

OF CAUTIVAS AND COLLARES: RE-FIGURING THE IDEOLOGY BEHIND *A LO DIVINO* POETRY

Tyler Fisher
Magdalen College
University of Oxford

At the close of the sixteenth century a Cistercian abbot, Lorenzo de Zamora, penned an *Apología contra los que reprehenden el uso de las humanas letras* and included it as a preface to a re-edition of his massive theological treatise, *Monarquía mística de la Iglesia*.¹ Overall, the arguments of Zamora's apology represent a standard defense of the study of secular literature and pagan myths, as well as standard prescriptions for how a Christian writer or preacher could properly use such texts in the composition of sermons and edifying literature. His justifications and admonitions frequently reflect those of similar Patristic apologies, such as Basil the Great's "On the Right Use of Greek Poetry" and Justin Martyr's *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, which endorse the use of select aspects of Hellenic learning for their compatibility with Christian doctrine. Zamora revives these ideas by applying them to contemporary Spanish literature. He broadens his apology's application by conflating scholarly study with textual production, the writing of homilies with the composition of literature for wholesome entertainment, and Græco-Roman myths, pagan philosophies, and classical poetry with various genres of contemporary, secular literature. In keeping with the ideology of his age, he treats the categories "pagan," "secular," and "Gentile" as interchangeable synonyms; "letras humanas" and "letras divinas" are the two broad categories in dynamic opposition for Zamora. At times, Zamora's manner of updating and conflating obscures his objective and message, but it also allows for fruitful and wide-ranging treatments of traditional arguments, as we shall see in his exposition of Old Testament figures in relation to the use of secular literature.

Zamora organizes his *Apología* like St. Thomas Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*, by adopting a quasi-forensic format. He begins by presenting in a very convincing manner objections to the position he will take, then states his position, and finally answers the objections in order. For the sake of providing context, I will summarize Zamora's argument now. The opening pages of the *Apología* take up three reasons in support

of an outright ban on the use of secular literature—reasons which Zamora claims had once convinced him but which he has since rejected after long study.

First, Plato expels poets from his ideal *polis*. Likewise, the Spartans, according to Plutarch, banished the influential Greek lyricist Archilochus for his imprudent verse. Such poets, Zamora writes, are justly rejected “como a artífice[s] de mentiras, y fabricador[es] de novelas poeticas” (fol. A_{1v}). It is the old, stock charge: poets are liars—otiose fabulists at best, and dangerous falsifiers at worst.

The second reason follows from the first, in presenting a corresponding rejection by the Church. Many of the “santos padres de la Iglesia Griega y Latina,” Zamora notes, have repudiated secular knowledge and literature as having no place in the Church. They discard even Aristotle, Pindar, and Aesop as the origin of heresies. The “buen Teólogo” should know nothing of them (fol. A_{4r}).

Finally, there is Scriptural basis for renouncing the study and use of secular letters. Zamora cites five biblical passages which he identifies as standard ammunition for those who object, without qualification, to secular texts for Christian readers. A representative example is Isaiah 1.22, calling Israel to repentance.² The Authorized Version renders the verse as follows: “Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water;” and Zamora, presumably adopting the voice of his opponents, glosses the passage broadly: “Son tus predicadores, pueblo mío, taverberos alevosos y traydores, que mezclan con la pureza del vino de mi palabra, el agua turbia y cenagosa de las dotrinas ajenas” (fols. A_{4v}-A_{5r}). Christian truth, he goes on, should not be mixed like a cheap alloy with “dotrinas ajenas” and artificial, rhetorical adornment. Rather, one should heed St. Paul’s admonitions to Timothy: Maintain a steadfast adherence to the preaching of unadorned truth, for a time will come when men will spurn pure teachings in favour of doctrine that is “afeytada con fábulas y poesías vanas,” as Zamora’s fanciful gloss has it (fol. A_{6r}; cf. II Timothy 4.3-4).

Having stated these three opposing arguments, “pesando desapasionadamente [...] las razones” as he claims (fol. A_{1r}), Zamora proceeds to make his case. He marshals seven *razones* in support of the use of secular literature, the first five of which are accompanied by *reglas* for how a Christian author or preacher might have acceptable recourse to secular texts. Because several of the *razones* are little more than variations on a theme, the following summary will abbreviate and combine them accordingly.

First, whatever truths are contained in secular literature or pagan philosophy are not inimical to Christian truth but complement it, for they derive ultimately from the same source: Christ, “que es primera

verdad por esencia: y assí qualquiera verdad ha de ser participación suya" (fol. A_{7r}). If, then, all truth originates in Christ, the first rule regarding teachings found in non-Christian texts is that they be evaluated with reason and appropriated with judicious moderation. The study of pagan literature is neither illicit nor unprofitable, Zamora reiterates, or else Daniel would have refused such study along with the unlawful pagan foods he declines in Daniel, Chapter 1, and St. Stephen would not have esteemed Moses's mastery of Egyptians lore. Moreover, Zamora cites examples of patristic texts which press profane literature into their service for illustration of divine truth.

The mention of Moses in Egypt leads Zamora to his *segunda razón*. Just as the Hebrew slaves of the Exodus ransacked the choicest treasures of Egypt on their departure, the Church Fathers studied secular letters and rightly plundered them to advance the Faith. So, too, can writers of today, Zamora argues, if they choose only the best and reform the base, to render secular texts usable. This is the second rule.

