



Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

Comoedia Sacra and Comedia Nueva

Wouters, Dinah

2023

document version

Version created as part of publication process; publisher's layout; not normally made publicly available

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Wouters, D. (2023). Comoedia Sacra and Comedia Nueva: Defending Innovation in Comedy from the Northern Humanists to Lope de Vega. *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 47, 19-39.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

pure@knav.nl

Comoedia Sacra *and* Comedia Nueva

Defending Innovation in Comedy from the Northern Humanists to Lope de Vega

DINAH WOUTERS

Abstract

This article draws a link between Lope de Vega's *Arte Nuevo*, a theoretical treatise about theater, and other theoretical texts about drama that originated in theatrical practice. More specifically, it traces the similar use of two arguments in favor of innovation in prologues of humanist sacred comedies, or *comoediae sacrae*, from the Low Countries and the German-speaking part of the Holy Roman Empire. The first argument against prescriptive dramatic theory is that the times have changed since the classical theorists laid down the rules and that drama must change as well in order to stay relevant. The second argument is that a main goal of the dramatist must be the entertainment of the audience. The article discusses seven sacred comedies or collections of comedies. First, three famous comedies from northern humanists: *Acolastus* by Guilielmus Gnapheus (1529), *Ioseph* by Cornelius Crocus (1535), and *Anabion* by Johannes Sapidus (1539). Second, two southern humanist comedies: *Gastrimargus* by the Spanish humanist Iacobus Romagnanus (1530s) and the Italian play *La strega* by Antonfrancesco Grazzini (1546). Third, two later prologues by, respectively, the Dutch playwright Cornelius Schonaeus (1599) and the Spanish Jesuit Ludovicus Crucius (1605). By looking at the early use of these arguments in humanist comedies, I want to show how they defended the *comoedia sacra* as a new genre in a similar way to the *comedia nueva* and suggest that they could have inspired the great Spanish writer of *comedias*.

Medievalia et Humanistica, New Series, Number 48 (Reinhold F. Gleis and Maik Goth, eds.), Rowman & Littlefield, 2023.

Lope de Vega's *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (*The New Art of Writing Comedies in Our Time*) from 1609 is a remarkable text, "obra capital, no sólo en la literatura, sino también en la cultura española" (a fundamental work, not only in literature but also in Spanish culture), as Juan Manuel Rozas put it.¹ It is a theoretical text on drama from the perspective of the playwright, not the theorist. It mocks prescriptive theories by giving its own precepts taken from theatrical practice, where the question is not whether Aristotle approves, but whether the audience is entertained. The abundant secondary literature on the *Arte Nuevo* has situated Lope's treatise both in relation to prescriptive dramatic theory from Antiquity to the Italian Renaissance and contemporary Spanish theorists, and in relation to Lope's dramatic practice and the development of the Spanish *comedia nueva*.²

This article draws a link between the *Arte Nuevo* and other theoretical texts about drama that originated in theatrical practice. More specifically, it traces the similar use of some arguments in favor of innovation in prologues of humanist sacred comedies, or *comoediae sacrae*, from the Low Countries and the German-speaking part of the Holy Roman Empire. These northern comedies were popular in Spain, so much so that Joaquín Pascual Barea claims that, "[f]rom the 1540s onwards, the religious dramas of Petrus Papeus, Georgius Macropedius, Guilielmus Gnapheus and Levinus Brechtanus exerted a greater influence than the ancient and humanistic comedies from Italy."³ As examples for such a reception, Pascual Barea mentions the Toledo professor of grammar Alexius Vanegas and the Jesuits Miguel Venegas and Pedro Pablo de Acevedo/Acevedus.⁴ Vanegas published his corrected and annotated edition of Petrus Papeus's comedy about the Good Samaritan in 1542, three years after the play's original publication in Antwerp.⁵ Acevedus adapted and staged Gnapheus's *Acolastus* in 1555 for the inauguration of a new school in Cordoba, and the following year his pupils performed Brecht's *Euripus*. Venegas, who worked in places throughout Europe, was involved in several productions of Lewin Brecht's *Euripus* (1548) as well.⁶ In the early decades of Jesuit school plays, in Spain as in the Holy Roman Empire, teachers looked to sacred drama from the Low Countries for inspiration as well as for ready-made plays.⁷ As Lope went to a Jesuit school during the late 1560s and 1570s, he would probably have been acquainted with sacred comedies.

The *comoedia sacra* and the *comedia nueva* are quite different genres of comedy. The *comoedia sacra* was developed by northern humanists from the thirties of the sixteenth century onward.⁸ The term refers to a Latin comedy that combines the theme of a biblical story with the language,

character, genre scenes, and humor from Terence and Plautus. The genre was specifically developed for the school, with the goal of providing moral and religious education. The *comedia nueva*, in contrast, originated in the context of companies of professional players and the first permanent theaters in Spain. It refers to a Spanish play in three acts. It is not restricted to one sort of subject matter, but treats historical, legendary, mythical, romance, biblical, and hagiographical stories. Love and honor are two central concerns.

The two genres share resemblances as well. First, they both cater to a new kind of audience: pupils of humanist schools, in the case of the *comoedia sacra*, and a broad, paying public of theatergoers looking for entertainment, in the case of the *comedia nueva*. Second, both kinds of drama, keeping to a less strict concept of genre, easily cross the division between comedy and tragedy according to the traditional definitions handed over from Antiquity. They treat serious matters and include highborn characters, and even end badly sometimes. This article wants to trace the similar use of two specific arguments in favor of dramatic innovation that recur in these practical defenses of a theater rooted in its performance context. The first argument against prescriptive dramatic theory is that the times have changed since the classical theorists laid down the rules, and that drama must change as well in order to stay relevant. The second argument is that the entertainment of the audience must be a main goal of the dramatist. By looking at the early use of these arguments in comedies by northern humanists, I also want to show how they defended the *comoedia sacra* as a new genre in a similar way to the *comedia nueva*.

