SUPERNATURAL PERSUASION AND LUIS DE MOLINA'S THEOLOGY IN THREE OF TIRSO DE MOLINA'S WORKS: *EL BURLADOR DE SEVILLA* (1630), *EL CONDENADO POR DESCONFIADO* (1635) AND *QUIEN NO CAE NO SE LEVANATA* (1636)

Whitney Winters

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in the of Romance Languages.

Chapel Hill
2011

Approved by:

Dr. Carmen Hsu

Dr. Frank Domínguez

Dr. Irene Gómez-Castellano

ABSTRACT

WHITNEY WINTERS: Supernatural Persuasion and Luis de Molina's Theology in Three of Tirso de Molina's Works: *El burlador de Sevilla* (1630), *El condenado por desconfiado* (1635) and *Quien no cae no se levanta* (1636)
(Under the direction of Carmen Hsu)

This article seeks to reveal Tirso de Molina's view of *auxiliis* through analysis of three of his religious plays, *El burlador de Sevilla* (1630), *El condenado por desconfiado* (1635) and *Quien no cae no se levanta* (1636). While several aspects of Tirso's theological perspective have been well researched, the supernatural characters and their theological implications have received practically no scholarly attention. This study demonstrates that the playwright utilizes these characters to illustrate his personal belief in man's free will. In order to explore his theological perspective, the essay first briefly looks at the presiding debate of *auxiliis* in its historical context and then analyzes the dramatic functions of three distinct manifestations of supernatural forces in the plays: the demonic manipulation in *El condenado por desconfiado,* the ghostly apparition of Don Gonzalo in *El burlador de Sevilla* and divine messengers' attempt to win souls in both the plays aforementioned and *Quien no cae no se levanta*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am blessed to have so many people to whom I owe gratitude. I would like to thank my director, Carmen Hsu, for pushing me, even when I was stubborn, because she cared enough about my work and me to do so. Thank you to the rest of my committee, Frank Dominguez and Irene Gomez-Castellanos, for their encouragement and contribution. I am very grateful that I was able to have such a knowledgeable and supportive committee; because of them I am able to have confidence in this work. My patient editor and best friend, Lindsey Evans, has been more help to me than I deserve and I am fortunate to have her in my life. Finally, I would like to thank my parents who have loved, supported and accepted me for all that I am and all that I pursue. Because they have brought me up in the truth, I have faith in God's purpose for my life.

Introduction

During the European Renaissance the ageless question of *auxillis,* the relationship of grace to predestination and its role in human salvation, was frequently debated among scholars and theologians. Despite numerous attempts to resolve the matter, the Catholic Church was unable to reach a consensus on the issue. The repercussions of the controversy were profound, especially in Spain, and marked works by playwrights like Tirso de Molina (c. 1571-1648) and Calderón de la Barca (c. 1600-1680) among others. In view of the great impact of the issue on the Spanish theater from the 1580s onward, this paper is intended to be the initial stage of a much more extensive research project that seeks to reveal Tirso's view of this controversial issue through analysis of three of his religious plays, *El burlador de Sevilla* (1630), *El condenado por desconfiado* (1635) and *Quien no cae no se levanta* (1636).[1]

Scholars acknowledge that what partially made Tirso's works so memorable is his personal belief in God's efficient grace and man's free will. Many also agree that although religious concerns were not the only focus of his plays, they became an increasingly important part of his art.

---

[1] This paper does not focus on the *autos* or *diálogos* of Tirso, but on three of his most popular plays because of their remarkable treatment of *auxiliis* through supernatural forces and also their tremendous contribution to the development of the Spanish theater during the seventeenth century. The plays studied here all fall into the category of Tirso's religious plays that deal with theology in a more practical and mundane way. Wilson defines them as "those which dramatize a doctrinal truth, usually some aspect of the theology of conversion and salvation, and in these the author uses his full powers of characterization to animate the abstract idea" (Wilson 526). The other religious plays, of course, are the *autos sacramentales*.

While several aspects of Tirso's approach to theology have been well researched, the supernatural characters – demons, ghosts and angels – have received practically no scholarly attention.[2] Their dramatic function, their theological implications and the ideological factors that contributed to their creation are the topic of this study. This paper argues that, through supernatural intervention, Tirso dramatizes the struggles that men have to go through in order to arrive at a decision to either reject or embrace God. This essay will first briefly look at the debate in its historical context. It will then analyze the supernatural forces within the plays, exploring the demonic manipulation in *El condenado por desconfiado,* studying the ghostly apparition of Don Gonzalo in *El burlador de Sevilla* and examining the role of angels and divine messengers in *Quien no cae no se levanta* as well as in the other two plays.

The *Congregatio de auxiliis divinae gratiae* and Its Impact During the Time of Tirso

Before analyzing Tirso's plays, it is instructive to explore why the issue of *auxiliis* became so prominent in Spain. The issue had been of special interest to the Church for many years prior to Tirso's time. People's view of God's character can dramatically impact the approach Christians take to evangelizing and their individual responsibilities.[3] Despite its importance, the role of God in the salvation of men was not clearly explained by Scripture, which supports both free will and predestination. Authors like Paul believed in God's election of those he would save and those he would cause to refuse Him, such as the Pharaoh

[2] While I.L. McClelland also investigates the role of the supernatural in the chapter "The Conception of the Supernatural" in his book *Tirso de Molina: Studies in Dramatic Realism*, his approach to the supernatural is entirely different, as he investigates the dramatic impact it has on the audience due to their superstitions. Tirso, McClelland argues, uses spirits as well as "omens from unpretentious forebodings, rising to of depression or anxiety, to unnaturally repeated incidents" to cause confusion, essential for the dramatic effect desired (40-41).

[3] The idea of predestination could be particularly frightening to some members of the Church, as it can remit man's responsibility to do good: if his destiny has already been decided and there is nothing he can do to influence it, he has no motivation for doing good things (Cowburn 104, 106).

of *Exodus* (Bible*: New International Version, Rom*. 9: 17). It has been argued that Paul saw himself as chosen, not only because he was a messianic Jew, but also due to God's direct intervention on the road to Damascus (Cowburn 84; *Acts* 9). As a former persecutor of Christians, Paul believed that he would have been incapable of compelling divine grace had God not chosen to show it to him, thus his views tended towards predestination. The Apostle writes in his letter to the Romans, "It [salvation] does not, therefore, depend on human desire or effort, but on God's mercy" (*Rom*. 9: 16-17), and "God has mercy on who he wants to have mercy, and he hardens whom he wants to harden" (*Rom*. 9:18). In Paul's view, God's grace, not good works, is the basis of salvation. However, God's mercy is limited to those He causes to follow Him. Those to whom He refuses mercy are condemned to suffer.

In contrast, writers like St. Thomas Aquinas, saw the troubles of the world and were forced to question the reason why a loving God would create such a tragic existence. They reconciled a fallen world and the gracious character of God by attributing evil to man's free will (Cowburn 79). This idea was further supported by the case of the Jews who *chose* to reject Christ, resulting in His death and their damnation, as found in the New Testament (Cowburn 85).

During the Greek era Christians placed a greater emphasis on the free will argument partially in response to the Greek belief that men are completely controlled by destiny (Cowburn 86). Christians emphasized the autonomy of men, who were made in the image of God and were therefore rational beings capable of choosing Him. In the 4th century, Pelagius advanced this argument by emphasizing the strength of human nature, which can choose correctly with the aid of God's grace.

The opposite view was espoused by St. Augustine, who had a profound impact on the debate by radically claiming that free will had existed only in Eden. His God gave no independence to humanity, whose lives were predetermined after the Fall. He argues in *On the Predestination of the Saints* that "[God shows] mercy towards the elect which has obtained the righteousness of God, but judgment to the rest which have been blinded [by God's own will…]. Certainly such an election is of grace, not at all of merits" (133). For Augustine, grace was not a gift bestowed upon all, but rather only on those God chose in advance. In deciding whom He will save, God does not take into account what those elected will do—His gift of grace is completely gratuitous.

Although innovative and powerful for western theology, Augustine's ideology was minimally supported by the Catholic Church after his death. The concept of predestination was not generally accepted at that time, but the Church did not condemn Augustine's writings either (Cowburn 93).

The middle ages tended to favor determinism, as there was a strong emphasis on hierarchies and feudal order; however, matters changed during the Renaissance, which no longer saw the individual as subordinate to a natural order from birth, but as having an influence over his own destiny.[4] The already difficult topic of *auxiliis* then became the center of theological debate and, with the rise of the Protestant Reformation, concern over man's influence over his own salvation intensified. These ideological reflections came to a head during the Council of Trent (1545-1563; Trubiano, *Libertad* 16).

