the Novelas; while most of them lose their reason as an effect of their love, García keeps his.

While Hipólita’s story involves violence similar to other stories in the Novelas (her murder of Luis echoes Aminta’s murder of Jacinto and Flora, for example), it has a happier ending than many of the other stories. Though Aminta also lived with her husband Martín for the rest of her life, she was forced to conceal her identity from many that she knew. Because Hipólita stays in the convent until her husband dies, she is easily able to marry García after she leaves. She has decided that she no longer wants to live with her husband, but to do so outside of the separated space of the convent would mean dishonor. To keep the honor she worked so hard to restore, she remains in the convent until the death of her husband. Her loyalty to García matches his loyalty to her; he visits her regularly while she lives in the convent, and when she finds herself “free, young, and rich,” she marries him, “making him lord of her beauty and of her large estate.” García’s fidelity to Hipólita is rewarded through his marriage to her, and he is finally able to ‘possess’ her beauty in the way he refused to the first night he met her. His journey as the true and rational lover is complete.

130 “libre, moza y rica,” “haciéndole señor de su belleza y de su gruesa hacienda,” de Zayas (2010), 444.
The story of Hipólita and the story of Aminta have obvious connections. Both women are beautiful and noble, and both are tricked by men and dishonored. They also both decide to take violent revenge on those men and to enact this revenge with their own hands. The connections between Hipólita and Aminta are also clear in the men they end up with—García for Hipólita and Martín for Aminta. These men fall in love with their beloveds after the prior dishonor, and neither of them seem to care about their beloveds’ pasts. Most importantly, both of these men place reason over desire and are thus the chosen lovers at the end of the stories. Martín does not protest Aminta’s desire to kill the people who wronged her, and in fact does what he can to assist her in this process. While García enters the story after Hipólita has committed her revenge, he helps her to safety after her abuse by Gaspar and then ensures that she is protected throughout the criminal proceedings that follow. For both of these men, the violent revenge of their beloveds does not phase them or deter them from the love. Their rational treatment of their beloveds also gains them the chosen position of the lover. Importantly, these women are able to choose the men that they end up with, contrasting their prior inability to choose what happened to them.

The previous two stories are about women reclaiming their honor back from those who took it, with the help of their rational lovers. The next two stories, on the other hand, feature protagonists who are helpless in the face of the offenses they suffer, though in very different contexts. These stories will help to further understand the theme of choleric lovesickness as it appears in the Novelas. They also provide important conceptual developments for the idea of gender, how society shapes it, and its influence on sexed bodies.
Choleric Lovesickness and Gender

The story entitled “El prevenido engañado,” or “The Forewarned Fool,” is the fourth story told in the Novelas, told on the second night of the party by don Alonso. The story’s main themes are choleric lovesickness and the woman’s role in these relationships. Within the frame, don Alonso is in love with doña Nise, who tells the first story on the next night (“La fuerza del amor,” or “The Strength of Love”), and these two stories provide a look into the ways in which a narrator’s identity affects the kind of story they tell. Don Alonso’s story centers around the nobleman don Fadrique, who finds himself cuckolded several times over by several different women. Despite his best efforts to prevent the women from pulling one over on him, Fadrique still falls for the tricks—hence the title of “The Forewarned Fool.” The first woman to fool him is doña Serafina, who is betrothed to Fadrique but pregnant by another man. Fadrique finds out about the baby after following Serafina one night and witnessing her give birth. He leaves the city after bringing her baby to a convent, swearing off women; he soon after falls in love with a widow named doña Beatriz. He proposes to her, and she accepts, but Fadrique later discovers that Beatriz is in love with a former servant, a black man named Antonio, who she keeps in a bed in her stable. Once more tricked by a woman, Fadrique again leaves the city and again swears off women. He travels to Madrid where he again falls in love with another woman, named doña Violante. He courts Violante for several months with the help of his cousin, only to discover her one day in bed with another man. At this point, he flies into a violent rage and beats Violante. After this, he not only leaves the city but leaves Spain altogether, not returning for many years. When he does return, he goes
back to his hometown of Granada and meets the daughter of Serafina, still in the convent, named Gracia. He discovers that Gracia is “boba,” meaning idiot, and thinks that this is his opportunity to marry a woman without being cuckolded. They never consummate their marriage, and he teaches Gracia that, in order to fulfill her wifely duty, she should stand outside of their bedroom every night wearing armor. Even with these precautions, when Fadrique leaves on a trip, another man teaches Gracia the true nature of life between husbands and wives. When Fadrique returns and discovers that he has once again been cuckolded by a woman (though she does not even recognize her betrayal), he gives up on women for good and eventually dies without heirs.

Fadrique’s story shows an—at times less than plausible—example of a man ruled by his heart over his head. Though he tries his best to stop these tricks from happening to him, and despite the fact that he swears off love after each insult, he always finds himself in the same spot as before. His relationship with Violante is the most developed within the story, and it at first appears that she reciprocates his feelings and that Fadrique may have found a woman who would be loyal to him. However, after a while Violante begins to neglect Fadrique, who was “jealous, placing the blame on a new employment, he became more enraged and hateful.”

We can see here already his choleric nature, from his jealousy and his willingness to turn to rage. He then convinces a servant of Violante’s to let him into the house at night, where he finds Violante with her new lover. At this sight, his passions can no

131 “celoso, dando la culpa a nuevo empleo, se hacía más enfadado y aborrecido,” de Zayas (2010), 327.
longer be controlled, and he falls into violence, as seen in the following passage,
which occurs after he discovers the couple in bed:

Don Fadrique’s rage could not at this point be so sensible to not obligate him to enter with the determination to give a beating, to not dirty his sword in a young man of so few years. But the lover who saw that man so determined enter, and saw himself naked and without a sword, he dropped to the floor, and grabbing a shoe he covered it with his hand, as though it was a pistol; and saying that if he did not let him out, he would kill him, he made it through the door and in little time the street, leaving Fadrique frightened by his action.

So Violante, already resolved to lose to the last point the friendship of don Fadrique, she saw him frozen staring at the door through which his competitor had left, she began to laugh very suddenly, celebrating the joke of the shoe. This offended the Granadan more than all the rest, his passion could not stop to yield to her impudence, and he walked to Violante and punched her until he bathed her in blood.132

When he sees Violante’s betrayal, his “rage could not at this point be so sensible to not obligate him to enter with the determination to give a beating.” In Spanish, the word for ‘rage’ is ‘cólera,’ which signifies anger but also relates to the choleric temperament, a temperament related to the four humours Hippocrates posited made up the body. Choleric temperament is related to the production of yellow bile, while black bile causes melancholic temperament, phlegm causes phlegmatic temperament, and blood causes sanguine temperament. Ideally, these four humours would be in balance in the body, which would make the person’s temperament also balanced.