Comedia nueva and Arte Nuevo

The Spanish *comedia nueva* emerged out of several strands of drama that coexisted and intersected during the sixteenth century.⁹ Spanish drama took inspiration from Italian and northern humanism. From the second half of the fifteenth century, both classic Latin plays by Plautus and Terence and Italian imitations of classical drama such as Leon Battista Alberti's *Philodoxus* (1426) were studied at Spanish universities.¹⁰ Soon, Spanish academics began producing their own Latin drama, such as the tragedy *Galathea* and the comedy *Zaphira* by Hércules Florus.¹¹ The Italian *commedia erudita*, modeled on classical comedy but written in Italian, provided inspiration for writing humanist comedies in Spanish. *Commedie erudite* include classical, biblical, and romance material; focus on

comic and romantic intrigue; and are divided into five acts. An example of a Spanish humanist play is Miguel de Carvajal's *Tragedia llamada Josefina* (1535). In the fifties of the sixteenth century, the Jesuits established their school drama, first importing Latin religious drama from authors of the Low Countries, such as Petrus Papeus, Georgius Macropedius, Guilielmus Gnapheus, and Levinus Brechtanus.¹² Before long, they too were writing in Spanish. During this time also developed the characteristic Spanish genre of the religious plays in one act, the *autos sacramentales*. These dramas tell biblical stories, legends, and saints' lives and were performed on religious feast days. They also contain farcical and festive elements. Playwrights writing for professional theater companies combined these strands into the *comedia nueva*. In the 1540s and 1550s, the first companies of professional players organized themselves, and in the 1570s and 1580s, permanent theaters cropped up in the big cities. During that last decade, Lope de Vega arose as the star playwright in Madrid and in Spain. His talent and popularity cemented the formula of the *comedia nueva* as the national drama of Spain.

Lope de Vega explicitly credited himself with inventing the *comedia nueva*. His 1609 treatise *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (from now on, *Arte Nuevo*), spoken before the "academy of Madrid," an intellectual society about which not much is known, mocks prescriptive treatises of drama by describing the "rules" for writing a comedy in the new style. In his treatise, Lope defends the kind of popular comedy that he and his fellow playwrights were writing at the time against the normative rules of classical drama. In an ironically regretful tone, he says that he would prefer to write Aristotelian tragedies, but that they would simply not sell and would bore the public to death. He then gives his own guidelines for writing a good drama, dispensing with most classical rules and favoring a highly entertaining blend of tragic and comic elements, meant for the entertainment of a broad audience. For instance, in choosing the subject, Lope rejects the rule of only featuring highborn characters in tragedy and not in comedy. This social mix creates a new genre, tragicomedy, of which the strength lies in its heterogeneity and the variety that is also part of nature's beauty. Now that we have strayed from Aristotle's rules anyway, Lope says, we can as well let go of the unity of time. Furthermore, one should divide a play into three acts that each take place within the course of a day. The outcome of the plot should not be obvious until the very end; otherwise the audience will think of leaving. Likewise, the stage should never be empty and the play should not be too long, or the audience will get restless. The new rules go on, but always return to one crucial point: make sure that the public is

entertained. As Lope says, “yo hallo que, si allí se ha de dar gusto, / con lo que se consigue es lo más justo” (and I say, if the aim is to delight, / whatever serves that purpose must be right).¹³

Tragicomedy was developed in Spain since the late fifteenth century, and under the denominator of *comedia nueva* became the most popular genre of Spanish theater during the last quarter of the sixteenth century.¹⁴ The strict separation between comedy and tragedy known from the classical canon and codified in theory was broken down in practice by introducing characters of high rank into lighthearted everyday situations and people of lower rank into dilemmas of life and death. The resulting mix came to be called *comedia*.¹⁵ The tragicomic generic mix was part of a European phenomenon gaining in strength around the turn of the seventeenth century, but the development of the *comedia* in Spain and the emancipation of Spanish theorists from the traditional dichotomy between comedy and tragedy had its own peculiarities. Sofie Kluge describes “the slow and hesitant, yet retrospectively clear” replacement of the Aristotelian classification of four genres (tragedy, comedy, epic, and lyric) dominant in the Renaissance with the tripartite system (drama, epic, and lyric) described in the works of Plato, Diomedes, and Donatus. The latter system is not based primarily on thematic criteria but on the formal criterion of diegetic versus mimetic art. In this view, comedy and tragedy are subsets of a single genre. This “characteristic Spanish attitude” reflects contemporary practices of writing drama in Spain.¹⁶

Marta Albalá Pelegrín links Lope’s treatise to a historical-descriptive current of thinking about the *comedia*, represented by Angelo Poliziano, Leone de Sommi, and Battista Guarini.¹⁷ One of the crucial ideas of the *Arte Nuevo* is that comedy is a genre that changes in time. That is, the rules that Aristotle was supposed to have laid down in his lost book on comedy did not describe a timeless essence of the genre, but the rules once current in Greek comedy. The concept of the imitation of life is central to the definition of comedy, as for instance in the often-quoted definition attributed by Donatus to Cicero: “Comoedia est imitatio vitae, speculum consuetudinis et imago veritatis” (Comedy is the imitation of life, a mirror of custom, and the image of truth).¹⁸ Hence, if ways of lives and habits change, the comedy that depicts them must change as well if it still aims to be the “image of truth.”¹⁹ Moreover, Albalá Pelegrín points out that both Angelo Poliziano and Lope de Vega are interested in the factor of the audience’s entertainment.²⁰ To Poliziano, this means the introduction of a king or satyrs in comedy, just as Lope is of the opinion that the variety of tragicomedy is more entertaining to people.

Comoedia sacra

Lope's treatise describes a new genre of comedy, one suited to early modern ways of life and customs in Spain, prioritizing the entertainment of the public. There are similarities with how the humanist schoolmasters of the Low Countries and the German-speaking parts of the Holy Roman Empire, a century earlier, had shaped the new genre of the sacred comedy. These schoolmasters also found themselves before a new kind of theater audience. They wrote their plays in the first place for their pupils, who served as actors and spectators. Their plays thus had to live up to their innovative pedagogic goals. They had to teach a good Latin style and the art of appearing in public, as well as providing religious and ethical instruction. Their new pedagogic ideals required the active involvement of the pupils in order to optimize learning. Drama was a way of achieving this goal, but in order to be effective, the exercise also had to be entertaining. Lastly, pupils performed before their parents and the local community, and playwrights tried to involve this audience as well as the boy actors.