[4] Trubiano explains this transformation: "el hombre medieval había orientado su vida desde la perspectiva de la muerte, de Dios. Dios era su guía y su meta…y su milicia en la tierra era nada más que un lapso de tiempo, un tiempo bien marcado y limitado y pendiente de la voluntad eterna. El hombre renacentista […] abandona definitivamente esta postura y adopta una perspectiva egocéntrica de la vida, es decir ve su vida desde y a partir de sí mismo, relegando a Dios en tiempo y espacio, remoto y lejano" (Trubiano, *El Hombre* 342).

The Council was essential to the Counter-Reform refuting many of Martin Luther's ideas,[5] along with objecting to the tenets of John Calvin.[6] However, it also set upon the reconciliation of opposing views on free will, predestination and the function of divine grace within the Church. In the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent, the members decided to formally condemn those (i.e. Protestants) who taught against what the Church deemed unquestionable.[7] The Sixth Session rejected the Reformers' theology on predestination, affirming that free will was present in Eden and had not been destroyed by the Fall (or Original Sin): "although free will, attenuated as it was in its powers, and bent down, was by no means extinguished in them [humans]" (Session VI, Chapter 1). It was also decided that man is not merely a vehicle driven by God, but is still completely subject to His will.[8]

---

[5] Luther's thought was completely revolutionary. In his 95 Theses, he not only condemned the abuse of alms by the clergy members, but the unquestioned infallible power of the Pope: "Thesis 76: We assert the contrary, and say that the pope's pardons are not able to remove the least venial of sins as far as their guilt is concerned" (Luther).

[6] John Calvin was also a huge supporter of predestination, and remains a prominent theologian in this ideology. In his book *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Calvin touched a lot on "the secret election of God" (7), who "alone 'knoweth them that are his'" (quoting Paul) (7). He further supports, "that the distinction of the heirs of the kingdom from those who have no share in it, is the free act of the sovereign election of God" (361). Grace, for Calvin, was the evidence that one has been saved, by which they are able to do works, for, he claims, "by the grace of God we have begun to repent" (340). For Calvin, God's grace was not extended to everyone: "it is not given to all men, we have no right to entertain a confidence that we shall receive the special gift" (292-293). This concept of selectivity is commonly referred to as "limited atonement" in Calvinism.

[7] "Furthermore […] no one, relying on his own skill, shall, in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church, whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, hath held and doth hold […] Contraveners shall be made known by their Ordinaries, and be punished with the penalties by law established" (Session IV).

[8] The Protestants, on the other hand, believed that God was completely sovereign, even over man's actions. In *De servo arbitrio*, Luther teaches that man is so depraved, that if he had free will he would still reject God. Good works are thus useless for salvation, for only God's grace is capable of giving men that gift. He argues, "If the nature of man be so evil, even in those who are born again of the Spirit, that it does not only not endeavour after good, but is even averse to, and militates against good, how should it endeavour after good in those who are not born again of the Spirit, and who are still in the 'old man,' and serve under Satan? […] As to myself, I openly confess, that I should not wish 'Free-will' to be granted me, even if it could be so, nor anything else to be left in my own hands, whereby I might endeavour something towards my own salvation […] For whatever work should be done, there would still remain a scrupling, whether or not it pleased God, or whether He required any thing more; as is proved in the experience of all justiciaries, and as I myself learned to my bitter cost, through so many years of my own experience. But now, since God has put my salvation out of the

Ultimately, the Council decided to support the ideas of Thomas Aquinas on free will, which state that man can choose salvation and that Divine grace is not withheld from man due to his actions, but only on the basis of his rejection of God.[9] The Council reaffirmed that man's free will was not lost with the Fall, and God did not show His "irresistible" grace only to the "elect," as Calvin supported. Rather, man was "freely" given the will to put faith in God. God's grace is bestowed upon everyone, as "He died for all" (Session VI, Chapter III), but it is up to the individual to accept it.

Following the Council of Trent, Spain (whose king was the Holy Roman Emperor and especially dedicated to eradicating heresies) became increasingly involved in the controversy.[10] The debate in the Iberian Peninsula was so intense that supporters of both sides began using their pulpits to condemn the opposition as heretics (Cowburn 111). The Spanish Inquisition held a conference in Salamanca (1582) called the *Congregatio in auxiliis* at which two prominent religious orders, the Dominicans and the Jesuits, took opposing sides regarding the controversy. The Dominicans were led by Domingo Báñez (1528-1604), who supported the concept of predestination. He claimed that those who supported free will

---

way of *my* will, and has taken it under *His own,* and has promised to save me, not according to my working or manner of life, but according to His own grace and mercy, I rest fully assured and persuaded that He is faithful, and will not lie, and moreover great and powerful, so that no devils, no adversities can destroy Him, or pluck me out of His hand by the power of "Free-will," no one whatever could be saved, but all must perish together. And moreover, we are certain and persuaded, that in this way, we please God, not from the merit of our own works, but from the favour of His mercy promised unto us; and that, if we work less, or work badly, He does not impute it unto us, but, as a Father, pardons us and makes us better" (*De servo arbitrio* CLXIV).

[9] "Man is justified by faith […] because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation, and the root of all Justification […] but we are therefore said to be justified freely, because none of those things which precede justification-whether faith or works-merit the grace itself of justification. For, if it be a grace, it is not now by works" (Session VI, Chapter VIII).

[10] Oakley explains that while "combating in the first half of the sixteenth century the rebellion of Lutheranism, Spain had already adapted itself to the humanistic rebellion that had been a part of the Renaissance: that Renaissance tendency to see man as capable of controlling his own individual destiny" (Oakley, *Tirso* 74).

committed a paralogism believing that God's grace was sufficient enough to cause some to convert, but not others. He called this belief ignorant.[11] He further supported the idea that God punishes some sinners to reveal His just character and saves the elect to show His mercy.[12] Báñez believed that men only do good works by and through God's grace.[13]

The Jesuits supported the concept of free will. Luis de Molina (1535-1600), author of *Concordia Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis, Divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praesdentinatione et Reprobatione* (1588), further stirred the controversy. It was the Jesuit priest's goal to reconcile Augustine's views on divine grace with the Renaissance view of individual liberty, but, most importantly, he took aim at the beliefs supported by reformers like Martin Luther.[14] Molina was especially interested in divine grace that, for him, was given freely to all men willing to receive it.[15] Good works, therefore, counted towards an individual's salvation, because they were outward signs of the grace they had found. According to Molina no one is divinely predisposed towards conversion. He claimed, "la voluntad…es libre por propia naturaleza" (Molina 54). Thus will and choice were synonymous and both pertained to humans: "Dios juzgará el mundo, cuando venga para

[11] "[m]uchos cometen paralogismos pensando que el libre arbitrio del hombre modifica el concurso igual y el auxilio de Dios, determinándolo a producir más o menos. Así, suelen algunos decir ignorantemente que con un auxilio igual de la gracia de Dios, uno se convierte y otro no" (Báñez 387).

[12] "pretende directa y secundariamente castigar al pecador, en cuanto que el castigo mismo ordena el hombre a Dios, justo juez, para que se manifieste su justicia en el universo y su mayor misericordia en los predestinados" (Báñez 402).

[13] God's "voluntad adivinase determina a sí misma para producir cualquier efecto especial y singular" (Báñez 386).

[14] Molina wrote that the error of Luther "no sólo contradice la fe católica—en la medida en que Lutero, por medio de él, pretende eliminar el mérito de las obras que realizamos con ayuda de la gracia divina—, sino que también es contrario a la luz natural y la filosofía verdadera" (Molina 44).

[15] "Por tanto, ya que al realizar muchos actos buenos […], no experimentamos una dificultad tal que no podamos voluntariamente decidir y realizar estos actos con facilidad, de aquí se sigue que no solo podamos querer, sino que también podemos realizar obras morales semejantes solo con el concurso general de Dios y las fuerzas naturales de nuestro libre arbitrio" (Molina 63).

juzgar a vivos y muertos, como declara toda la Iglesia, el Símbolo de la fe. Por consiguiente, si no hay gracia divina, ¿cómo salvará Jesucristo el mundo? Y si no hay libre arbitrio, ¿cómo juzgará Dios el mundo" (Molina 42).[16] In this way, salvation was left up to man. However, most of the aforementioned theologians (Paul the Apostle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Báñez and Molina) share the same belief regarding God's grace. For example, Molina explains, "En efecto, será asombroso que hubiésemos sido creados con vistas a un fin natural y, sin embargo, no pudiéramos realizar ningún acto honesto con nuestras propias fuerzas y solo con el concurso general de Dios" (Molina 63). For these theologians, man is incapable of doing good works without God's grace. In that sense, good works are essential to salvation, but not to obtaining it – they are actually mere signs of having received grace.