However, the overproduction of one of the humours could cause the person’s

132 “No pudo en ese punto la cólera de don Fadrique ser tan cuerda que no le obligase a entrar con determinación de molerle a palos, por no ensuciar la espada en un mozuelo de tan pocos años. Mas el amante que vio entrar aquel hombre tan determinado, y se vio desnudo y sin espada, se bajó al suelo, y tomando un zapato le encubrió en la mano, como que fuese un pistolete; y diciéndole que si no se tenía afuera le mataría, cobró la puerta y en poco espacio la calle, dejando a don Fadrique temeroso de su acción. Pues como Violante, ya resuelta a perder de todo punto la amistad de don Fadrique, le viese quedar como helado mirando a la puerta por donde había salido su competidor, empezó a reírse muy de propósito, solemnizado la burla del zapato. De esto más ofendido el granadino que de lo demás, no pudo la pasión dejar de darle atrevimiento, y llegándose a Violante la dio de bofetadas, que la bañó en sangre,” de Zayas (2010), 328.
temperament to be affected. In the case of an overproduction of yellow bile, the choleric temperament reigns over the rest, which produces rage in the person.\textsuperscript{133}

The use of the language of humoural theory in works that address lovesickness is not unique to this story. The \textit{La Galatea}, for example, regularly references the melancholy felt by the shepherds, which I discussed in the previous chapter. An act of rage caused by the actions of one’s beloved, on the other hand, is almost never seen in the \textit{Galatea}, yet it is rather common in de Zayas’ \textit{Novelas}. In this passage, we see that, though Fadrique commits the act of violence, he is not the acting subject. The rage “obligates” him to enter the room with the intention to beat both Violante and her lover. Later, it is his “passion” that “could not stop to yield to her [Violante’s] impudence,” and causes Fadrique to beat her bloody. In this passage, as in the rest of the story, Fadrique does not take the responsibility for his own action. The background of humoural theory allows for Fadrique’s lack of responsibility: the excess of the yellow bile produces the choleric temperament which causes rage and violent action. Fadrique operates completely under the influence of his emotions or of his humours; a common theme in the story as he consistently falls victim to the desires of his heart.

When Fadrique enters the room to give the young man with Violante a beating (he chooses to beat him with fists so as not to “dirty his sword in a young man of so few years”), the other man pulls off yet another trick on Fadrique. He sees Fadrique enter the room, and as he “saw himself naked and without a sword, he dropped to the floor, and grabbing a shoe he covered it with his hand, as though it was a pistol.”

\textsuperscript{133} Covarrubias makes this association in his definition of the word ‘cólera,’ writing that “it is sometimes taken for ire, which is effect of the choler,” (1943), 336.
Tricked by the ruse, Fadrique allows the man to exit the room safely, “leaving Fadrique frightened by his action.” Here again, Fadrique is fooled, a near constant in the story, though this trick is pulled off by another man, not Fadrique’s beloved. After Violante’s lover leaves, Fadrique stands there “frozen staring at the door through which his competitor had left,” likely still frightened by what he thought was a threat on his life. Violante, however, knows the truth of her lover’s trick on Fadrique, and begins to laugh uproariously, “celebrating the joke of the shoe.” Fadrique realizes that he has yet again been tricked when he hears Violante start laughing, and this “offended the Granadan more than all the rest.” Violante’s laughter constitutes the third insult to Fadrique in quick succession: the first was her affair with the other man, the second was the trick of the shoe, and the third is Violante’s amusement over the joke. Completely overcome by rage yet again—his “passion could not stop to yield to her impudence”—and he “walked to Violante and punched her until he bathed her in blood.” Again, here, the passion overcomes Fadrique’s other faculties and causes him to commit a violent act. The tension between passion and reason is one that is present in many lovesick lovers, but it is particularly pertinent in the stories of choleric lovesickness. The lovers in the stories of Aminta and Hipólita were able to keep their reason in front of their passion, and they were rewarded as lovers for this ability. Additionally, the violent acts committed by those women are not from a choleric passion but from reasoned attempts to regain their honor. Fadrique’s inability to keep his passions under the control of his reason, and his expression of these passions through choleric violence, demonstrate his inability to be an adequate lover.
Lovesickness often causes the person afflicted to lose their reason; as I mentioned in the introduction, Andrés Velazquez defined melancholy (a disease similar to lovesickness) as “a negation of the understanding or reason.”

Velazquez’s discussion of melancholy also mentions a “cold and dry intemperance in the brain,” which corresponds to the overproduction of black bile in the body and then creates the melancholic temperament. Similarly, an overproduction of yellow bile would cause an intemperance in the brain leading to a choleric temperament, and the person would lose their reason and fall into a rage-filled state. The passage above shows this choleric form of lovesickness and its violent results. De Zayas’ portrayal of this choleric lovesickness is what sets her works apart from other texts on lovesickness, which usually show a more melancholic form. The *Galatea*, for example, shows lovesick shepherds overcome by their passions, but expressed through an extreme melancholy or depression. The men in the *Novelas*, while often similarly overcome by their lovesickness, express these feelings through more violent means. While the shepherds compose love poetry, the men in the *Novelas* abuse or assault their beloveds. In the case of Fadrique, the violence comes as a reaction to a slight from his beloved, but in other stories the violence comes after the man has overcome his lovesick state, when he grows bored of the beloved. Occasionally, the violent actions of lovesick men in the *Novelas* manifests itself against other men, like when Fadrique attempts to beat his competitor, the man in bed with Violante. The passions must be expressed in some way, and they manifest either in a melancholic state or in a choleric one.