In order to satisfy all these new requirements for their theater, humanist schoolteachers could not restrict themselves to performing comedies by the Roman authors that were on the curriculum. Nor could they keep to creating faithful imitations, thematically and formally, of these ancient plays. Not only did Plautus and Terence provide a limited repertoire of plays,²¹ but their plots based on love intrigues and their scurrilous humor made them unsuited for school. Instead, humanist schoolteachers created a new hybrid genre of comedy, which they called *comoediae sacrae*, or sacred comedies. As so many other Neo-Latin genres, these comedies combined an imitation of classical style with new themes, in this case biblical stories. The prologues to these plays mostly express the contrast between pagan and sacred comedies in moral and didactic terms. I will explore two intermediate arguments, however, which only indirectly lead to the moral argument. The first argument is that novelty is a good thing, that times change and a new kind of drama is required to fit new audiences and new purposes. The second is that the entertainment and the involvement of the public is a factor of great importance. These arguments are also found in the *Arte Nuevo*.

Erasmus

These are also ideas that are famously expressed, be it not with regard to theater but to Latin style in general, in Erasmus's dialogue against

the Ciceronians, the slavish imitators of Cicero's style. The work was published in 1528. I cite Erasmus in order to refer to the whole debate on imitation and the ideal Latin style of which this text is one episode.²² The battle between Ciceronians and those who preferred a mix of models (with a place of honor for Cicero) began with the discussion between Poggio Bracciolini and Lorenzo Valla in 1452 and 1453 and continued between Angelo Poliziano and Paolo Cortesi. Erasmus refers to these earlier debates but elevates the question by bringing in the issue of the integration of Christian faith with classical style.

In Erasmus's dialogue, an old friend tries to cure Nosoponus from his extreme devotion to Ciceronian style, which he incurred during a trip to Italy, the home of the Ciceronians. Erasmus advocates a moderate approach to imitation, one that takes into account the different circumstances under which modern texts are composed. One should imitate the qualities of the style rather than its specific properties. For instance, one can use new words for Christian concepts. Only then can those who write Latin hope to not only write good imitations but even emulate their examples, for instance by combining an excellent Latin style with their superior Christian faith. Moreover, this is the only respectful way of imitating Cicero. As the dialogue states: "ne forte perperam illum experimentes, gloriam eius obscuremus, quemadmodum solent imperiti pictores eos traducere, quorum effigiem secus quam oportet expresserunt" (I hope to prevent us producing a bad copy of him that will give him a bad name, just as a portrait by an incompetent painter who cannot reproduce the features properly makes the sitter an object of ridicule).²³

An argument that will return in the prologues I will discuss next is that Roman culture was completely different from the present society, and art needs to adapt itself to changing times and circumstances. Nosoponus's friend Bulephorus first gets him to agree with the statement that to speak in a fitting way is to speak in accordance with the persons and conditions that are present. Then he asks him whether the present time resembles the time when Cicero lived, taking into account that the religion, the politics, the laws, the customs, the professions, and even the faces of people are different. Nosoponus can only answer that they resemble each other in nothing. Bulephorus then challenges him:

Quid igitur frontis habeat ille, qui a nobis exigit, ut per omnia Ciceronis more dicamus? Reddat is nobis prius Romam illam, quae fuit olim, reddat senatum et curiam, patres conscriptos, equestrem ordinem, populum in tribus et centuriis digestum: reddat augurum et aruspicum collegia, Pontifices maximos, flamines et vestales, adiles, praetores, tribunos plebis, consules, dictatores, Caesares, comitia, leges, senatus consulta, plebiscita, statuas, triumphos, ovationes, supplicationes, fana, delubra, pulvinaria, sacrorum ritus, deos deasque, Capitolium et ignem sacrum: reddat provincias, colonias, municipia, et socios urbis rerum dominae.²⁴

[What effrontery then on the part of anyone to demand that we speak in a totally Ciceronian manner! He must first give us back the Rome of long ago, the senate and the curia, the conscript fathers, the equestrian order, the people distributed into tribes and centuries; he must restore the colleges of augurs and haruspices, the pontifices maximi, the flamens and vestals, the aediles, praetors, tribunes of the people, consuls, dictators, Caesars, the voting in the comitium, the laws, the decrees of the senate, the resolutions of the people, the statues, triumphs, ovations, the supplications, the temples and shrines, the feasts of couches, the religious rites, the gods and goddesses, the Capitol and the sacred fire; he must restore the provinces, colonies, municipalities and allies of the city that was mistress of the world.]

Bulephorus even adds the metaphor of the world as a stage to drive home his point: “Quocunq̄ue me verto, video mutata omnia, in alio sto proscenio, aliud conspicio theatrum, imo mundum alium” (Wherever I turn I see everything changed, I stand on a different stage, I see a different theater, a different world).²⁵ The humanist dramatists will turn this phrase into its literal sense: the stage of the world has changed, so the theater stage must change as well.

Prologues of Comoediae Sacrae

I will discuss the prologues and dedications of seven sacred comedies or collections of comedies, demonstrating how these Latin playwrights defended their new creations against a variety of criticisms, in order to show the similarity with Lope’s treatise. I will first discuss three famous comedies from northern humanists: the *Acolastus* by Guilielmus Gnapheus (1529), who was headmaster in The Hague before fleeing to Elbing because of his protestant sympathies; *Ioseph* by Cornelius Crocus (1535), headmaster in Amsterdam; and the *Anabion* or Lazarus play by Johannes Sapidus (1539), headmaster in Sélestat. Next, I will discuss *Gastrimargus* by the Spanish humanist Iacobus Romagnanus (1530s) and the Italian play *La strega* by Antonfrancesco Grazzini (1546). Lastly, I quote two later prologues by, respectively, the Dutch playwright Cornelius Schonaeus (1599) and the Spanish Jesuit Ludovicus Crucius (1605).

Gnapheus, *Acolastus* (1529)

Both Gnapheus and Crocus stress and defend the novelty of their plays. Gnapheus begins the prologue to his *Acolastus* by asking his public to contain their amazement at seeing new titles performed on stage. He

says he knows how people hate the word “new,” but counters that the story is not new, only the combination with comic verse is:

Notum omnibus
Est argumentum, quod palam tractabitur,
Sed comicis strictum metris.²⁶

[Everyone knows / the plot, which will be presented plainly / but arranged in comic meters.]

Furthermore, Gnapheus asserts that his aim is not to do better than Plautus or Terence. However, new pieces that are well written and well performed are better than second-rate performances of the Roman authors, which he compares to leftovers that are cooked over and over (“quod bonas male / Semel atque iterum recoxerint comoedias”; “that they badly reheat good comedies time and again”).²⁷ Here, Gnapheus defends novelty itself, even apart from the moral argument for a Christian makeover. His argument resembles that of Erasmus by saying that the best imitations are not the ones that follow their examples to the letter, but the ones that learn from their examples and do their own thing.