The debate in Spain became too heated for the *Santo Oficio* to settle and they decided to take the issue to the Vatican in 1594. Fearful of a struggle that would cause fractures in the Church, Pope Clemente VIII (1592-1605) was obliged to call to order the *Congregatio de auxillis gratia* to investigate the matter in 1594. Unable to come to a conclusion, the pope prohibited its discussion in public, but Paul V reversed the prohibition in 1607, declaring that neither stance was heretical (Trubiano, *Libertad* 29).

This controversy had a great impact on Gabriel Téllez (birth name of Tirso de Molina) and his plays. Although, as Pat Soto has pointed out, Tirso's works are not written to favor one posture over another:

> Decir que el drama defiende una tesis no sólo es forzar el texto, sino quitarle su valor artístico y literario. La verdadera literatura no se hace tomando posiciones dogmáticas o defendiendo tesis; el verdadero literato hace arte escribiendo sin compromisos, y Tirso más que defender tesis hizo literatura. (Soto 18)

[16] Kaphagawani comments that Molina's theology must imply equality regarding choice—that to follow God or worldly pleasures—where both options must be equally appealing to man or the decision would undoubtedly not come out of freedom, but out of force (Kaphagawani 36).

Tirso's *comedias* were not written to support Báñez or Molina, but he was a friar and an artist whose faith definitely left traces in his works, and his religion reveals an inclination towards "molinista" theology.

Demonic Influences in *El condenado por desconfiado*

In his plays, Tirso expresses his views on the issue of free will most eloquently through the intervention of supernatural characters. For instance, he employs a demonic presence to manipulate Paulo, the ostensibly pious hermit, in *El condenado por desconfiado*. It is important to begin analysis with a brief investigation of Paulo's character and his faith, as they are the reason the demon pursues him.

The play opens with Paulo exiting a cave and praising creation directly to God. However, it is obvious from Paulo's first soliloquy that he has only one goal in mind for his outwardly holy actions. Paulo's words reveal that he did not become a hermit to live a worthy life of service to worship God. Instead, he pleads with God to always keep him in the desert for his own good: "El mundo dejé para el bien mío" (v. 66). Paulo's words reveal that, although he exemplifies a willingness to sacrifice, he has a selfish reason—to gain salvation with as few obstacles as possible. He did not leave the world to serve God, but so that he could selfishly calculate his own salvation by abstaining from sin. Paulo never sought to actually put his faith in God, but used his sacrifice to gain something and audaciously attempt to trick God into believing he was a good person.

Paulo further demonstrates such audacity when he cries, "¿Quién, ¡oh celestes cielo!, / aquesos tafetanes luminosos / rasgar pudiera un poco para ver…? ¡Ay de mí! Vuélvome loco. / Mas ya que es imposible" (I, vv. 21-25), implicitly asking God for a glimpse of the reward

that awaits him for the sacrifices he has made. The action shows his doubts and the distrust he feels when he seeks divine assurance.[17] For Paulo, his relationship with God is a transaction, and he forgets that grace is not given by merit. It is, by definition, the reception of what is not deserved. Paulo does not realize that faith in God is all that is required of him, but rather he negates God's promises, just nature and willingness to save.

It is then unsurprising that Paulo is easily brought to despair by a frightening dream that seems to threaten his salvation. In the nightmare, his good deeds were weighed and found wanting: "leyó mis buenas obras, / y el Justicia / Mayor del cielo […] las puso en dos balanzas; mas levanta / el peso de mi culpa y mi justicia / mis obras buenas no tanto, que el Juez Santo / me condena a los reinos del espanto" (I, vv. 170-183). Paulo's nightmare is extremely revealing of his true character. It further confirms that he actually has no faith in God or His mercy, but instead places faith in his own works ("buenas obras") and is fearful they may not be worth enough. Paulo believes that he should be able to control his own salvation through his actions, and does not acknowledge his own fallibility.[18] Tirso therefore uses Paulo's dream to illustrate the internal struggle that Paulo and other humans experience: an unwisely placed trust in good works caused by lack of faith in God's mercy.

Paulo's doubt is understandable—doubting is not a sin in itself —but it will set him on his way to becoming "el condenado" when he dares to question God about his fate: "¿[...] ir a vuestro cielo o al infierno?" (I, v.192). The demand demonstrates Paulo's complete lack of

[17] Pedrisco also shows how these sacrifices are truly done with reluctance for these en: "Aquí penitencia hacemos / y sólo yerbas comemos, / y a veces nos acordamos / de lo mucho que dejamos / por lo poco que tenemos" (I, vv.112-116).

[18] Soufas makes an interesting argument that Tirso creates his character around the Renaissance belief and understanding of *acedia* as Paulo's "fears, sadness, dreams of hellfire, visits from Satan, metamorphosis to violent criminal, and improper obsession with his own damnation are all in keeping with the age's understanding of religious melancholy " (Soufas 186). For religious melancholy, see Teresa Soufas, "Relgious Melancholy and Tirso's Despairing Monk in *El condenado por desconfiado*."

trust in the basic Christian doctrine of mercy and grace. For Paulo, it is God who has to justify His self to man, and not man unto God (Aranguren 247). His question[19] – "¿He di ir a vuestro cielo?" – evidences that Paulo dares to conceive the mysteries of the divine. He knows this is sacrilege, yet he persists.[20] Instead of placing greater trust in God, he seeks to place greater trust in his own merit and to possess divine knowledge—something that is not his to own.[21]

Paulo then recounts his sufferings, "Treinta años de edad tengo, Señor mío, / y los diez he gastado en el desierto" (I, v. 193). This prompting unto God further shows that his spiritual relationship is a calculated transaction that expects a return. Paulo further evidences this way of reasoning after hearing a description of the beautiful Celia, which reminds him of his past pleasures as a sinner. He then demands that his lackey, Pedrisco, mistreat him in a theatrical act of flagellation: "En el suelo me arrojo de esta suerte / para que en él me pise" (I, vv. 644-645). This act, too, is not done out of genuine repentance, but is based on appearances. Paulo's focus is on being rewarded, so he is most concerned with making his piety a spectacle. Through Paulo, Tirso criticizes a type of suffering that has nothing to do with serving God, but is done out of selfish desire for salvation. Paulo has misplaced faith in his actions. He ignores that good works and sacrifice are supposed to be a result of grace and

[19] According to Trubiano, Paulo presupposes the struggle between predestination and free will, as Paulo demands to know what God will do with him, even though he has not yet completed living his life (Trubiano *Libertad* 176).

[20] "Todo lector de *El condenado por desconfiado* se acuerda de que sólo Dios sabe el futuro, mientras que Paulo presume buscarlo y al intentar saber el futuro pierde de vista el presente" (Oakley, "La vida" 498).

[21] Varey argues that by demanding an answer, Paulo actually "tempts God" (208), similarly to how Satan tempted Jesus to show him His glory / omnipotence in the desert when He was fasting. In both cases, this is actually a challenge to God to disprove Paulo's fears.

not done with the sole intention of receiving celestial rewards. His despair and lack of faith allow the demon to enter the stage.[22]

Before addressing Paulo directly, the demon soliloquizes from a balcony, making it clear that Paulo "con la desconfianza / le ha ofendido [a Dios], pues es cierto / que desconfía de Dios / el que a su fe no da crédito" (I, vv. 221-224). The demon places blame directly on Paulo's distrust, which offends God. As the demon explains, because of such betrayal, God "[...] así me ha dado licencia / el juez más supremo y recto / para que con más engaños / le incite agora de nuevo" (I, vv. 229-232). The demon makes it clear that this is not the first time God, described as the most supreme and righteous judge, has allowed the demon to tempt Paulo ("le incite agora de nuevo"). It is thus clear that Paulo has struggled with this doubt for a while. In this way, the "Demonio" actually embodies Paulo's preexisting spiritual weakness of doubt.