---

134 Velazquez (1585), 55v.
After the scene above, in which Fadrique’s lovesickness culminates in a choleric expression of violent rage, Fadrique leaves the city out of fear that he would be brought to justice for his abuse. He goes to Naples, where several things happen that “confirmed his opinion that all women who dealt in modesty destroyed the judgment of men with their cunning.” He remains in Naples for sixteen years before returning to Spain. On his way back to Granada from the port in Barcelona, a duchess invites him to lunch in her house while her husband is away on business. He tells her, in a conversation that echoes one he had with his cousin earlier in the story, that modest and intelligent women scare him, and that he would rather marry a woman who is “necia,” or dumb/foolish. His wish for a ‘necia’ comes from his own foolish nature in the past; he wants to marry a woman who he can fool and who is unable to fool him in return. This seems to tie into his own inability to control his passions with reason. Because he is so susceptible to his passions, he does not want to marry a woman with a stronger reason than him. He sees a ‘necia’ as the only option to avoid pain in the future. He leaves the duchess behind with these thoughts in mind, and when he returns to Granada he learns from his aunt of all of the happenings since he had left the city so many years ago. He learns that Serafina, the woman to whom he was betrothed who then gave birth to another man’s child, spent the rest of her life living religiously and penitently. The child, doña Gracia, lived in a convent, and Fadrique’s aunt tells him that she is quite beautiful, the image of an angel. Fadrique asks to meet Gracia, and his aunt takes him to the convent where she lives.

135 “confirmaba la opinión de que todas las mujeres que daban en discretas, destruían con sus astucias la opinión de los hombres,” de Zayas (2010), 329.
When Fadrique meets Gracia, he realizes that she is “boba,” an idiot, and he decides to marry her. In this part of the story, Fadrique’s mistrust of women is clear. At this point, as well, he is more concerned with the possession of a wife than of true love, because marriage would be expected of a man of his status. He marries Gracia because she is beautiful and stupid, and he hires “the most ignorant and least malicious” servants to wait on her. He then fools her with the lie of “the life of married people,” in which she must stand outside their bedroom in armor every night. Here it is also clear that his goal was possession rather than any form of love. He doesn’t even desire a sexual relationship with Gracia, such is his mistrust of women. Yet, even with his precautions, Fadrique is again cuckolded—this time as a result of Gracia’s ignorance. When another man (whom Gracia simply calls “the other husband”) shows her the true sexual life of married people while Fadrique is away, she commits the ultimate betrayal to Fadrique. Now, the foolish woman that Fadrique admired because she would not be able to trick him has done just that. Fadrique ends the story disgraced, the “prepared fool.”

The story of don Fadrique is a unique one in the Novelas, and its location within the frame novel is particularly interesting. As mentioned above, don Alonso tells this story, and he finishes it with the following statement:

and I have given the end to this story so that it may warn the ignorant people who condemn the discretion of women. For where there is a lack of understanding, virtue cannot exceed; and furthermore, it does not matter if the woman who chooses to act badly is foolish, nor if the

---

136 The “boba” as a literary character is also treated in Lope de Vega’s 1613 play La dama boba, in which a woman named Finea, who is considered to be ‘boba,’ becomes extremely intelligent after falling in love. Conversely, her sister Nise, who is very intelligent, becomes ‘boba’ after she experiences love. The transformation of a woman’s intellectual capacity after encountering love is fascinating to consider, yet it does not occur here with Gracia.

137 “la vida de los casados,” de Zayas (2010), 335.
good woman is modest, as he should continue to watch out for them. And the story is a warning to those who test women of the danger in which they put themselves.\textsuperscript{138}

The warning against testing women calls back to a similar warning in the \textit{Galatea}, when Damón brings up how jealousy proves an “impertinent curiosity.” This impertinent curiosity, which may manifest itself in the testing of women, will only serve as a lover’s downfall—like Fadrique fell at the end of the story. Alonso’s story concludes the second night of the party, and the third night is begun by the lady Nise with the story “La fuerza del amor.” This story presents a beautiful woman by the name of Laura, who falls in love with and marries Diego. Diego is initially totally captured by Laura, and expressed lovesick symptoms; after their marriage, however, Diego’s feelings change, and he begins to abuse Laura. Laura is a woman who attempts to live as she is expected to, only to be abused and abandoned at every turn. As a protagonist, she presents a stark contrast to Fadrique, whose interactions with women border on the ridiculous. Fadrique’s fear of smart and modest women tricking him conflicts with Laura’s experience as a modest woman abused by the man she believed loved her. Alonso’s story appears to be farfetched when followed by Nise’s story, and Nise’s story could perhaps be read as a response to Alonso’s story.

“La fuerza del amor” (The Strength of Love), is the first story told on the third night of the party. It is told by a woman named Nise, described as “gracious” as well as “noble, rich, [and] beautiful” like the rest of the women attending the party.\textsuperscript{139} This

\textsuperscript{138} “yo le tengo de haber dado fin a esta maravilla para que se avisen los ignorantes que condenan la discreción de las mujeres. Que donde falta el entendimiento, no puede sobrar la virtud; y también que la que ha de ser mala no importa que sea necia, ni la buena el ser discreta, pues siéndolo sabrá guardarse. Y adviertan los que prueban a las mujeres al peligro que se ponen,” de Zayas (2010), 340.

\textsuperscript{139} “la graciosa Nise…todas nobles, ricas, hermosas,” \textit{ibid.}, 167.
story, like “El prevenido engañado,” gives the audience a look into choleric lovesickness and into the role of gender in the text of the *Novelas*. The story focuses on the character of Laura, a noblewoman who falls deeply in love with a man, only to be disgraced and abused by him after their marriage. She is beautiful and admired by all the men in the city, but most prominently by don Diego. She too falls in love with Diego, and the two get married. After their marriage, however, Diego loses interest in Laura and starts an affair with a woman with whom he had a prior relationship. In addition to the affair, Diego also begins to abuse Laura verbally and physically. Laura’s family finds it too difficult to see her constantly abused by Diego, and they leave the city, which leaves Laura hopeless and abandoned. She first attempts to consult a woman who performs love spells to assist her in winning Diego back, but this attempt fails, and she is worse off than she was before. She is about to commit suicide by jumping off the city walls when one of her brothers finds her and stops her. The family then brings Diego in front of the viceroy, attempting to find a solution to Laura’s predicament. Diego suggests that his mistress be sent to a convent, which would remove his distraction and bring him back into love with Laura. Though Laura’s family and the viceroy all agree to this solution, Laura protests and decides to enter the convent herself, where she spends the rest of her life.