The polemic dialogue at the beginning of the *Acolastus* is based on the Terentian type of prologue. Instead of setting the scene for the story, as was Plautus’s habit, Terence used the prologue to attack his critics and justify his creative choices, especially in adapting Greek drama to the Roman stage. Emily Kearns states that “[a] good deal of Gnapheus’s motives for the particular form of the prologue to *Acolastus* will have been the desire to make his play as Terentian as possible.”²⁸ However, it is clear that the polemical aspect of Gnapheus’s prologue is not only an imitation of Terentian style but also carries a similar function, namely to assert the legitimacy of his own drama and the innovativeness of his choices with regard to the norms taken from classical drama. Gnapheus’s prologue goes further than Terence, however, because it defends a new form of drama, the biblical comedy with a didactic purpose.

Crocus, *Ioseph* (1535)

In the dedication and prologue of his *Ioseph* play, Cornelius Crocus equally stresses that his comedy is new: “Novamque, iam scriptam recens comoediam” (a new comedy, written only recently).²⁹ Crocus originally writes his play for performance by his pupils as part of the consecration of an Amsterdam church, after which it was printed and circulated as a popular school play in various parts of Europe. Sacred comedy is a

combination of a biblical theme and the form of Roman comedy. In his defense of the genre, Crocus plays out both of these elements against each other in order to justify his innovations. Most important to Crocus is of course the moral and didactic effectiveness of his play. At least as important, however, is the entertainment value of the play, which makes it effective. Crocus notes that staging amusing content produces much more didactic effect than heavy matters. His decision to center his Joseph play on the episode with Potiphar's wife is a result of this reasoning. He says that pupils will enjoy this episode most and that they will learn more because of the brevity of the play: "ut quum ipsa rei gestae fide, tum narrationis voluptate et gratia, quod dici solet, brevitate inescati, cupide percipiant animi dociles, teneantque fideles" (so that their docile and faithful minds will eagerly perceive the play and keep it in mind, because of their faith in the story and the pleasure and charm of the narrative, which entices by its brevity, as they say).³⁰

Next to this didactic argument, he uses the classical rules of the unity of time and place to justify his possibly controversial abridgment of the biblical narrative. At the same time, he stresses that the morals of his play are the complete opposite of those of Roman comedy:

Apporto nanque, non Plauti aut Terentij,
 Quas esse fictas nostis omnes fabulas,
 Vanas, prophanas, ludicras ac lubricas:
 Verum ueram, sacramque porto, et seriam,
 Castam, pudicam³¹

[I bring you nothing of Plautus or Terence; / You know that their plays are all made up, / False, profane, ludicrous and deceitful. / I bring you a play that is true, sacred, serious, / Chaste, and virtuous]

That Crocus's treatment of the story was perceived as innovative and controversial by his contemporaries is proven by the criticism he received from Sixt Birck, who says in the prologue to his Susanna play that the character of Potiphar's wife is at least as depraved as Terentius's prostitutes.³² Moreover, Crocus's abridgement of the plot seems also to have been perceived as too innovative, as it prompted no following even among the imitators and admirers of the play. Almost all other plays about Joseph tell the protagonist's complete story.³³ In short, Crocus uses the rule of the unity of time and place to defend his abridgment of the biblical story, and he uses the moral lesson of the story to defend his use of humor. Imitation of the classics and adherence to the norms is not a goal in itself: both the abridgment and the humor serve to make the play as entertaining as possible, and the entertainment value of the play in turn serves its moral effectiveness.

Sapidus, *Anabion* (1539)

Johannes Sapidus calls his Lazarus play *Anabion* a “comoedia nova et sacra.”³⁴ He wrote his play for the inauguration of a new humanist school in Strasbourg, where Joannes Sturm was to be rector. It initiated a new kind of school drama in the Protestant city, where hitherto the other humanist schools had only performed classical plays.³⁵ In this context, Sapidus feels the need to defend the novelty of his play. His prologue is at least as polemical in tone as that of Gnapheus and is characterized by a disregard for the classical norms that strongly anticipates Lope’s *Arte Nuevo*. He begins by citing Terence that there are as many opinions as there are people, and that is it impossible to please everyone. He then lists all the criticisms that the play is likely to attract, refuting their arguments but also showing that the various critics disagree among themselves and ask for opposing things.

For instance, there will be the overzealously pious critics who will say that it is sacrilegious to write about sacred things in a comic style (“quod comicis modis sacras res tradimus”). Sapidus counters that his play is not without precedent:

Quum prodiere nuper una et altera
Ex literis sumptae sacris comoediae
Quas exhiberi vidimus magno omnium
Spectantium applausu.³⁶

[Recently there have appeared one or two / sacred comedies taken from the holy book, / which met with great applause / from all the onlookers.]

Sapidus might well have been speaking about the plays by Gnapheus and Crocus. The latter’s *Ioseph* was reprinted in 1537 both in Strasbourg, where Sapidus worked, and in Cologne with the printer Johann Gymnich, where Sapidus published his own *Anabion* two years later. The argument that there are others writing similar comedies does not directly contradict the charge of sacrilege, but rather places the play within a larger context, the new genre of sacred comedy. Moreover, like Lope de Vega, Sapidus justifies his play by referring to the popularity of the genre and the applause of the public.

On the opposite side of the sacrilege argument, Sapidus places those who “care nothing about sacred matters” and who dislike the gravity of a sacred story (“nimis severa sanctimonia”) on stage. But Sapidus’s goal is to “Christianize, not paganize.”³⁷ Here, he follows his friend Erasmus’s concept of competitive imitation: instead of slavishly imitating classical texts, modern authors should enrich their texts with their Christian faith and reach even higher standards than possible in a pre-Christian world.³⁸

Like Erasmus, and like Lope seventy years later, Sapidus stresses that literature must go with the times and should not be tied to centuries-old rules. He says:

At cum suis, et pro suis, certo modo
 Si sit nephas aliena sensa tradere,
 Quod hactenus factum optimis autoribus:
 Foret ante mille annos abolita licentia
 Ususque scribendi, statutis legibus.³⁹

[But if it is in any way wrong to translate foreign meanings / with one's own people and for the sake of one's own people, / which the best authors have always done, / then the liberty to write and the custom of writing / would have been abolished since more than a thousand years, / with the establishment of rules as law.]

This does not only pertain to content but also to style. Sapidus says that other critics might disapprove of his use of German proverbs in his Latin play, to which he responds that the play is after all meant to be performed in Germania.