The demon thus sets to work on winning Paulo's soul. Descending from the balcony in the disguise of an angel, the demon convinces Paulo that there is a way for him to know his destiny, which is to seek out Enrico, a criminal: "Dios que en él repares quiere, / porque el fin que aquél tuviere, / ese fin has de tener" (I, vv. 282-284). The demon's argument is not that the salvation of Paulo is based on his faith in God, but that it has already been determined and is linked to the destiny of a heinous criminal. The ties between the devil and Enrico is made clearer when the latter proudly calls himself, "el Diablo" (I, v. 499) and brags about having killed, raped and robbed many (vv. 715-878). The demon is aware that after Paulo witnesses the cruelty of Enrico, Paulo will misguidedly think that it will be impossible

[22] It is evident that the demon has been pursuing Paulo for years because of his obvious weakness: "Diez años ha que persigo / a este monje en el desierto, / recordándole memorias / y pasados pensamientos" (I, vv. 201-204). The demon is aware that Paulo has given up his former life as a sinner only for the sake of his salvation, and will easily revert back to his old ways if the motive for his righteousness (salvation) is taken away.

for Enrico to receive grace. In fact, when Paulo and his lackey first encounter Enrico, Pedrisco declares, "en vida está ya ardiendo en los infiernos" (I, v. 273). For these two, Enrico is a "desalmado" who, as far as they are concerned, is already in Hell.[23] With the demon's deception, Paulo loses faith in Enrico's salvation and his own. He cannot understand how others, who have lived less righteously than he, could receive eternal reward.

As scholars have pointed out, Paulo is incapable of acknowledging the hope of salvation in others because he does not believe in his own (Trubiano, *Libertad* 181). He ignores that it is God who wishes to see even sinners such as Enrico come to salvation and repentance.[24] This disbelief will in turn cause Paulo to decide that there is absolutely no purpose in serving God, as he is already condemned. In a moment of rage, he quickly rebels against God ("antes de ir allá / en el mundo nos venguemos," I, vv. 979-980), and decides that God has offended *him*, and it is now *his* prerogative to take revenge for there is no point in leading a life of penitence: "no es bien que yo en el mundo / esté penitencia haciendo" (I, vv. 964-965). Again, Paulo's words clearly reveal that his sole incentive for living a life of contrition was to attain the desired salvation as a reward. His prompting unto God and his desire for revenge show that Paulo's relationship with God has been superficial, basing itself purely on selfish gain.

Paulo's attempt to manipulate God is absolute sacrilege, as he misuses the life God gave him to intentionally spite his creator and retaliate against the Almighty himself, as Satan once did. His downfall began with his doubt, and the "Demonio" encourages this weakness

---

[23] For Pedrisco and Paulo, Marni argues, "Enrico represents a perfect example of Aristotelian-Thomistic counterpassion…Fiendish Enrico behaves like a devil because it is the devil who is in control of his body," since he has not yet received grace (Marni 127). With this logic, it is unsurprising that Enrico is very proud of his depravity, as is the Devil, and even brags about having it.

[24] This concept is stated throughout the Bible, such as in *2 Peter* 3: 9: "It is not His will that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (*New International Version)*.

so Paulo would fall further from the truth. Tirso portrays how some men arrive at a decision to reject God in this play through the demon's manipulation of impressionable characters. We see this clearly through the spiritual attack on Paulo, who the "Demonio" knows is already living with a doubt-filled faith. Thus, Tirso uses the supernatural presence to show that Paulo, like all men, has free will to accept or reject God's grace but that evil forces can and will manipulate this will to cause men to fall further from the truth. Predestination, according to him, is a deception of the devil, because salvation is based on an act of faith. This theology is reminiscent of that of Luis de Molina who also felt it was man's own will that lead him to Heaven or Hell, and salvation is not based on merit.

Don Gonzalo as Agent of Divine Justice and Mercy in *El burlador de Sevilla*

Another excellent example that Tirso has created to illustrate men's misuse of repentance as a calculated means for salvation and supernatural intervention can be found in Don Juan's character in *El burlador de Sevilla*. Throughout the text, the carefully depicted Don Juan, who thrives on darkness and absence of identity calling himself in the first act "Un hombre sin nombre" (I, v. 14),[25] deceives and mocks women, provoking countless dishonors.[26] Although the "burlador" tries to fault his youth for his actions,[27] sexual pleasure is not actually what motivates him. He simply enjoys the "burla de fama" (II, v. 1476).[28]

[25] Don Juan is also very unstable and spontaneous in his actions. Rhodes argues, "Such lack of personal identity and individual initiative signals social impotence. It is a feature of Woman" (Rhodes 274).

[26] Francisco Ruiz Ramón investigates how Don Juan's character and actions are carefully calculated, mathematically and symbolically in his article "*El burlador de Sevilla* y la dialéctica de la dualidad."

[27] Don Juan reminds his uncle, "mozo soy y mozo fuiste" (I, v. 63).

[28] "Don Juan is far less a lover that a spoiler, compelled to defeat women rather than to please them or, surprisingly perhaps, to gratify his own sexual appetite" (Friedman 63).

Driven by defiance, Don Juan seeks to manipulate and control his own fate and nothing causes him to contemplate the brevity of life.[29] Whenever he is reminded of morality and his need to repent, he simply responds "¡Qué largo me lo fiáis!" (I, v. 905). Despite Don Juan's father's advice to stop his philandering and repent lest God greet him with a swift and condemned death,[30] his son deflects disrespectfully, with disbelief in the possibility that he will die before he is ready.[31]

Don Juan's character shares much in common with Paulo. In agreement with Trubiano, if Paulo is obstinate in his wish to see his Heavenly reward prematurely, Don Juan is stubborn in postponing the thought of Heaven to the point of offending God (Trubiano, *El hombre* 349).[32] The two characters both erroneously believe that they can control their own salvation. This completely undermines the importance of faith, leaving them reliant on their ability to manipulate God. Paulo does this in believing his good works will permit him entrance into Heaven, while Don Juan ignores works completely, relying on his scheme to feign repentance on his deathbed. His infamous reply, "¡Qué largo me lo fiáis!" implies that despite all his repugnant actions, he is still young and has time to repent later. He is basically defying God by suggesting that he has the power to decide when he will choose to be saved.

---

[29] Trubiano suggests that the capacity of Don Juan "de ajestarse, penetrar y manipular la realidad para satisfacer su insaciable apetito mundano, le lleva al a trágica presunción de creerse omnipotente e intemporal" (*El hombre* 345).

[30] He warns, "Traidor, Dios te dé el castigo / que pide delito igual. / Mira que aunque al parecer / Dios te consiente, y aguarda, / tu castigo no se tarda, / y que castigo ha de haber / para los que profanáis / su nombre, y que es juez fuerte / Dios en la muerte" (II, vv. 1439-1447).

[31] "¿En la muerte? / ¿Tan largo me lo fiáis? / De aquí allá hay larga jornada" (II, vv. 1447-49).

[32] Friedman also discusses the many opportunities of grace afforded to Don Juan, in his article, "Redressing the Trickster: *El burlador de Sevilla* and Critical Transitions." He argues, "The events of the play, essentially the deceitful conduct of Don Juan, defer his death and damnation while ensuring that without repentance this end is inevitable. Analogously, and paradoxically, the span of the drama gives him multiple opportunities to save himself" (62).

Tirso reflects that God's deliverance is a choice that the "burlador" can make and he decides that he will do it later.[33] Don Juan is not, of course, an atheist. This is evidenced by his desire to confess at the end of the play. However, Don Juan's God is an abstract one who will wait on him, who will not become a concrete figure for Don Juan until the hour of his death. With such defiance, there is little reason to doubt why divine forces will step in to control the "burlador" and why there is little despair over his death.[34]

While Don Juan's mockery of honor is abhorrent, it is not the reason God's justice intervenes.[35] God intervenes only when human laws prove ineffective and incapable of administering justice after Don Juan takes the life of Don Gonzalo.[36]

In this play, we do not know whether the ghostly apparition of the statue of Don Gonzalo is from Heaven or Hell. Yet it is clear Don Gonzalo represents divine justice, and God ordains his actions while still allowing Don Juan the option to accept God's mercy and flee. The murdered Don Gonzalo re-appears to enforce justice and usher Don Juan into Hell.[37] Don Gonzalo's appearance shows that God is still sovereign over the world, despite the chaos caused by the "burlador" (Casalduero 118), and He allows supernatural forces to

---

[33] Catalinón also emphasizes the free will aspect of this play. See Edward H. Friedman, "Redressing the Trickster: *El burlador de Sevilla* and Critical Transitions" 67.

[34] Elizabeth Rhodes partially attributes the crowd's pleasure in seeing Don Juan condemned due to his cross-gendered nature. See Elizabeth Rhodes, "Gender and the Monstrous in 'El burlador de Sevilla'" 267-285.

[36] Bruce Wardropper also attributes much of the inefficacy of human justice to favoritism or *privanza* and he argues that "the play is a plea for law enforcement" (Wardropper 64-65).