After Laura’s family decides to leave the city, she is left abandoned to her abuser. Laura, overcome with frustration at her situation, delivers this speech, which gives a very clear conception of society’s influence on gender:

Misfortune on you, Laura, and how much happier you would be if, like you took the life of your mother at your birth, yours was sacrificed as well! Oh love, mortal enemy of all people! What wrongs have come upon the world from you, and more on women who in everything lose
the most and are the easiest to trick; it seems that for them alone you have the power, or to say it better, the anger. I don’t know why the heavens raised me as beautiful, noble, and rich, if those were all to have such little strength against this misfortune...Damn the woman that believes in men, well afterwards she’ll find the cost of her love, like I found it! What idiot girl wants to get married, seeing so many pathetic examples? Well the more one thinks she’s right, the more she’s wrong. How is my spirit so little, my strength so effeminate, and my cowardice so much that I cannot end the life, not only of the enemy of peace, but also the ingrate that treats me with such severity? But, oh, that I have love! And on the one hand I am scared to lose him, and on the other to I am scared to anger him. Why, vain legislators of the world, do you tie our hands for revenge, making impossible our forces with your false opinions, denying us the pen and the sword? Are our souls not the same as men’s? If it is [the soul] that gives courage to the body, then who compels our [bodies] to be so full of cowardice? I assure you that if you understood that in us, too, there is courage and fortitude, you wouldn’t ridicule us like you do now. And like this, in keeping us as subjects since we’re born, you go on undermining our forces with the fears of honor and undermining our understanding with the concern for disgrace, giving us spinning wheels for swords and pin-cushions for books. But sadness on me! For what purpose do these thoughts serve me? Because they cannot remedy things so irremediable. What’s important to think of now is how I will get this woman what she asks.\footnote{“¡Desdichada de ti, Laura, y cómo fueras más venturosa si como le costó tu nacimiento la vida a tu madre, fuera también la tuya sacrificio de la muerte! ¡Oh amor, enemigo mortal de las gentes! Y que de males han venido por ti al mundo, y más a las mujeres que, como en todo somos las más perdidosas y las más fáciles de engañar, parece que solo contra ellas tienes el poder, o por mejor decir, el enojo. No sé para qué el cielo me crió hermosa, noble y rica, si todo había de tener tan poco valor contra la desdicha... ¡Malhaya la mujer que en ellos cree, pues al cabo hallará el pago de su amor, como yo le hallo! ¿Quién es la necia que desea casarse, viendo tantos y tan lastimosos ejemplos?, pues la que más piensa que acierta, más yerra. ¿Como es mi ánimo tan poco, mi valor tan afeminado y mi cobardía tanta que no quito la vida, no solo a la enemiga de mi sosiego, sino al ingrado que me trata con tanto rigor? ¿Mas, ay, que tengo amor! Y en lo uno temo perderle, y en el otro enojarle. ¿Por qué, vanos legisladores del mundo, atáis nuestras manos para las venganzas, imposibilitando nuestras fuerzas con vuestras falsas opiniones, pues nos negáis letras y armas? ¿El alma no es la misma que la de los hombres? Pues si ella es la que da valor al cuerpo, ¿quién obliga a los nuestros a tanta cobardía? Yo aseguro que si entendieras que también había en nosotras valor y fortaleza, no os burlarais como os burláis. Y así, por tenernos sujetas desde que nacemos, vais enflaqueciendo nuestras fuerzas con los temores de la honra, y el entendimiento con el recato de la vergüenza, dádolos por espadas ruecas, y por libros almohadillas. ¿Mas triste de mí! ¿De qué me sirvan estos pensamientos, pues ya no sirven para remediar cosas tan sin remedio? Lo que ahora importa es pensar como daré a esta mujer lo que pide,” de Zayas (2010), 363-364.}

This speech was not just delivered by a woman within the story, but also delivered by a woman, Nise, in front of a group of men and women at the party. Laura’s speech is
a soliloquy; there is no one around to hear her make these arguments, but Nise was speaking in front of people. There is another layer added to the speech when we think of de Zayas’ own position as a female author in this time period. De Zayas addresses this directly in her note to the reader at the beginning of the *Novelas*. She writes that “the true cause of women not being scholars is not a defect of their ability, but a lack of application of said ability.”

Thus, in the reading of this passage we can see three different women (Laura, Nise, and de Zayas) questioning the gendered roles forced upon them by society and challenging the perceived differences between men and women. In addition to this questioning, they are challenging the societal structure that values them as beautiful objects yet does not protect them from harm or mistreatment.

In the opening line of this passage, Laura, speaking to herself, states that she would be much happier “if, like you took the life of your mother at birth, your life was sacrificed as well!” She invokes one of the most common causes of death for women at the time, childbirth. While the sentence functions primarily as a lament of Laura’s current situation, Laura’s mention of her mother dying in childbirth also provides the reader with an understanding of women’s plight in the time. Even a woman who married happily and maintained a loving relationship with her husband could die during childbirth. Laura knows that if she, too, had died in birth with her mother, she would never have been abandoned and abused by her husband. This seems to present the two of the only options for the life of a woman in the time: get married and die in childbirth or get married and live unhappily until death.

---

141 “la verdadera causa de no ser mujeres doctas no es defecto del caudal, sino falta de la aplicación,” de Zayas (2010), 159-160.
142 A third option for women would be to leave public life completely and enter a convent.
After wondering at her own misfortune, Laura rails against love as the “mortal enemy of all people.” More than that, though, she argues that love targets women especially, because “in everything we lose the most and are the easiest to trick; it seems that for them alone [love] has the power, or to say it better, the anger.” Speaking of love as an enemy or a villain is common throughout literature of this time (we saw Silerio call love a villain in the second book of the *Galatea*), but Laura’s specificity in identifying women as more likely subject to love’s anger is remarkable. Often, men are the ones calling love their enemy, and they will frequently also refer to the women they love as villains or enemies to their happiness. The men in the *Galatea* use this language frequently, as I discussed in the previous chapter. For the most part, this pain in men caused by love comes from either a lack of recognition from the ones they desire or a conscious rejection from the women. In women, however, pain from love manifests itself as physical or emotional abuse, much like the kind Laura, Aminta, Hipólita, and Violante experienced. Laura shifts the position of women from those who are the villains to the love of men to one where women are the most easily victimized by love’s anger. Her reference to anger aligns love with a choleric temperament, rather than a melancholic one, and it also brings to mind the vengeful god love that I treated in the chapter on the *Galatea*. At this point in the speech, however, her argument that women are the easily tricked seems to go along with the conventional wisdom of women being weaker—she has yet to complicate what exactly makes women so susceptible to love’s power.