He ends his prologue with a popular tale ("fabula vulgi") about a farmer who brings his donkey to the market, is repeatedly criticized for the manner in which he does so, concludes that it is impossible to do right for everyone, and eventually throws his donkey in the river out of frustration. Sapidus has no need to throw his play into the water, because he has learned from this tale not to try to please everyone. To the criticism that his characters lack the right decorum, he responds that anyone who is not happy about it can sue him. Lastly, he mentions the charge that his comedy sometimes approaches the serious matters and passions that belong more appropriately to tragedy. His response is that the times have changed and literature must change as well:

At nos nec potuimus nec volumus sequi
 Artem atque morem, quem tenuit antiquitas.
 Nam aetate nostra, prisco ab isto tempore,
 Rerum alia facies, ordo et institutio,
 Alius modus vitae, alius est cultus Dei,
 Alia hominum communicatio invicem,
 Non publice solum, sed et domestice:
 Unde et alia ratione scribendi est opus.

[But we were not able and did not want to follow / the art and the habits of Antiquity. / Because our age, since that early time, / has a different outlook, political and institutional order, / a different way of living, a different religion, / different ways of interacting between people, / in public as well as personal: / and therefore we need a different way of writing.]⁴⁰

He adds that he does not care how others call his play. He himself has chosen to name it a comedy, but others can call it a tragicomedy or even

a “planipedia,” a word that refers to a kind of Roman mime, as long as they do not use the term “ludus” with the intention of ridiculing the play.

Like Gnapheus’s *Acolastus* and Crocus’s *Joseph*, the *Anabion* quickly became very popular and was printed in many places: two years in a row in Strasbourg (1539, 1540), twice in Cologne (1539, 1541), once in Antwerp (1540), and a later reprinting in Augsburg (1565). In 1546, the Basel professor Heinrich Pantaleon repeated some of his remarks in his own “*Comoedia nova et sacra*” about Zacchaeus, the New Testament converted tax collector. Pantaleon simply refers anyone who has a problem with the sacred comedy to Sapidus’s prologue.

Romagnanus, *Gastrimargus* (1530s)

I now turn to the example of a similar prologue by a Spanish humanist. Iacobus Romagnanus (Jaime Romañá / Jaume Romanyà) was a schoolmaster on the island of Mallorca. We do not have many Latin plays from sixteenth-century Spain, and his *Nova Tragicomoedia Gastrimargus* is exceptional in this respect. The play was performed on May 2 in the year 1562, as a notice on the first folio of the extant manuscript tells us, in the Plaza Mayor before an audience of eight thousand.⁴¹ The prologue, however, states that the play was performed in the house of Honoratus Ioannis, the Valencian humanist who studied with Luis Vives in Leuven during the twenties of the sixteenth century. This Ioannis, a famous Ciceronian with a huge network, returned to Valencia during the thirties. It is probably during these years and in this place that the *Gastrimargus* was first performed. Like Sapidus’s play, *Gastrimargus* too is about a Lazarus, but not about the brother of Martha and Mary whom Jesus brings back to life. Rather, Romagnanus’s tragicomedy treats the parable about the rich man and the poor Lazarus recounted in the Gospel of Luke chapter 16. The play is a typical example of the sacred comedy because it fits the biblical parable into a Terentian stylistic mold and language.

The prologue again stresses the generic novelty of the play. Romagnanus first calls it a comedy, written about a new theme and according to a new comic logic: “*comoediam novo argumento et ratione nova comica contextam*” (a comedy telling a new story and composed according to a new logic of comedy).⁴² This new logic consists in the fact that the comedy “transgresses its boundaries,” from comedy into tragic upheaval and terror.⁴³ Mixing joy with sorrow, it can rightly be called a tragicomedy, as the prologue notes. Romagnanus gives

three examples of tragicomedies, those that were at that time “apud Hispanos celebratissima et gratissima” (the most famous and popular among the Spanish).⁴⁴ These are Gnapheus’s *Acolastus*; the Spanish *Tragedia llamada Josefina*, a play about the patriarch Joseph published in 1535 by Miguel de Carvajal; and the *Comedia Celestina* by Fernando de Rojas. Like Sapidus, Romagnanus situates his tragicomedy in a line of popular predecessors. Whereas Sapidus situated his play in the genre of the Latin sacred comedy, Romagnanus is more concerned with the term “tragicomedy” and also mentions the two most famous humanist plays written in the Spanish language. The prologue does not differentiate between the Latin and the Spanish plays: all three use the “new method” of mixing comedy and tragedy, and all three are insanely popular. Their popularity justifies the use of the new method.

Like the *Acolastus* prologue, the prologue to *Gastrimargus* addresses an imagined critic in the audience:

Sed quid tu, livide, obmurmuras,
rem non dicere seriam facere ludicram?⁴⁵

[But what are you mumbling spitefully under your breath, / saying that one should not make fun of serious matters?]

The answer is taken from Horace: “Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?” (What argues against speaking the truth while laughing?).⁴⁶ Laughter and serious matters do not mutually exclude each other. Romagnanus adds:

Quid prohibet nos populo ad spectaculum allecto
aperire quae via nos ad Tartara praecipitet,
quae ad superos euelet beatosque faciat?⁴⁷

[What is wrong with drawing people to a spectacle / in order to show them which road leads straight to hell / and which road leads us upward to beatitude?]

In other words, a spectacle like this play is much more didactically effective than other forms of writing or speaking. This justifies the combination of comedy and biblical parables. Romagnanus clearly situates himself in the line of humanists composing sacred comedies, or at least in the line of Gnapheus’s *Acolastus*. His familiarity with the northern humanists probably stemmed from his contact with the circle around Honoratus Ioannis. However, as I have noted, when Romagnanus calls his play “nova,” he is referring to the intergeneric mix of comedy and tragedy rather than to the mix of comical and biblical that is also central to his play. This seems associated with his mention of the Spanish tragicomedies, and it might be specific to the Spanish context.