[37] McClelland in his book discusses the dramatic effect Don Gonzalo's presence has on the audience, as the audience is given omens and waits in suspense for something dramatic to happen (McClelland 42). He further argues that Tirso uses the supernatural to add intensity to the climax of the play and convey mystery (49). Tirso's apparitions of the supernatural are not symbolic, he argues, but play on the human minds "bafflement" of "the unknown" (51). However, I disagree, as the supernatural apparitions in these plays are very symbolic of God's justice and grace along with the treachery of evil. While McClelland contributes amply to identifying Tirso's ability as a writer to impact his audience with the supernatural and does recognize their spiritual overtones, he places less focus on the extreme presence of theology in these divine characters who seek to persuade on behalf of good or evil.

intervene on His behalf.[38] Yet, before actually ushering Don Juan into Hell, Don Gonzalo shows mercy, offering the mortal a choice to flirt with his hour of death or to delay it. Don Gonzalo does this through the offering of his hand: "dame la mano" (III, v. 2512). Don Juan also uses this same phrase and his hand to seduce and trick his own victims.[39] In doing so, Tirso shows that these women also had a choice in the matter of their dishonor. Accepting Don Juan's hand would ultimately lead to their downfall and, although they can refuse it (as the audience prays they do), they continually accept the crude offer of the *burlador*. The women have a choice, just as Don Juan will have the option to reject Don Gonzalo's hand and invitation or to repent.[40]

With his own free will, Don Juan accepts Don Gonzalo's hand and invitation to dinner. Many have claimed Don Juan's sentence is inevitable when the statue enters. However, Don Gonzalo does not drag Don Juan to the church and his death, but merely offers him the option via his hand, to which Don Juan responds, "Si fueras el mismo infierno / la mano te diera yo" (II, vv. 2514-2515). His reply shows that Don Juan will stop at nothing to defy Heaven and the power of Hell, even when confronted with spiritual forces. The dead man's apparition should cause Don Juan to fear God and his own mortality, yet when the statue

---

[38]Arias believes that Don Gonzalo is sent from God, but is also condemned: "the text means precisely what it says: the Commander suffers the same punishment as Don Juan; he burns in hell" (Arias 370). For Arias, Don Gonzalo represents that very unchristian desire for revenge. Don Gonzalo, as he lay dying, threatens Don Juan, "Seguirále mi furor, / que es traidor, y el que es traidor / es traidor porque es cobarde" (III, v. 1596-98). His desire for revenge is so strong that "it survives death" (Arias 370). God thus "intervenes to destroy the statue" as well (Arias 372). However Daniel Rogers argues, "there is no indication that Don Gonzalo, having delivered his charge into hell, will himself be obliged to stay there" (Rogers 144).

[39] The phrase actually first appears in Scene One, after Don Juan has seduced the duchess. "Dame, duquesa, la mano" (I, v. 18), he commands her, which is then echoed later in the Act I with Tisbea. Don Juan tricks the poor fisher girl into loosing her honor by swearing by his hand: "yo vuestro esclavo seré, / ésta es mi mano y mi fe" (I, vv. 946-947).

[40] In this critique of the women's lack of discernment, Arias believes that Tirso sought to criticize the corrupt society of judicial abuse and dishonorable women by making Don Juan the "scapegoat," whose death is the only thing that can restore the order that they have all participated in destroying (364).

invites him to the chapel for dinner, he willingly responds, "Iré mañana a la iglesia, / donde convidado estoy, / porque se admire y espante / Sevilla de mi valor" (III, vv. 2552-2555). Here, Don Juan is most concerned about living-up to his reputation as the "burlador of Sevilla." His desire is to amaze the people of Seville with his audacity and willingness to confront this divine messenger who threatens him with justice. He thus feels more obliged to his pride than fear of God: "Podrá el muerto / llamarme a voces infame" (III, vv. 2740-2741). Don Juan *chooses* to accept the statue's invitation because he would much rather confront damnation than be considered a coward.

Yet, Don Juan is still not hopelessly condemned even upon entering the Church, for he is again given the opportunity by the ghost to show fear of God and repent, delaying his death. Instead he consents to dine with the statue with insincere bravery: "Comeré / si me dieses áspid a áspid / cuanto el infierno tiene" (III, vv. 2798-2800). Don Juan is so defiant towards the divine agent that he contends he would accept any food Don Gonzalo gave him, even if it were vipers, demonstrating that he still believes himself far removed from death and is unwilling to repent. Yet he is still offered a choice. Once more, Tirso uses the dilemma of the hand to illustrate the protagonist's options. Don Gonzalo tells the "burlador," "Dame esa mano. / No temas, la mano dame" (III, vv. 2816-2817). Yet again, the statue does not forcibly take the sinner's hand, but Don Juan willingly and defiantly gives it and his soul on his own accord, responding, "¿Eso dices? ¿Yo temor?" (III, vv. 2818-2819). Once more, Don Juan is most concerned with his reputation and still believes God is incapable of taking his life before he is ready to die.

With this ultimate decision to accept the ghost's invitation, Don Juan finds that he has pushed the limits too far, and pleads for confession. Don Gonzalo reminds him that "No hay

lugar, ya acuerdas tarde" (III, v. 2841). Although the statue's reply seems cruel, it is merely the divine and just response to Don Juan's motto: "¡Qué largo me lo fiáis!". The "burlador's" calculated procrastination proves he ultimately feels no remorse for his wicked crimes and never had any intention to truly repent, which would have meant changing his wicked ways in life, not at the hour of death. Don Juan thought he could outwit God by postponing repentance until he absolutely had to do so to save his own skin from the flames of Hell, but Tirso emphasizes in this play that timing (especially when concerning death) is a matter which pertains only to God. Because of this, men are to live their lives according to the knowledge that each moment could be their last. Don Gonzalo denies Don Juan confession and the mercy of God because the latter took these for granted during life, believing God would wait on his readiness. Don Juan had the option to choose repentance, but by accepting Don Gonzalo's hand, he chose to face divine justice.

Don Juan's death is undoubtedly retribution for his acts against God, as Don Gonzalo reminds him, "Ésta es justicia de Dios, / quien tal hace, que tal pague" (III, vv. 2848-2849).[41] Tirso still saw this unrepentant sinner as capable of repenting up until the hour of death. On both occasions, the statue of Don Gonzalo never forces Don Juan to go to the church or to take his hand. It is Don Juan himself who chooses to take on Don Gonzalo's offers. Don Juan is given multiple opportunities to repent, but he continues to dare God by affronting the supernatural Don Gonzalo. Using the spirit of the *burlador*'s victim, Tirso reflects

[41] According to Archimede Marni, this is essentially counterpassion; "the principle whereby justice demands the sin receive retribution first and foremost in *kind*," whereas the punishment should be equal to the crime (124). Marni argues that this is seen from the beginning with Isabella who disregards courtesy to the king, and is thus treated with disregard and discourtesy in return (Marni 128). The same is true with Tisbea, who flirts with men only to reject them. When Gonzalo deceitfully asks for Don Juan's hand, he is doing this in complete counterpassion, as Don Juan often asks for the hands of the women he tricks (Marni 129).

"molinista" theology of free will, showing that sinners such as Don Juan always have free will and they decide their own destiny—that of humility and grace or eternal condemnation.

Divine Presences and Their Pursuit of Men

Through the careful examination of Paulo and Don Juan, we have seen how Tirso employs supernatural forces to represent either agency of divine justice or a physical manifestation of disbelief. In both cases, the characters are given liberty to continue in their sin or repent. In addition, there is a third type of force in all three of Tirso's plays. This includes the divine presences that seek to counteract demons and supernatural temptation by winning souls over to salvation. These forces exemplify grace, through which Tirso wished to convey how God desires all men. Thus the Spanish playwright used divine presences that came not only in the form of angels but also through visions, music and shepherds. These forces attempt to persuade the characters of the truth, often mentioning the individual's free will that must be used to choose God in order to be saved.