---

143 The verb in Spanish is “engañar,” primarily meaning “to trick” or “to deceive,” but also meaning “to be unfaithful” and in certain contexts “to satisfy.” When Laura says that women “somos…las más fáciles de engañar,” she is playing with the several meanings of this word, implying that women are the easiest to trick, the easiest to cheat on, and potentially the easiest to satisfy.
After this, she begins to question the heavens that “raised me beautiful, noble, and rich” only for those qualities “to have so little strength against this misfortune.” Here, she credits the heavens directly with her raising, not her parents. In giving the credit to “el cielo” for raising her, she distances herself from the society into which she was born. This separation perhaps sets up her ability to perform the critique on society later in the passage. Her different conception of her upbringing can be related to Aminta’s unique conception of honor in the second Novela. As Aminta saw honor as something internal and separate from society, Laura believes her qualities of beauty, nobility, and wealth are internal and heaven-given, rather than coming from an external society. Additionally, this language of a woman being beautiful, noble, and rich echoes the description given to the narrator Nise at the beginning of the frame story. In that way, Laura’s speech may be echoing Nise’s own dissatisfaction with her situation.

A woman questioning why the universe made her so beautiful also appears within other works of literature of this period. The character Gelasia in the Galatea rejects love completely, though she is beautiful, and she refuses to accept blame for the suffering of the men who love her. Similarly, in the Quijote, the shepherdess Marcela fights back against the idea that she caused the death of a man who was hopelessly in love with her, saying that “the heavens made me, as you all say, beautiful, and to such a point that, without being powerful to another cause, my beauty moved you all to love me, and for the love that you show me, you say, and
you want, that I am obligated to love you.” Marcela, like Laura, credits the heavens with making her beautiful. She tells the men who blame her for the death of another who loved her that she has no obligation to reciprocate their love just because she is beautiful and they love her beauty. These women, in challenging the perceptions others have of them, are also challenging the place society has constructed for them and then put them in. For Laura, societal norms tell her that a woman who is beautiful, noble, and rich should be happy. However, her situation is clearly the opposite.

In the next section of the passage Laura begins to question not just the universe’s influence over her life, but the particular people who exert their influence over her. She starts with her husband Diego, then extending it to all husbands: “what idiot girl wants to get married, seeing so many pitiful examples?” Referencing the common plight of women left abandoned and destitute (or worse, abused and murdered) by their husbands, Laura is placing her past self into the position of the “idiot girl.” She hopes that said girl “find[s] the cost of her love, like I found it!” Laura is condemning women who believe they will find a true husband, but she counts herself among that number. Laura already knows the pain caused by her own husband, but she cannot leave him because “I have love! On the one hand I am scared to lose him, and on the other I am scared to anger him.” Notably, the Spanish here is ambiguous: Laura uses the verbs “perderle” and “enojarle,” with the indirect pronoun

144 “hizome el cielo, segun vosotros decis, hermosa, y de tal manera, que, sin ser poderosos a otra cosa, a que me ame os mueve mi hermosura, y pr el amor que me mostrais, decis, y aun queréis, que este yo obligada a amaros,” Cervantes (1995), 196.
145 The Spanish is “necia,” feminine of “necio,” which Covarrubias defines as “the ignorant person who knows little” (1943, 825). It is commonly interchanged with “tonta” or “boba,” both meaning “dumb,” “silly,” or “idiot.” The necia also appears in the story of don Fadrique, in the character of Gracia.
“le,” leaving the object open to be either Diego or love itself. The dual meanings should be considered equally, as Laura is a victim of both her husband and love. Reading this as an address to love continues the apostrophe begun earlier in the passage in which Laura refers to love as an enemy. While she advises other women from entering into the situation she herself is in, Laura also recognizes that the forces of love are keeping her there. This presents one of the reasons Laura characterizes love as her enemy and how her characterization differs from ones made by male characters. Laura’s fear is twofold: if she loses her husband, she would be left destitute and abandoned, and if she angers him, she will be further abused (or possibly killed). If Laura is addressing love in this section, her fear is similarly structured—she fears losing love, because she cannot comprehend life without it, and she fears angering love further, because she has already felt the effects of its anger. This fear is part of what is holding Laura back from action against her husband and her husband’s lover, and it influences the next part of her argument.

The next line begins Laura’s interrogation of what has forced her into this position. She asks, “how is my spirit so little, my strength so effeminate, and my power such that I cannot end the life, not only of the enemy of my peace, but also of the ungrateful man who treats me with such severity?” This quote relates strongly to my framework of gendered characteristics: Laura’s strength is effeminate, which weakens her from the ability to enact revenge on those who have wronged her. The word “effeminate” itself is gendered in its definition by Covarrubias in his 1611 dictionary. His first definition of the term “afeminado” is “the man in woman condition, inclined to occupy himself in what they [women] do and to speak their
language in a delicate tone.”\footnote{146 “el hombre de condición mujeril, inclinado a ocuparse en lo que ellas tratan y hablar su lenguaje y en su tono delicado”, Covarrubias (1943), 46.} His second definition of the word is “the delicate [nature] of the members and the leanness of the complexion, although one has a masculine spirit,” as though describing an illness of sorts.\footnote{147 “el delicado de miembros y flaco de complexión, aunque tenga ánimo varonil,” ibid., 46.} In either case, while “effeminate,” is related to the nature of femininity, the definitions only mention it in the context of its application to the male body. This, again, fits in with the concept of society gendering characteristics then placing them onto sexed bodies. Thus, the characteristics of having a strong spirit and strength are ascribed to the sexed male body, with the reverse being ascribed onto the sexed female body.

Again, these characteristics take on a perceived meaning—in Laura’s society, weakness is feminine, and weakness is also negative. A male who has the characteristic of being weak, then, is also considered feminine and does not have the standard characteristics of a ‘true’ man. Covarrubias seems to point to this when his definition of “effeminate” comes across as a description of an illness or serious condition. A trait such as strength can have a masculine and a feminine side to it (as Laura points towards), but the masculine strength appearing in a sexed female body or vice versa are non-normative. If Laura were to have the strength to kill her husband and his lover, she would not be read as ‘female,’ because she would be taking on a masculine characteristic. Laura’s personal choice is complicated within this situation. Laura didn’t choose for her spirit to be too weak for her to act on her desires, nor did she choose for her strength to be so effeminate. It also seems as though she is unable to choose any other characteristics, because no other options have ever been given to
her. With the inability to change the aspects of herself that she did not choose in the first place, Laura is stuck between a rock and a hard place.