Grazzini, *La strega* (1546)

Next, I will quote the Italian poet and playwright Antonfrancesco Grazzini.⁴⁸ In the introduction to his comedy *La strega*, written in 1546, the provocative Grazzini stages a debate between the personifications of *Prologo* (the prologue) and *Argomento* (the argument), the two traditional elements prefixed to humanist drama.⁴⁹ The figure of Prologo defends prescriptive theories of drama, whereas the figure of Argomento argues for innovation. The latter begins by stating that a prologue is no longer necessary nowadays. In the tradition of Plautus, the prologue usually says something about the scene where the play is set and about the author. Argomento argues that it is clear to all, from the stage design, that *La strega* is set in Florence, and that the name of the author hardly matters, if at all (“poco importa, o niente”). Prologo asks whether there is no need for a different function of the prologue, namely to urge the audience to be silent and attentive. There is no need for such an admonition, quips Argomento, if the play is entertaining, smart, and performed by good actors. He expresses his opinion that you do not find these qualities in the plays performed in the palaces of the nobles, but that you have to turn to acting companies to find them.

Grazzini then begins bad-mouthing the Italian *commedia erudita* and *commedia grave*, characterized by their imitation of the classical form and by their seriousness and pathos. Even by casting his introduction in the form of a debate, Grazzini parodies the *commedia grave*, which loved to include debates on moral topics.⁵⁰ Grazzini, or rather Argomento, defends the extreme position that drama does not need to be didactic but primarily entertaining. He says, “Hoggidi non si v`a pi`u` `a veder recitare Comedie per imparare `a vivere, ma per piacere, per spasso, per diletto, e per passar maninconia, e per rallegrarsi” (Nowadays people no longer go to see the comedies to learn how to live, but for pleasure, amusement, delight, to get rid of melancholy and to have a good time).⁵¹ With a sentence that reminds of Erasmus but especially of Sapidus, Grazzini contends that new times ask for a different kind of drama: “Tu armeggi fratello; Aristotile, e Oratio, viddero i tempi loro, ma i nostri sono d’un’altra maniera, habbiamo altri costumi, altra religione, e altro modo di vivere, e per`o bisogna fare le Comedie in altro modo” (You miss the point, brother. Aristotle and Horace saw their own times, but ours are of another kind; we have other manners, another religion, and another way of living, and therefore comedies must be made in another

fashion).⁵² Like the other authors I discussed, and like Lope, Grazzini offers the perspective of a playwright caught between the demands of prescriptive dramatic theory and the expectations of the audience.

Schonaeus and Crucius

I will give two later examples of arguments about the need for drama to change with the times, in order to show how this becomes a regular argument in favor of generic innovation in drama. The Dutch headmaster Cornelius Schonaeus, who worked in Haarlem, writes in the prologue to his biblical drama *Triumphus Christi* (1599): “Nunc nostra aetas aliam vitam, alios mores postulat. Neque enim quae tantum delectent, aut quae voluptatis illecebris in animos auditorum influant” (Now our time requires a different way of living and different habits, not things that merely entertain or that pour thoughts of seductive pleasures into the minds of the listeners).⁵³ With Schonaeus, we return to the didactic sacred drama of the northern humanists. Note how the “changing times” argument is used differently in this tradition than by Grazzini. Schonaeus criticizes the ancients for doing everything to keep the audience entertained, which is exactly the ideal of Grazzini. Both, however, are against an overly strict imitation of classical drama. Schonaeus wants to trade in classical plot elements such as love intrigues with prostitutes and the tricks of the cunning slave against biblical drama and Christian morality. Grazzini wants to transfer these elements to a contemporary context. But Grazzini also reacts against the Italian genre of the *commedia grave*, which shares with Schonaeus the combination of classical forms of drama with moralization and gravitas. The argument of the changing times therefore does not always serve the same purpose. However, it is always used against the strict imitation of the classics and in favor of generic innovation.

My second example is a preface by the Portuguese Jesuit playwright Luis da Cruz, or Ludovicus Crucius/Cruceus. The Jesuits were the inheritors of the humanist sacred drama. They were not so fond of comedy, preferring Senecan tragedy and heroic drama with martyrs as protagonists, although in the decades right after the establishment of the order, they also performed many humanist comedies like the ones by Cornelius Crocus and Georgius Macropedius in their entirety.⁵⁴ The Jesuits share with the humanist schoolmasters the important role of drama in their educational program. In general, Jesuit playwrights elevate this didactic aspect above prescriptive theories of drama. Ignatius of Loyola

had categorized Terence's dramas as texts that were not to be used as textbooks, similar to the works of Erasmus and Vives. Jesuits rather used purged versions of Terence, read the sacred comedies of the northern humanists, and of course composed their own drama in abundance.⁵⁵

In the preface to the 1605 edition of his collected plays, Ludovicus Crucius claims that an entertaining plot is more important than following Aristotelian or Horatian rules. He states this while defending himself against accusations of not writing drama according to the rules. He says he was reproached for not abiding by Horace's rule that no more than three actors should be speaking at once. The number of actors in Crucius's plays is much higher than usual in Antiquity because of the wish to give a large number of students a speaking part. Crucius also mentions the accusation that his plays violate the dignity of Antiquity. Instead of trying to justify his plays according to these classical standards, Crucius makes clear that he has no wish to abide by them:

Lector optime, aduerte. Primum quis pro ea re decertabit, quam tempora antiquarunt? Vbi Athenae illae? Vbi forum populi Romani? Vbi ludi Megalenses? Vbi circus et theatra? Si haec omnia interierunt; cur requiremus, quae cum vigeabant, poetae facitabant? Deinde ista nostra parabantur non externis spectantibus, quibus in poemate antiquitas cordi est, vt in pictura, sed Lusitanis, Academiaeque Conimbricensi, in qua si quid illo vetusto more ederetur, fortasse non placuisset.⁵⁶

[Dear reader, please listen to my answer. First, who will defend something that time has made obsolete? Where is this Athens? Where is the forum of the Roman people? Where is their Megalensia festival? Where are their circuses and theaters? If all of this is gone, why do we require our poets to imitate the things that were popular then? Moreover, my plays were not written for foreign spectators, who are fond of Antiquity in their poetry and in their painting, but for the Portuguese and the Academy of Coimbra, where people would perhaps not like it if plays adhered to those ancient rules.]

Again, we encounter the same arguments as in the prologues of the humanists: why should we adhere to the precepts of the ancients, when the times are different, the place is different, and the public wants something else? Like Sapidus and Grazzini, Crucius situates his play in the local performance context, the Jesuit college in Coimbra, and prioritizes the wishes of this local public.