In *El condenado por desconfiado* and in *El burlador de Sevilla* this presence takes the form of divine melody. While Enrico is in his jail cell, and the "Demonio" speaks to him, a providential sound plays to frustrate the advice of the demon. It tells Enrico, "Detén el paso violento: / mira que te está mejor / que de la prisión librarte / es estarte en la prisión" (III, vv. 2265-2269), encouraging him to do the exact opposite of the demonic suggestions. The sounds Enrico hears are, in fact, grace in the form of divine and supernatural song. The saintly music orders: "Detente, engañado Enrico; / no huyas de la prisión, / pues morirás si salieres, / y si te estuvieres, no" (III, vv. 2279-2282). Divine grace, voiced in a melody, fights to persuade Enrico to await his execution in the prison in order to win his soul. The grace that

is seen here is that which is sufficient, as it is very convincing (Saugnieux 210), but not efficacious or irresistible (a type of grace supported my the Reformers, which Luis de Molina sought to dispel). Enrico certainly considers ignoring it, but finally decides to place his faith in God – "Dios es piadoso y es grande: / su misericordia alabo; / con ella podré salvarme" (III, vv. 2406-8). The grace Enrico receives is in accordance with Molina's view of grace, which is completely reliant on faith, not works (as evidenced by Enrico who does virtually nothing to merit Heaven).[42] Enrico remains in his cell. He later confesses his sins because he cannot bear to watch his father suffer on his account: "[...] más el alma ha sentido / [...] / el pesar que tenéis vos, / que el mal que espero afligido" (III, vv. 2549-2502). Enrico repents and is saved because he is persuaded by the divine music to remain in his cell in order to later be converted by his love for his father, which is an example of Luis de Molina's belief in grace and divine foreknowledge. Enrico is very good to his father, showing a predisposition to filial love. He confesses as he takes cares of Anareto, "Que esta virtud solamente/ en mi vida destráida/ conservo piadosamente,/ que es deuda al padre debida/ el serle el hijo obediente" (I, v. 1068-72). Again, Luis de Molina supported that good works could only be done through God's grace, but this did not mean that divine grace was limited to those who had already converted, for Molina also believed in an omniscient God who was capable of knowing the future decisions of the individuals through *free knowledge*.[43] He could

[42] Throughout the play, Enrico is quite the opposite of what he becomes, as he proudly states, "Soy / el Diablo" (I, v. 498-9). In fact when Paulo and his lackey first encounter Enrico, Pedrisco declares, "en vida está ya ardiendo en los infiernos" (I, v. 273). For Pedrisco and Paulo, Marni argues, "Enrico represents a perfect example of Aristotelian-Thomistic counterpassion… Fiendish Enrico behaves like a devil because it is the devil who is in control of his body," since he has not yet received grace (Marni 127). With this logic, it is unsurprising that Enrico is very proud of his depravity, as is the Devil, and even brags about having. Yet he is still pursued by God, which is clearly not based on his merit.

[43] Argument 9, Disputation 52: "free knowledge, by which, after the free act of His will, God knew absolutely and determinately, without any condition or hypothesis, which ones from among all the contingent states of affairs were in fact going to obtain and, likewise, which ones were not going to obtain." (168)

therefore, through what Molina referred to as *middle knowledge,* bestow grace unto a person to cause him to do good works before actual conversion.[44] Such is the case with Enrico, who shows unconditional love to his father, which is a good work allowed to him by God's grace.[45]

In contrast, the music that Don Juan hears has practically no impact on him at all. Despite being a sinner who spurns the Almighty, Don Juan is another example of a character pursued by God and grace via providential appearance of the "Músico" that warns him to avoid the church (and the death he believes is so far removed). When Don Gonzalo first enters Don Juan's abode at the beginning of the Third Act, the music sings: "Si de mi amar agradáis, / señora, de aquesta suerte, / el galardón a la muerte, / ¡qué largo me lo fiáis!" (III, vv. 2448-2451), giving Don Juan clear warnings of the divine justice he would soon face. The music further cautions him: "Adviertan los que de Dios / juzgan los castigos tarde, / que no hay plazo que no llegue / ni deuda que no se pague" (III, vv. 2801-2804). It indicates that

[44] In Argument 8 of Disputation 52 in *Concordia,* Molina defines *middle knowledge* as "the most profound and inscrutable comprehension of each faculty of free choice, He saw in His own essence what each such faculty would do with its innate freedom were it to be placed I this or in that or, indeed, in infinitely many order of things—even though it would really be able, if it so willed, to do the opposite" (168).

[45] Luis de Molina supported that good works could only be done through God's grace and man's will, but this did not mean that divine grace was limited to those who had already converted, for Molina also believed in an omniscient God who was capable of knowing the future decisions of the individuals through "free knowledge." He argues, "free knowledge, by which, after the free act of His will, God knew absolutely and determinately, without any condition or hypothesis, which ones from among all the contingent states of affairs were in fact going to obtain and, likewise, which ones were not going to obtain" (168). He could therefore, through what Molina referred to as *middle knowledge,* bestow grace unto a person to cause him to do good works before actual conversion (168). Such is the case with Enrico, who shows unconditional love to his father, which is a good work allowed to him by God's grace. This love he shows for his father is evidence of Tirso's support of Luis de Molina's concepts on divine foreknowledge, as Enrico's loyalty is a premonition of the grace he will receive from God (Trubiano, *Libertad* 182).

God will repay Don Juan for his remorseless sin so he ought to repent, but the "burlador" continues to ignore the music and confronts damnation.

The divine music has a different impact on each of the two characters. For Enrico it proves to be more efficacious, as he who used to revel in his crimes chooses to repent and follow divine counsel, facing his execution, but ultimately finding salvation. The audience is spared his death, and is left with his ascension heavenward with angels.[46] Of course, Don Juan experiences a much different fate. God clearly shows some grace to Don Juan as the supernatural music gives plenty of warning that his sins demand retribution and he should avoid challenging God further, but divine counsel is lost on the "burlador." He ultimately gives into the temptation of pride, ignores divine warning and defies God's justice. Despite Don Juan's evildoing, he is still given a chance to repent and is pursued by God's supernatural grace. Thus, Tirso employs divine music to show that God seeks to convince the protagonists to avoid temptation and repent from their sins.

Like Don Juan, Paulo also offends God, but is equally pursued by His angel even after his doubt and acts of sacrilege. In the Second Act when he is in the woods committing atrocious sins against God and mankind alike, he suddenly hears a divine song: "No desconfíe ninguno, / aunque grande pecador, / de aquella misericordia / de que más se precia Dios" (II, vv. 1454-1457). These words are meant to remind Paulo that even great sinners are valuable to God. Intrigued, Paulo listens more carefully to the song, which proclaims that God has given each individual "libre albedrío, / y fragilidad le dio / al cuerpo y al alma; luego, / dio potestad con acción / de pedir misericordia, / que a ninguno le negó" (II, vv. 1460-1464). The voice is very clear in claiming that all men have free will and the ability to

[46] Varey explores Tirso's use of the stage as a celestial hierarchy in the article: "The Use of Levels in *El condenado por desconfiado*" 299-310.

recognize the need of God's forgiveness (which differs from the concept of predestination, where God has predetermined for some to harden their hearts towards Him). This song turns out to be that of a shepherd, which most have recognized as an angel in disguise or perhaps Christ himself (Soufas 186). Even the doubtful Paulo believes his presence to be holy: "no es humana sino divina" (II, v. 1598). Tirso uses this divine presence to show Paulo and the audience that it is never too late to have faith in God.[47] Unfortunately, Paulo continues to put his faith in his and Enrico's behavior (Levin 100).

Despite Paulo's stubbornness, the divine shepherd pursues Paulo again in the last Act. The "Pastor" who used to wander the area with his sheep happily, is crying for one he has lost. He laments, "desde el día / que una, la más buena, / huyó del rebaño, / lágrimas me anegan" (III, vv. 2628-2631). This scene is identical to the biblical parable of Luke chapter 15, and here the lost sheep represents Paulo's lost soul (Rennert 138). Much like the shepherd in the parable, Tirso's shepherd grieves his loss, despite the arrogance of his rebellious animal. As Christ in the parable did, this shepherd has left his other sheep to seek out the lost one, "la llamé con silbos / y avisé con señas. / Ya por los jarales / por incultas selvas, / la anduve a buscar" (III, vv. 2690-2694). Like Christ, the shepherd will do anything to have the sheep back. This reflects the extent of God's grace and love, which is willing to seek out and forgive this rebellious animal (Paulo) that abandoned its protector. However, eventually the shepherd must surrender his attempts to find his sheep, promising to receive it if it chooses to return with amnesty and "palabras tiernas" (III, vv. 2680-2681). Tirso shows

[47] Despite hearing this angel's prophetic words on his own destiny, Paulo applies the divine advice of hope to Enrico's situation, believing himself capable of saving the villains' soul—this is clearly a role that is sacrilege for Paulo to take, as only God can save men. Again he completely forgets his own need to repent. When Paulo's gang captures Enrico, Paulo practically forces a confession on him, threatening Enrico with his life; he pressures, "¿No veis que os han de matar / ahora?" (II, v. 1787-8). When Enrico refuses, Paulo despairs again.

that God pursues men in no uncertain way and is willing to forgive the rebellious hermit if he chooses to repent and return to Christ through his own free will (Green 213). This theology is likening to Molina's, who understood that grace was only obtained by the individual's choice—the sheep must decide to return to his Shepherd in order to enjoy salvation. This is all demonstrated through Tirso's creation of the divine shepherd, who reflects a God truly concerned with his sinners, who is willing to seek them out, but not to force their loyalty.[48]