Working within this framework, we see how bodies themselves are not endowed with certain gendered characteristics, but how the society places them onto these bodies. Laura points this out herself: “are our souls not the same as men’s? If it is [the soul] that gives courage to the body, then who compels our [bodies] to be so full of cowardice?” She addresses these questions to the “vain legislators of the world,” perhaps referring to the forces that created the universe, but most likely also including those who make the laws and culture. It is they who “tie our hands for revenge, making impossible our forces with your false opinions, denying us the pen and the sword.” Through denying women the pen and the sword (i.e., denying them the opportunity to either be educated to write or fight wars), these legislators of the world have forced women into subjugated positions within society. The options for women in this time were limited to either marriage or entering a convent, and they seem to be based entirely on the ways in which they are educated.

By evoking the concept of ‘armas y letras,’ de Zayas is making her own contribution to a popular argument at the time: which is better, armas (arms) or letras (letters). For a man in this time, the two ways to create a legacy were to either take up arms as a soldier or learn letters and become a scholar or poet. While railing against the legislators of the world, Laura notes that women are denied both options, leaving them with no recourse to escape their situations. As Laura points out, the
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148 There is a notable exception to this dichotomy in Garcilaso de la Vega, who was a Spanish soldier and poet in the early 16th century. Garcilaso was able to be both, but Laura’s mention of ‘armas y letras’ here points out how women were not permitted to be either.
souls of men and women are the same, which should make their physical abilities the same. But it is the fact that society keeps “us as subjects since the day we are born, undermining our forces with the fears of honor and undermining our understanding with the concern for disgrace.” Laura believes, as does de Zayas, that if women had not been given “spinning wheels for swords and pincushions for books,” they would be able to rise out of their lower position. In fact, there need not even be a lower position; the lower position of women is itself a construct. It is merely the fact that such perceived negative characteristics—of being weak, being more concerned with the domestic, being unintelligent, and more—have consistently been ascribed onto the sexed female body that keeps them where they are and keeps that position as lower.

At the end, though, Laura leaves this line of questioning. “For what purpose do these thoughts serve me?” she asks, “because they cannot remedy things so irremediable. What’s important to think of now is how I will get this woman what she asks.” She refers to the woman she enlisted to help her win Diego’s love back through magic. In the text, the woman is referred to as ‘hechicera,’ which translates roughly to ‘witch,’ but had different connotations in the time. While ‘bruja’ is commonly used in Spanish to refer to a witch, ‘hechicera’ or occasionally a person who ‘hace hechicería’ were also used in the early modern period to refer to people (most often women) who practiced sorcery. Hechiceras were often consulted to work on matters of the heart. Covarrubias defines the word ‘hechizar’ as a “genre of incantation with which the bewitched person is bound; in such a way that he loses all judgement, and he is made to love what bored him when he was free.”

149 “cierto genero de encantación, con que ligan a la persona hechizada; de modo que le pervierten el juicio, y le hacen querer lo que estando libre aborrecería,” Covarrubias (1943), 680.
utilized as go-betweens for lovers to communicate, the most famous literary example of this being the role of Celestina in Fernando de Rojas’ *La Comedia de Calisto y Melibea, o La Celestina*. De Zayas does not move the story into an unrealistic arc when Laura consults the hechicera, as some readers may assume when reading about witchcraft. Rather, the hechicera was a common and important figure in literature and daily life for people (and especially women) in the early modern, and Laura’s interactions with the hechicera would be a normal choice of recourse for a woman in her position. Just before this scene, however, the audience is informed that the woman Laura utilizes is not an honest hechicera, but one who is looking to scam Laura. The woman asked her for several ingredients, and it is heavily implied that the woman is only looking to trick Laura, not help her. Laura challenges the entire societal structure in her speech, but then immediately dismisses her questions because they won’t help her in her immediate situation. She thinks that there is nothing she can do as a woman to take down said society, so she decides to do what she can to improve her own life.

In the end, Laura is able to leave her husband after he proposes that his lover move to a convent, so he will no longer be so distracted. She enters a convent herself, because God “was a more thankful lover.”\(^{150}\) After this, Diego leaves the city and Laura, “seeing herself totally free, took the religious habit and professed her time [to God].”\(^{151}\) Laura only sees herself as free after she moves into the convent, which is slightly paradoxical given the restricted lives that nuns live. For Laura, at least, the life of a nun is one without her abusive husband, so she is free of that pain. While her ending may be a ‘happy’ one, given that she survived her abusive situation, to the

\(^{150}\) “Dios, que era amante más agradecido,” de Zayas (2010), 369.

\(^{151}\) “viéndose del todo libre, tomó el hábito de religiosa, y a su tiempo profesó,” *ibid.*, 369.
reader it may seem like a missed opportunity to act on the questions raised in Laura’s speech. While Laura may see no recourse to move herself out of the subjected position she is in, the wider context of the speech shows how a woman might achieve such mobility. Nise tells the story in front of a small audience of her friends at the party, after which they all agree that “none of them would dare to go to the lengths that Laura did.” Nise’s own recitation of the speech may have been an attempt to bring up the same topic with her friends, though we never see whether any further discussion occurred.

De Zayas, as the writer herself, is in the best position of the three. She writes that women were not given the option to take up the pen or the sword, but she herself has been able to take up the pen. She was able to write the story and publish it for a wide audience, who all read Laura’s speech and the questions she was raising. De Zayas’ popularity in her time period (and continuing today) proves her claim that women, if educated the same as men, would be able to write just as well as men do. Through Laura’s speech, she is able to show how the society that values women so long as they are beautiful, noble, and rich does nothing to protect them from mistreatment. In fact, the society keeps them in a place where they have no choice but to accept such abuse. However, de Zayas does not only address this with words. While Laura felt unable to enact revenge on her husband and his mistress, other female characters in the *Novelas* were able. Several women kill their abusers in violent acts of revenge, inverting Laura’s claim that her strength is only effeminate. If

---

152 “diciendo que entre ellos no hubiera ninguno que se atreviera a ir al lugar que ella fue,” *ibid.*, 369.
de Zayas is able to prove her ability with the pen by writing the Novelas, then her characters prove their abilities with the sword.

The story of Laura, told by Nise, contrasts the story of Fadrique, told by Alonso. Fadrique’s troubles seem outlandish when compared to Laura’s—the story of a man whose own inability to trust women causes his downfall pales in comparison to that of a woman brutally abused by her husband. While this may be read as a commentary on the much more serious plights that women face in love (and the world in general), there is another interpretation implicit in the stories. Within the larger frame story, Alonso is in love with Nise; read in this light, the stories might be in conversation with each other. Each of the narrators may be expressing their fear of what will happen if they disclose their love for the other. For Alonso, the fear is that Nise would not be loyal to him, and that he would end up cuckolded in a manner similar to Fadrique’s experience. Nise’s fear, on the other hand, is that Alonso would grow bored of her and then turn abusive. This again demonstrates the variability in experience for men and women in love. Alonso’s worst fear manifests in a story that is at times comically implausible, while Nise’s seems to address a common experience among women in the early modern.