Conclusion

I have argued that if we want to understand the background of Lope de Vega's unique dramaturgic treatise, we can look at treatises on drama, but we can also look at other theoretical arguments tied to the

practical performance context of drama. Such texts are the prologues of humanist plays, which (once they appear in print) link the play text to the performance context by alluding to the performance and the audience. I have highlighted two arguments in favor of innovation that these prologues share with the *Arte Nuevo* and that distinguishes them from most theoretical dramaturgic treatises. The first is that drama must reflect society and change with the times; the second and related argument is that the entertainment of the audience is more important than theoretical precepts. Erasmus in his *Ciceronianus* makes the same kind of argument in favor of practicality and common sense, which shows how these arguments about theater tie in with a general attitude toward classical normative precepts. But we can also see how the use of these arguments has an impact in drama that is distinctive to the genre: they defend not only stylistic but also generic innovation, namely the creation of tragicomedy. Lope uses them to defend the Spanish *comedia nueva*, with its tragicomic mix of noble and plebeian characters; serious or historical events and trivial, everyday plotlines; and great deeds and exciting romantic encounters. Lope does not just defend his own way of writing or a singular breach of decorum, but a new genre and a new manner of writing plays. In the same way, the humanists defend not only their own plays but also the concept of a sacred comedy, which applies the art of classical comedy to a biblical story and a didactic context.⁵⁷ They refer to each other's plays in order to justify their own: Sapidus refers to other writers of sacred comedies, and Romagnanus specifically mentions Gnapheus, Carvajal, and Rojas. Whether they defend themselves against accusations that they treat the Bible irreverently, or that they besmirch the gravitas of tragedy, or that they disrespect classical precepts in other ways, all of these playwrights are also giving shape to new generic constellations in drama. These forms of tragicomedy are suited to new audiences, functions, times, and places, and they devote themselves to entertaining their audience, whether this entertainment becomes a goal in itself or serves a further moral or doctrinal goal. Although we cannot be certain how well acquainted Lope was with the Latin sacred comedies, we know that they were prominent on the international book market and that they were staples in school drama everywhere in Europe, especially during the first decades of the new Jesuit schools. It is therefore not unlikely that Lope's apologetic treatise for the Spanish *comedia nueva* owes some of its arguments and tone to defenses of the Latin *comœdia sacra*.

Notes

1. Juan Manuel Rozas, *Significado y doctrina del Arte nuevo de Lope de Vega* (Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería, 1976), 11. This article was written within the scope of the Dutch Research Council (NWO)–funded project “TransLatin: The Transnational Impact of Latin Drama from the Early Modern Netherlands.”
2. Marta Albalá Pelegrín, “El Arte Nuevo de Lope de Vega a la luz de la teoría dramática italiana contemporánea: Poliziano, Robortello, Guarini y el Abad de Rute,” *EHumanista* 24 (2013): 1–15; Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez, Rafael González Cañal, and Elena E. Marcello, eds., *El “Arte nuevo de hacer comedias” en su contexto europeo: congreso internacional, Almagro, 29, 29 y 30 de enero de 2009, Corral de Comedias 27* (Ciudad Real: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 2010); Lope de Vega, *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias. Edición crítica y anotada. Fuentes y ecos latinos*, ed. Felipe B. Pedraza and Pedro Conde Parrado (Ciudad Real: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla La Mancha, 2016); J. Enrique Duarte and Carlos Mata Induráin, eds., *El “Arte Nuevo” de Lope y La Preceptiva Dramática Del Siglo de Oro: Teoría y Práctica, RILCE: Revista de Filología Hispánica* 27, no. 1 (2011).
3. Joaquín Pascual Barea, “Neo-Latin Drama in Spain, Portugal and Latin America,” in *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Jan Bloemendal and Howard B. Norland (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 545–631, here 552.
4. Barea, “Neo-Latin Drama,” 552. See also Julio Alonso Asenjo, “Introducción al teatro de colegio de los jesuitas hispanos (siglo XVI),” in *La “Tragedia de San Hermenegildo” y otras obras del Teatro Español de Colegio* (Valencia: UNED-Universidad de Sevilla-Universitat de València, 1995), 13–81; Orlando E. Saa, *El teatro escolar de los jesuitas en España* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Slusa, 1990); Alejandro Arteaga Martínez, “El teatro jesuita novohispano: ¿Cuál es el estado de la cuestión?,” in *De Amicitia et Doctrina: Homenaje a Martha Elena Venier*, ed. Luis Fernando Lara, Reynaldo Yunuen Ortega, and Martha Lilia Tenorio (El Colegio de Mexico, 2007), 77–102; Jesús Menéndez Peláez, *Los jesuitas y el teatro en el Siglo de Oro* (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1995).
5. Petrus Papeus, and Alexius Vanegas, *Parables on a Roman Comic Stage: Samarites—Comoedia de Samaritano Evangelico, 1539 by Petrus Papeus: Together with the Commentary of Alexius Vanegas of Toledo, 1542*, ed. Daniel Nodes (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2017).
6. Nigel Griffin, “Lewin Brecht, Miguel Venegas, and the School Drama: Some Further Observations,” *Humanitas*, nos. 35–36 (1984): 19–86.
7. Asenjo, “Introducción,” 13. See also Jean-Marie Valentin, “Aux origins du théâtre néo-latin de la réforme catholique: L’*Euripus* (1549) de Livinus Brechtus,” *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, no. 21 (1972): 81–188.
8. Jan Bloemendal, “Neo-Latin Drama in the Low Countries,” in Bloemendal and Norland, *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*, 293–364; Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford, eds., *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008); James A. Parente, *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition: Christian Theater in Germany and in the Netherlands, 1500–1680* (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1987); Marvin Theodore Herrick, *Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France and England* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955), 16–62.
9. Melveena McKendrick, *Theatre in Spain 1490–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 38–40.