Tirso's belief in God's pursuit of man's decision through supernatural forces is also prominently seen in a hagiographic play, *Quien no cae no se levanta*.[49] In Act I of this less studied play, Margarita is flirting with untrustworthy men and, instead of obeying her father's will respectfully as she ought to, she threatens to leave him and become a nun (I, v. 175). Similarly to Don Juan, she revels in and takes for granted her youth (I, vv. 83-84). She even agrees to meet her love interest, Valerio, in secret while her father is away (I, v. 545). Margarita cares little for the pain she causes her aged father, and confesses to having already been with single men, yearning to experience love with a married man: "Que varíe me has mandado; / sabré a qué sabe un casado / pues ya sé lo que es soltero" (II, vv.1412-1414). Margarita is clearly a depraved soul who has yet to know God's grace. Tirso creates this

[48] Despite these angelic words that are meant for Paulo's heart, he rejects the message, and in doing so he also rejects salvation (Trubiano, *Libertad* 195), for this was Paulo's last opportunity—he is soon to die at the villagers' hands. Unfortunately, Paulo continues to put his faith in demonic counsel, believing Heaven is a reward for good works, and is especially unable to accept grace when he acts in a way that is undeserving. Paulo's condemnation for his belief in his good works and predetermined fate can be conceived as an argument against predestination and Báñez. Because Paulo listened to the *Demonio* he believes that he is predestined: this belief aids in his loss of faith in God's mercy and ultimately his condemnation.

[49] Cécile Vincent-Cassy says that this is a play of *Santos,* which can be defined as: "las obras que ponen en escena a uno o varios santos […] El teatro hagiográfico de este fraile Mercedario es original por ser dedicado en igual proporción a personajes masculinos y femeninos cuya santidad, en muchos casos, no era reconocida por la Congregación de Ritos romana. La producción tirsiana atestigua una conciencia profunda del poder santificador del hecho teatral, a pesar de las críticas de ciertos sectores del clero y de los poetas del tiempo respecto a su inmoralidad" (Vincent-Cassy 59). In this play the *santa* represented by the protagonist is possibly Mary Magdalene, as Margarita's character, is similar to the saint as she is not reputable for her honor at the beginning of the play, which is similar to the conception of the female saint of the New Testament.

female character in such a way that will prove God pursues all people, even with His divine interaction, despite people's perversion.

While Margarita is trying to plot her own dishonor through an illicit relationship with the married Lelio ("tiene nombre / de casado") (I, vv. 128-129), she suddenly hears a voice: "el infernal cazador / que caza almas con tus ojos / perderá tu posesión" (II, vv. 1490-1492). The voice warns her of the dangerous potential of Satan and evildoings. She is then told of the consequences her sins will hold if she does not choose correctly: "Si de tu libre albedrío / siguieres la inclinación / y sus vicios no dejares, / darante mal galardón" (II, vv. 1529-1531). Her inclinations, the voice warns, are going to cause her eternal pain if she does not use her free will to make a good decision and choose conversion. If she continues on this road, she will be condemned to "el reino del espanto, / entre fuego y confusión" (II, vv. 1534-1535). Margarita then receives a divine vision of stairs leading to a throne and a crown of fire. The voice tells her, "En vez de oro tiene fuego, / brasas sus follajes son, / su corona basiliscos, / azufre y pez es su olor" (II, vv. 1541-1544). By showing her visions of flames and frightening creatures, which will be part of her eternal punishment should she not choose to follow God, the heavenly voice seeks to scare Margarita into repenting.

The spiritual presence also grants her another option that she may choose. Margarita is shown a staircase of roses that leads to a throne with a crown of gold. The heavenly voice explains,

> El cordel que te remedie
> las cuerdas divinas son
> de esta escala, donde sirve
> cada cuenta de escalón.
> Por ella, para que suba
> hasta el cielo el pecador,
> da la mano poderosa
> su admirable devoción.

Silla y corona de rosas
es quien paga el fruto en flor
a María, flor de gracia,
e intenta tu conversión. (II, vv. 1553-1564)

This vision more profoundly impacts Margarita and is obviously more agreeable, as it offers a crown of roses, with images of flowers, fruit and remedy, which would all be products of her conversion. Clearly, this supernatural voice and divine vision are meant to convince Margarita of the importance of choosing God so she can enjoy this heavenly reward. Through this representation, Tirso gives the audience insight to Margarita's and their own dilemma, along with the consequences of each option (Cull 628). Thus Tirso uses the supernatural to give clear evidence of his "molinista" belief that Margarita has two options in life accorded to her by her free will, but one is clearly more desirable.

This vision, which grace has granted her, causes her immediate repentance, and she claims, "¡Viva la virtud! Desde hoy, / salgan los vicios de casa. / Salid fuera, torpe amor" (II, vv. 1582-1585), showing her enthusiasm to take the right path. This scene sets her on the path to her eventual complete conversion, but in every moment of Margarita's progress, Tirso demonstrates that it is impossible for her to leave her sinful life without divine grace. She does not receive a lasting grace until the end, where she is completely converted with help from the angelic presence.

When the Angel appears in the Third Act, Margarita has already gone a year faithful to God (III, v. 2270). She is able to resist the temptation to see Lelio, but unfortunately she cannot resist his offer to run away together when he sneaks into her house. She confesses, "al centro quiero volver / que mi inclinación dispone, / Dios y el rosario perdone" (III, vv. 2644-2646). Although she knows that her actions are not pleasing to God (which is why she asks Him and her rosary for forgiveness), without God's grace she is incapable of refusing

her former lover. Tirso then shows how grace must intercede on her behalf in order to keep her from failing spiritually, so as she walks towards the door she falls incessantly—three times in fact (III, v. 2814). On the third fall, she realizes that she cannot get up. Her sudden inability to walk is a supernatural act that occurs in order to help Margarita stop and *choose* to remain in her present state of religious actualization.

God then illuminates Margarita through the handsome angelic presence that identifies himself as her personal guardian ("ángel de guarda") (III, v. 2962). This Angel ultimately has the greatest impact on Margarita's final decision to convert. As she struggles lying on the ground, the Angel encourages her to stand: "Si su justicia os espanta, / mi Margarita, levanta" (III, vv. 2892-2893), to which she replies that she is unable, finally coming to terms with her mortal and moral shortcomings. He says, "Por tí sola no podrás / si la gracia no te ayuda" (II, vv. 2897-2898). The Angel further encourages her, affirming that by God's grace she can rise again. Once more, she doubts, since she falls continuously (literally and figuratively), but he responds, "Quien no cae no se levanta" (III, v. 2910).[50] The Angel helps Margarita to finally realize that she is helpless without God and eventually she is ready to freely accept the grace the Angel offers. The offering of a divine hand is again employed in this play when the Angel tells her, "Dame la mano, que así / no volverás a caer" (III, vv. 2923-2924), evidencing Tirso's belief that God offers His grace to all people,[51] even before they show

[50] The title of the play means that in order to rise above sin, it is necessary to first fall completely to oneself, surrendering pride to God. For Margarita, even after her first spiritual enlightenment, she does not trust in God or ask Him to help her persevere, but instead relies on her own abilities (Minelli 186). After her fall to Lelio and continuous tripping, Margarita realizes that the biggest obstacle to her salvation and divine grace is her own vanity (Minelli 188). Margarita at times realizes her obstacle to receive divine Grace, yet she continues towards the married man, until she is unable to *levantarse* (Minelli 188).

[51] Luis de Molina similarly supports, "Dios atrae a los creyentes hacia la fe. En efecto, antes de que estos actos se produzcan, Dios no atrae a los creyentes, sino que tan solo los invita y los incita a creer […] la atracción ni la vocación divina, suprimen la libertad de arbitrio, ni el libre arbitrio puede realizar estos actos y acceder a la fe sin la atracción y vocación divina" (Molina 78).

interest in Him and even while they are sinning, but it is the individual's choice to accept or not. Similarly to what Luis de Molina explains, Margarita can overcome temptation and loss of salvation through her decision to receive grace.[52]

This offering of grace is attractive but not irresistible. Minelli argues that here God's grace is shown as totally efficacious, for the Angel uses a command to offer Margarita his hand—something that is so sweet that it is nearly impossible to refuse, even though, he argues, the choice is still Margarita's (Minelli 192). However, it is impossible for an irresistible grace and free will to coexist, especially for Tirso, or else all his characters would be saved (grace is shown to the protagonists in all three of his plays, but two are certainly condemned despite God's pursuit). So Margarita, by her own free will, accepts the hand extended to her, saying "Sólo en mi pecho hallará / entrada alegre y suave / tu amor, que por dueño queda, / y por que otro entrar no pueda, / cierra y llévate la llave" (III, vv. 2970-2974). Furthermore, she professes, "me rinde la libertad / que soy toda voluntad / sin tener el sensitivo / apetito entrada aquí" (III, vv. 3008-3010). The protagonist is now able to humble herself, having realized she must surrender her desires before she can give her hand to the Angel. This scene shows that even though divine action is powerful, it does not subjugate the will. It was in Margarita's power to reject the hand and pursue Lelio, or accept the help of the Angel and God's grace.