Conclusion

If violence was mostly absent from the Galatea, it is ubiquitous in the Novelas. The women in the stories are often the victims of violence at the hands of the men who claim to love them. At times, as well, the women enact their own violence, usually in the name of avenging their lost honor. If the pastoral was an idealized space for the expression of love and lovesick symptoms, then the urban
space is repressive, forcing the women into these dishonored positions. It may also be idealized, however—Aminta and Hipólita’s murders of their abusers would likely fulfill a revenge fantasy for other abused women reading the text. The fact that the narrative rewards these women with rational lovers to end their stories supports this idea. Martín and García are shown to be able to place their rationality before their passion or desire, making them closer to the neo-Platonic ideal lover. They are countered in the stories by the less rational lovers of the women (Jacinto for Aminta, Luis and Gaspar for Hipólita), whose willingness to abuse, trick, and forget the women aligns them with a choleric form of lovesickness. The presentations of Martín and García as rational and preferred lovers places the Novelas in conversation with the discussions held by the shepherds in the Galatea and the dialogue of Philo and Sophia in the Dialogues of Love. The rationality exhibited by Martín and García also make them more honorable lovers than their counterparts, and they are able to assist their beloveds in avenging their insulted honor.

The choleric form of lovesickness is expanded upon in the stories of Fadrique and Laura, which again show explicit examples of violent abuse against women. These stories, and Fadrique’s in particular, also elaborate on the tension between reason and passion. Fadrique is, unlike Martín and García, unable to place his reason before his passion, and this causes him to commit choleric violence against the women he desires. Similarly, Laura’s husband Diego’s passionate feelings for another woman causes him to abuse Laura, despite his previous love for her. Both of these men allow their passions to rule them, rather than their reason, which contributes to their choleric sentiments. While some of the shepherds in the Galatea could also be
seen as holding passion before their reason, these characters are critiqued by others as worse lovers. Fadrique and Diego are also unfit lovers for the women they choose, which is proven by the fact that both of them end up alone at the end of their stories. Jealousy, which is argued to be the worst form of lovesickness by Damón in the Galatea, also plays a major role in these stories. Fadrique is characterized as jealous, which contributes to the intensity of his passion and his violence. These two stories, in their expansion upon the theme of choleric lovesickness, also expand on the role of gender within the text.

All of the stories selected for my analysis of the Novelas work with gender in some way. Aminta and Hipólita’s stories discuss the conception of honor and how it affects men and women differently. Fadrique’s story centers around an extreme distrust of women and their behavior. Laura’s story addresses violence against women and questions the societal roles given to women. The questions that Laura expresses in her speech are the same as the ones that de Zayas addresses in her note to the reader at the beginning of the text, and the other treatments of gender in the stories (and within the frame story) similarly uphold a concept of gender that involves the societal imposition of gendered characteristics onto sexed bodies. In the hypotactic-paratactic form of the frame novel, de Zayas utilizes the paratactic individual stories to uphold hypotactic ideas about both lovesickness and gender. The ideas that de Zayas promotes most clearly are the dangers of a choleric lovesickness that emerges when a lover fails to balance his passion with his reason and the ways in which the society where the women live in the stories forces them into subjugated positions. Even as de Zayas promotes these overarching themes, she also shows the
ways in which they are not static—not all of the men experience the same violent, choleric lovesickness, and many of the women are able to use their abilities to escape their abusive situations and enter into better relationships and lives.
Epilogue

In this thesis, I established several characteristics of male lovesickness as it was conceived in early modern Spanish texts. Miguel de Cervantes’ La Galatea showed the pastoral lives of shepherds and shepherdesses and the ways in which love affected them. María de Zayas’ Novelas amorosas y ejemplares described the lives and loves of men and women violently constricted in urban spaces. In order to study these texts, I implemented the thematic schemas of the pastoral/urban, the melancholic/choleric and the male/female authorial perspective. I also drew out the tensions between reason and passion and how honor functions in gendered ways. I have concluded my analysis of how each of these texts tells us something unique about early modern lovesickness, but now the question may arise: what use does this serve to a modern reader? What can we gain from studying lovesickness? While I could answer that lovesickness is an important concept to understand within its historical context, I also see a potential for lovesickness to be used in the creation of new works. Rather than remain constrained to the past, I believe that feminist and gender theorists could use lovesickness as a useful intervention into historical understandings of gender and expression.

Through the works of Cervantes and de Zayas, we already see shifting conceptions of lovesickness. The Galatea’s more melancholic, poetic expressions of lovesickness are replaced by the Novelas’ choleric, violent expressions. This can be attributed to a shifting political and cultural climate in Spain between the 16th and 17th centuries. As the socioeconomic formation of the country shifted from noble courts to an urban mercantile gentry, so too did literary conventions change. Spain of the 17th
century was more zealously religious, more misogynistic, and more violent than that of the 16th. Between the publication of the *Galatea* in 1585 and the *Novelas* in 1637, Spain experienced three different kings (Felipe II, Felipe III, and Felipe IV), several wars, the expulsion of the Moors in 1609, and periods of both economic prosperity and difficulty. The pastoral ideal found in the *Galatea* came from court life, and the genre all but disappeared after the publication of Lope de Vega’s *Arcadia* in 1598. Avalle-Arce writes that, in the pastoral novel, “this immediate psychologism captures the European sensitivity in the precise moment that it began to crystallize the modern emotional life”—that is, the representations of lovesickness in works like the *Galatea* captured a moment of transition across Europe, and that works like the *Novelas* show the more modern world that came after this tradition. The popularity of wife-murder plays in the early 17th century also proves these shifting ideas of love, honor, and duty in early modernity. De Zayas’ work, through its uses of violence, thus used language and plots familiar to Spanish readers, though she often inverted the outcomes in order to promote ideas of women’s empowerment. Her later work, the *Desengaños amorosos*, continued these themes of violence, but to an even darker level, as “the intervening decade [between the two texts] was one in which the pessimistic mood of seventeenth-century Spain increased markedly” due to several political and economic failures. We thus see how influential the cultural
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153 “este psicologismo en caliente capta a la sensibilidad europea en el momento preciso en que comienza a cuajar la vida sentimental moderna,” Avalle-Arce (1959), 241.
environment of Spain was on these authors, and how reading these texts in their contexts draws out further understandings of the content.