10. Vicente Picón García, "El teatro neo-latino humanístico y escolar en España en el siglo XVI," in *Teatro neolatino em Portugal no contexto da Europa. 450 Anos de Diogo de Teive*, ed. Sebastião Tavares de Pinho (Coimbra: Coimbra University Press, 2006), 39–95; Barea, "Neo-Latin Drama."
11. Picón García, "El teatro neo-latino"; Julio Alonso Asenjo, "El teatro del humanista Hércules Floro," *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Literari. Homenatge a Amelia García-Valdecasas*, ed. Ferran Carbó et al., no. 1 (1995): 32–50.
12. Barea, "Neo-Latin Drama," 552.
13. Lope de Vega, *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo: Dirigido a la Academia de Madrid*, ed. Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez (Almagro and Madrid: Festival de Teatro Clásico de Almagro; Sociedad Estatal de Conmemoraciones Culturales, 2009), vv. 209–10.
14. Sofie Kluge, "A Hermaphrodite? Lope de Vega and the Controversy of Tragicomedy," *Comparative Drama* 41, no. 3 (2007): 300; María Rosa Álvarez Sellers, "'Lo trágico y lo cómico mezclado': lope de vega y la creación de la tragedia 'al estilo español,'" in *Callando pasan los ligeros años . . .*: *El Lope de Vega joven y el teatro antes de 1609*, ed. Héctor Brioso Santos and Alexandra Chereches (Madrid: Liceus, 2012), 48.
15. Kluge, "A Hermaphrodite?"
16. Kluge, "A Hermaphrodite?," 303.
17. Albalá Pelegrín, "El Arte Nuevo."
18. Aelius Donatus and Eugraphius, *Quod fertur commentum Terenti; accedunt Eugraphi commentum et scholia Bembina*, ed. Paul Wessner (Leipzig: Teubner, 1902), V.1 (p. 22).
19. Albalá Pelegrín, "El Arte Nuevo," 5.
20. Albalá Pelegrín, "El Arte Nuevo," 8.
21. See Jan Bloemendal, "Neo-Latin Drama in the Low Countries," 331.
22. Charles Fantazzi, "Imitation, Emulation, Ciceronianism, Anti-Ciceronianism," in *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, ed. Philip J. Ford, Jan Bloemendal, and Charles Fantazzi (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014), 141.
23. Erasmus, *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi: Ordinis primi tomus secundus*, ed. J. C. Margolin and P. Mesnard (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971) (ASD), 619; Betty I. Knott, "Ciceronianus," in *Literary and Educational Writings*, ed. A. H. T. Levi, vol. 6, *Collected Works of Erasmus* 28 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986) (CWE), 360.
24. ASD I, 2: 636; CWE 26:383.
25. ASD I, 2: 637; CWE 26:383.
26. Guilielmus Gnapheus, *Acolastus*, ed. P. Minderaa, Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken 15 (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1956), 58. Erasmus also employed the *theatrum mundi* metaphor in his *Praise of Folly*, ASD IV, III: 104.
27. Gnapheus, *Acolastus*, 60.
28. Emily Kearns, "The Prologues of Comoedia Sacra and Their Classical Models," in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis: Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies: Toronto, 8 August to 13 August, 1988*, ed. Alexander Dalzell, Richard J. Schoeck, and Charles Fantazzi (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1991), 406.
29. Cornelius Crocus, *Ioseph: Editie met inleiding, vertaling en aantekeningen*, ed. Jan Bloemendal (Amersfoort: Florivallis, 2010), 84.
30. Crocus, *Ioseph*, 68.
31. Crocus, *Ioseph*, 84.
32. Xystus Betuleius, *Susanna Comoedia Tragica* (Köln: Johann I. Gymnich, 1538), 9–10. "Iuvat Ioseph magis audire? Sed / Terentius nullum scortum

- impudentius / Petulantiusue inducit, quam sit Sefpirach.” (Is it better to go watch a play about Joseph? But / Terence never brought such a shameless and reprobate prostitute on stage as is Sefpirach. [Sefpirach is the name Crocus gives to Potiphar’s wife.])
33. Jean Lebeau, *Salvator mundi: L’ “Exemple” de Joseph dans le théâtre allemand au XVIe siècle* (Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1977); Ruprecht Wimmer, *Jesuitentheater: Didaktik und Fest: das Exemplum des ägyptischen Joseph auf den deutschen Bühnen der Gesellschaft Jesu* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1982).
 34. Johannes Sapidus, *Anabion: Text Lateinisch und Deutsch*, ed. Wolfgang F. Michael and Douglass Parker (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991).
 35. Parente, *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition*, 41.
 36. Sapidus, *Anabion*, 30.
 37. Sapidus, *Anabion*, 31.
 38. Parente, *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition*, 40.
 39. Sapidus, *Anabion*, 32.
 40. Sapidus, *Anabion*, 36.
 41. Julio Alonso Asenjo and Manuel Molina Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus’, tragicomedia humanística de J. Romañá / Romanyà,” *TeatrEsco* 1 (2006).
 42. Asenjo and Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus,’” 34.
 43. Asenjo and Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus,’” 34.
 44. Asenjo and Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus,’” 34.
 45. Asenjo and Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus,’” 35.
 46. Horatius, “Sermones,” I, 1, 24–25.
 47. Asenjo and Sánchez, “‘Gastrimargus,’” 35.
 48. I have found this play in Marvin T. Herrick, “The New Drama of the Sixteenth Century,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 54, no. 4 (1955): 555–77.
 49. For the modern edition, see Antonio Francesco Grazzini, *La strega*, ed. Michel Plaisance (Abbeville: F. Paillart, 1976). I have consulted: Antonio Francesco Grazzini, *La strega: Comedia* (Venice: Appresso Bernardo Giunti, e fratelli, 1582). The Universal Short Title Catalogue records no less than eighty-four copies of this work.
 50. Louise George Clubb, *Italian Drama in Shakespeare’s Time* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 54.
 51. Grazzini, *La strega*, 11v.
 52. Grazzini, *La strega*, 12v. Translation taken from Herrick, “The New Drama of the Sixteenth Century,” 560.
 53. Cornelius Schonaeus, *Terentius Christianus: Seu comoediae sacrae sex* (Köln: Gerard Greuenbruch, 1614), 91.
 54. Jesús Menéndez Peláez, “Los jesuitas y el teatro en el Siglo de Oro: Repertorio de obras conservadas y de referencia,” *Archivum: Revista de La Facultad de Filosofía y Letras* 54–55 (2004): 421–563; Martínez, “El teatro jesuita novohispano”; Saa, *El teatro escolar de los jesuitas en España*.
 55. Manuel Molina Sánchez, “Plauto y Terencio en el renacimiento español: La tragicomedia Gastrimargus de Jaime Romañá,” *Florentia Iliberritana* 18 (2007): 316.
 56. Ludovicus Crucius, *Tragicae, comicaeq[ue] actiones a regio artium collegio societatis iesu, datae conimbricæ in publicum theatrum* (Lyon: Cardon Roussin, 1605).
 57. Herrick, “The New Drama of the Sixteenth Century”; Herrick, *Tragicomedy*, 25.

Huygens Institute for the History and Culture of the Netherlands
 dinah.wouters@huygens.knaw.nl