Through the examination of supernatural influences, this paper has shown how Tirso de Molina's work demonstrates the playwright's belief in free will and God's sufficient grace; views which are similar to those of Luis de Molina. Supernatural forces such as demons can manipulate characters such as Paulo by playing off their faults to cause them to fall further

[52] Molina explains, "que también podemos realizar obras morales semejantes solo con el concurso general de Dios y las fuerzas naturales de nuestro libre arbitrio" (Molina 63).

from the truth. The character of Don Gonzalo illustrates the divine justice of God, and the option man has to confront this justice or to repent. The angelic forces in the works show Tirso's view of a loving God who pursues His people to convince them of the reward He offers them in salvation. God's pursuit of men through the supernatural in Tirso's work is powerful and appealing, but His grace in no way takes away the freedom of the individual: the characters all receive divine counsel, but must decide for themselves to accept it.

This investigation has also shown how Tirso presents grace as something good, especially when conveyed by God's messengers, such as a shepherd and an angel, but it is always dependent on man's acceptance. The use of supernatural characters in this play embody man's internal conflict, due to free will, but the playwright views salvation as a gift given not by merit, but through repentance and faith alone, a concept strongly supported by the writings of Luis de Molina. Tirso's works clearly reflect the *auxiliis* debate, his enormous preoccupation with salvation and his willingness to utilize any and all means to transmit this message to the world.

WORKS CONSULTED

Aranguren, J.L. “Teología y teatro en Tirso de Molina.” *Revista Internacional de Teología Concilium: Teología y Literatura* 115 (1976): 233-252.

Arias, Judith H. “Doubles in Hell: *El burlador de Sevilla y convidado de piedra*.” *Hispanic Review* 58.3 (1990): 361-377.

Augustine (St.). "A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints." *The Works of Aurelius Augustine: a New Translation*. Ed. Marcus Dods. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872. 119-170.

Báñez, Domingo. "Cuestion XIV: Sobre la ciencia de Dios." *Diálogos teológicos y otros versos diseminados*. Ed. Luis Vázquea. Reichenberger: Kassel Edition, 1988. 376-402.

Bible: New International Version. Ed. Kenneth L. Barker. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. William Fry, Printer. 1816.

Conlon, Raymond. “Enrico in *El condenado por desconfiado*: A Psychoanalytical View.” *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 173-182.

“The Council of Trent.” *History Department, Hanover College*. Web. 03 Mar. 2011. <http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent.html>.

Cowburn, John. *Free Will, Predestination, and Determinism*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette UP, 2008.

Cull, John T. “‘Hablan poco y dicen mucho:’ The Function of Discovery Scenes in the Drama of Tirso de Molina.” *The Modern Language Review* 91 (1996): 619-634.

David-Peyre, Yvonne. "Purgación y catarsis: Tema literario ambiguo de la literatura del Siglo de Oro." *Asclepio. Revista de Historia de la Medicina y de la Ciencia* 42.1 (1990): 281-289.

Friedman, Edward H. “Redressing the Trickster: *El burlador de Sevilla* and Critical Transitions.” *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 29.1 (2004): 61-77.

Green, Otis H. “Imaginative Authority in Spanish Literature.” *PMLA* 84 (1969): 209-216.

Jones, C. A. “Spanish Honour as Historical Phenomenon, Convention and Artistic Motive.” *Hispanic Review* 33 (1965): 32-39.

Kaphagawani, Didier Njirayamanda. *Leibniz on Freedom and Determinism in Relation to Aquinas and Molina*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1999

Kennedy, Ruth Lee. *Studies in Tirso*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, 1974.

Levin, Leslie A. “Signs of the Times: Metaphors of Conversion in Selected Dramas of Tirso de Molina and Calderón de la Barca.” Diss. Brown U, 1997.

Luther, Martin. "*De Servo Arbitrio* ‘On the Enslaved Will’ or the Bondage of Will." *Christian Classics Ethereal Library*. Web. 03 Mar. 2011. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/luther/bondage.xiii.xxx.html>.

-----. *Martin Luther's 95 Theses*. Sprouda: Ed. Akanthus, 2005.

Marni, Archimede. “Did Tirso Employ Counterpassion in His *Burlador de Sevilla*?” *Hispanic Review* 20 (1952): 123-133.

McClelland, I. L. *Tirso de Molina Studies in Dramatic Realism*. Liverpool: Institute of Hispanic Studies, 1948.

Minelli, Fiorigio. “Poesía y teología de la conversión en *Quien no cae, no se levanta*.” *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 183-204.

Molina, Luis de. *Concordia del libre arbitrio con los dones de la gracia y con la presciencia, providencia, predestinación y reprobación divinas*. Ed. Echevarría Juan Antonio Hevia. Oviedo: Fundación Gustavo Bueno, 2007.

Molina, Tirso de. *El burlador de Sevilla*. Valencia: Prometeo, 1926.

------. *El condenado por desconfiado*. Ed. Ciriaco Morón y Rolena Adorno. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1974.

------. *Quien no cae, no se levanta*. Madrid: Aguilar, 1958.

Oakley, Robert J. "La vida y la muerte en *El condenado por desconfiado*." *Teatro del Siglo de Oro*. Kassel: Reichenberger, 1990. 487-503.

-----. *Tirso de Molina: El condenado por desconfiado*. London: Grant & Cutler, 1995.

Ortuzar, Fray Martín. "'El condenado por desconfiado' depende teológicamente de Zumel.—Nueva aclaración." *Tirso de Molina: Ensayos sobre la biografía y la obra del padre maestro Fray Gabriel Téllez*. Madrid: Revista Estudios, 1949. 321-336.

Rennert, Hugo A. "Tirso de Molina's *El Condenado por desconfiado*." *Modern Language Notes* 18 (1903): 136-139.

Rhodes, Elizabeth. "Gender and the Monstrous in 'El burlador de Sevilla.'" *MLN* 117 (2002): 267-285.

Rogers, Daniel. "Fearful Symmetry: The Ending of *El Burlador de Sevilla*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 41 (1964): 141-159.

Ruiz Ramón, Francisco. "*El burlador de Sevilla* y la dialéctica de la dualidad." *Estado actual de los estudios sobre el Siglo de Oro*. Ed. Manuel García Martín, Ignacio Arellano Javier Blasco & Marc Vitse. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1993. 905-911.

-----. *Historia del teatro español (desde sus orígenes hasta 1900)*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1971.

Smith, Dawn L. "Fray Gabriel Téllez—Tirso de Molina." *Revisa Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 152-154.

Saugnieux, Joël J. "Significación teológica, metafísica y psicoanalítica de *El burlador de Sevilla*." *Literatura y espiritualidad españolas*. Madrid: Prensa Española, 1974. 201-245.

Soto, Pat. *Soto, Pat. La teología y la Biblia como texto genético en tres obras de Tirso de Molina*. Thesis (M.A.)—Arizona State University, 1983.

Soufas, Teresa. "Relgious Melancholy and Tirso's Despairing Monk in *El condenado por desconfiado*." *Romance Quarterly* 34 (1987): 178-187.

Templin, E.H. "The *Burla* in the Plays of Tirso de Molina." *Hispanic Review* 8 (1949): 185-201.

Trubiano, Mario F. *El hombre y su destino: la teología de la gracia en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1979.

-----. *Libertad, gracia y destino en el teatro de Tirso de Molina*. Madrid: Ediciones Alcalá, 1985.

Varey, J.E. "The Use of Levels in *El condenado por desconfiado*." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10 (1986): 299-310.

Vincent-Cassy, Cécile. "Casila, Orosia, Margarita, Juana y la Ninfa: Sobre las comedias de 'santas' de Tirso de Molina." *Criticón* 97 (2006): 45-60.

Wade, Gerald E. "Tirso de Molina." *Hispania* 32 (1949): 131-140.

Wardropper, Bruce W. "*El burlador de Sevilla*: A Tragedy of Errors." *Philological Quarterly* 36 (1957): 61-71.

-----. *Teatro español del Siglo de Oro*. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

Wilson, Margaret. "The Last Play of Tirso de Molina." *The Modern Language Review* 47 (1952) 516-528.