The shift from the popularity of pastoral romances to wife-murder plays comes through an increased distrust of and violence towards women. We can see this clearly if we compare the behaviors of men in the *Galatea* to a character like that of don Fadrique in the *Novelas*. These trends are not exclusive to Spain, nor do they remain confined to the early modern period. The medicalization of hysteria in Victorian England can also be partly attributed to a distrust of women and their emotions and to a distrust of the validity of these emotions. Instead of attempting to understand the latent causes of hysteric behavior, doctors instead created extensive machinery with the purpose of “curing” the women’s disease. The medicalized abuse of women today may have ceased to center around diagnoses of hysteria, but the continued need for reproductive control over women’s bodies hints at a longer history of repression and control related to the female sexual experience. Returning to lovesickness as a medical, philosophical, literary, and spiritual phenomenon opens up new ways of understanding this history and its continuing influence on us in the present day.

Lovesickness is a disease of expression, through songs, poetry, violence, physical symptoms, and other forms. These expressions, while not necessarily alleviating the suffering of the lovesick, still create spaces in which the intensity of emotion expressed by lovesick lovers (in its melancholic or choleric forms) is normalized. Because of this, while it might appear similar to hysteria at times, it functions very differently. Hysteria is a disease of repression, particularly of women’s
sexual expression. This tradition remains to this day, as women are consistently
discouraged from expressing the desires, abuses, joys, or pains in their sexual lives—
in fact, western society discourages women from openly expressing these sorts of
emotions even if they aren’t related to sexuality. This repression is not solely focused
on women; because of the more rigid ideas governing masculinity and how to be a
“real man,” male expressions of love and desire have also been limited. The male
characters of the *Galatea* and the *Novelas* express their emotions much more freely
than would be allowed within current formulations of a toxic masculinity—though, of
course, we could say that some of the men in these works (particularly within the
*Novelas*) suffer from a form of toxic masculinity as well. Though the ideas of gender
expressed in the *Novelas* may seem closer to our current conceptions of gender roles,
the instances of revenge enacted by the women upend the roles in a way that seems
just as radical today as they were in the 17th century. The *Galatea*, in removing the
constraints of society through the pastoral setting, allows for greater expression from
the men and women within it, and the men’s emotional composition of poetry seems
foreign when reading from a modern perspective of masculinity.

Lovesickness, when conceived as an inherently expressive disease, opens up a
new potential site of analysis for feminist thinkers. As I wrote in my Introduction, the
examples of lovesickness challenge common conceptions of the early modern (really,
of most of history before the advent of women’s movements) as upholding the strict
binary of men as rational and women as irrational. It also challenges the conception
that people in this historical moment were forbidden from expression. Both men and
women are given the freedom to fully express their interiorities in the literature of
lovesickness, something that seems foreign to us today. Feminist scholars looking to break down the history of emotional repression might turn to lovesickness as a moment which allowed for such free expression. Additionally, in a feminist movement committed to removing the toxic influence of patriarchy on men and on women, we may look to the works of lovesickness as an alternative to the rigid behaviors assigned to men and women today.

Lovesickness also provides us with a framework for a disease that is intrinsically connected to both the mind and the body. Rather than an illness of the mind that has no material effects on the physical body, lovesickness is an internal pain (from love) that manifests externally in physical symptoms. While the mind is usually given primacy over the body, the embodiment of lovesickness is one of the central facets of the illness. The examples of characters fainting, sweating, taking to their beds, and weeping all demonstrate the physicality of lovesickness as a disease. This embodiment is of particular interest to feminists who wish to challenge the Cartesian mind/body dualism from a historical point of view. While Descartes was writing nearly contemporaneously with Cervantes and de Zayas, their conceptions of the body and the mind clearly differed greatly. Oliva Sabuco’s text also challenges this strict dualism. Her argument of the relation between mind and body culminates in the thesis that “mind and body are separate entities, but being human depends upon the two entities working in concert as a holistic unit.”

Writing more than fifty years before Descartes’ works, Sabuco describes the interaction of mind and body through “a bidirectional system of nutrition and influences between the mind/soul and the

body and covers a much broader scope of emotions than that later presented by Descartes.”¹⁵⁶ Sabuco’s text itself could provide a new place of analysis for an alternative answer to the mind/body problem, and the interrelatedness of the mind and the body within lovesickness provides an alternative background for feminists to apply when creating new understandings of the mind/body relationship.

Feminist new materialists have already begun the project of challenging the strict divide between the mind and the body. Karen Barad, in her influential article “Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter,” makes an intervention into the conceptualizations of discursivity and materiality (terms which can be mapped onto the mind and the body, respectively). She writes that:

what is needed is a robust account of the materialization of all bodies—‘human’ and ‘nonhuman’—and the material-discursive practices by which their differential constitutions are marked. This will require an understanding of the nature of the relationship between discursive practices and material phenomena.¹⁵⁷

Barad makes her intervention through a study of physics, particularly through Bohr’s quantum model of the atom, which she says “poses a radical challenge not only to Newtonian physics but also to Cartesian epistemology and its representationalist triadic structure of words, knowers, and things.”¹⁵⁸ Other feminist scholars in science and technology studies have followed in her path, publishing new materialist works in scientific fields like biology, chemistry, ecology, genetics, and many more. The goals of these theorists are to challenge classical notions of the body as separate from and

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 813.
lesser than the mind and, in doing so, move the body back into a place of primacy.

While these interventions have been made in science and technology studies, I propose lovesickness as a historical method to situate feminist new materialism and challenge the Cartesian dualism. Though I did not treat this topic within the body of my thesis, I believe future feminists may use lovesickness as a starting-point for these materialist theories.

While lovesickness may no longer be as central to culture as it once was, the questions it brings up are ones that we still grapple with today. The tension between rationality and passion is a theme that has appeared within the Western tradition of philosophy from Plato to the present. Rationality has subsequently been associated with masculinity and passion with femininity throughout history from Aristotle to conceptions of hysteria to the present day. In this way, we see how the gendering of characteristics remains an important method of creating gender norms, and truly of creating gender itself. The ways in which the two interact through lovesickness works to undo this gendered binary, which potentially opens up an opportunity for the destruction of other binaries. I believe that lovesickness—whether studied in the Spanish tradition or in another—has been left relatively untreated when compared to other diseases like hysteria. Even so, I hope that others will pick up on lovesickness as a site of analysis, as it is not only an interesting topic historically but one that is still relevant to our lives today.
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