The third *razón* provides the basis for the remainder that follow. Now the previous idea of plundering is turned on its head as Zamora, following the claims of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, asserts that anything true and worthy in the ancient poets and philosophers was itself stolen from Moses and the sacred Hebrew scriptures. Therefore, one can justifiably make use of such purloined truth (via secondary sources, as it were), with moderation and prudence, as Rule Three prescribes.

According to Zamora, the ancient Hebrews, beginning with Moses, drew on pagan wisdom. Aside from the respective educations of Moses in Egypt and Daniel in Babylon, however, he does not specify how this occurred. The ancient pagans, for their part, culled sacred truth from whatever traces of the Mosaic revelation might persist under the guise of Egyptian hieroglyphs. As evidence for this interchange between Gentile and Hebrew Scriptures, Zamora makes an extensive list of fantastic figures (sirens, dragons, satyrs and fauns, Titans, giants, and centaurs) which appear in both pagan mythology and the Old Testament. Dubious translations and etymologies serve to corroborate his claims. Because of this presumed shared heritage for pagan and Judaeo-Christian mythologies, Zamora continues, the saints can legitimately quote pagan poetry, as the Apostle Paul does when preaching to the Areopagites in Athens.³ Besides adding attractive variety to a Christian text, such quotations from secular literature can serve as useful illustrations. The myths of the sirens, Zamora attests, provide a compelling illustration of the dangers of loose women, though such illustrations must be used with a view to the audience and the occasion. They are most permissible in university sermons

where the audience will recognize the allusions; they are least permissible in popular homilies during Lent and Eastertide. Moreover, reference to ancient classical literature is necessary for rightly interpreting scriptural passages that deal with the finer points of the natural sciences and obsolete customs of the ancient Near East. Indeed, some difficult passages of the Bible cannot be properly understood without consulting contemporary pagan texts for relevant context.

Finally, to clinch his argument, Zamora offers these parting shots: Even those texts which are most clearly the workmanship of the devil can and should be turned against him. The Old Testament proverbs, after all, recommend the study of all sorts of literature. And has not God, in times past, bestowed some prophetic abilities even on pagans? Zamora answers in the affirmative, pointing to the oracles of Balaam in Numbers 22-24. Wholesale rejection of secular literature, then, is not only unfounded and unnecessary but also unadvised.

Two illustrative figures stand out in Zamora's apology, figures extracted from the Old Testament to expound his second and fourth rules for how a Christian writer could reclaim, reform, or incorporate a secular text as a new, edifying work. First, expurgating and refashioning a text is analogous to an Israelite's cleansing and assimilating a captive Gentile woman as his wife. Second, enhancing the efficacy of a Christian text by drawing on secular writings for suitable variety and substantiation is like moulding the intermingled gold and silver jewelry which the lover promises his beloved in the Song of Songs.

It is worth quoting Zamora's exposition of the captive Gentile at length for the sake of reference during the following discussion:

Mandaba Dios en el Levitico, que si ganada por fuerza de armas la batalla, alguno de los vencedores entre el despojo del trofeo hallasse alguna muger hermosa, y quisiesse casarse con ella, que le cortassen los cabellos, y las uñas, y lavandola pudiesse casarse con ella. Que quiere dezir el Espiritu santo debaxo de los perfiles desta pintura (dize S. Cirilio Alexandrino)⁴ sino que si en la letura de los libros humanos hallamos una joya hermosa, algun punto curioso, algun concepto delgado, que lo desnudemos de lo que a Gentilidad sabe, y nos aprovechemos del? [...] *Si adamaueris mulierem captiuam id est scientiam secularem, & pulchritudinem eius* (dize S. Geronymo) *decalua eam, & inlecebras crinium, atque ornamenta uerborum cum tenacibus unguib[us] seca, & requiescens cum ea dicit: sinistra eius sub capite meo, & dextera ipsius amplexabitur me, & multos tibi captiua foetus dabit.*⁵ Si te enamoras de la hermosura y gracia de la letura de los Gentiles, de aquellos dichos agudos, de aquellos pensamientos admirables, que a cada passo en sus libros resplandecen: cortales los cabellos, y las uñas, quitales las superfluydades, aquel verdor de palabras

lascivas, echalas en lexia, limpialas de todo lo que a gentilidad sabe:
y casate con ella, y della ternas partos soberanos, conceptos
delicados y subidos, que sean gloria tuya, y provecho de todos. (fols.
B_{1v} - B_{2v})

A Christian writer who finds himself enamoured of the charms of a secular passage need not suppress his feelings and discard the text as unusable. A figurative trimming, washing, bleaching, and subsequent marriage will result in consecrated, edifying offspring.

Zamora commits a surprising error in attributing this Mosaic regulation to Leviticus when in fact it appears in Deuteronomy 21.10-13.⁶ The Authorized Version expresses it as follows:

When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put off the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and mother a full month: and after that, thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

Zamora does not claim to be saying anything new by drawing an analogy between the captive Gentile of Deuteronomy and the secular text. He cites both St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Jerome as his sources. Jerome's interpretation appears centuries later in Hrabanus Maurus (who quotes Jerome almost verbatim without acknowledging his source [*De institutione clericorum* III.18; Zimpel ed., 470]) and in Thomas Aquinas (who cites the same letter from Jerome in his commentary on Boethius [Quæstio II.3; Decker ed., 93]).⁷ Jerome himself, in at least two other epistles, draws on this particular Mosaic injunction when addressing the treatment of profane texts.⁸ The figure of the beautiful captive seems to have become the basis for a standard justification (union with the pagan is permitted by Mosaic law) and admonition (such union is permitted on the condition that the pagan be cleansed) for the use of non-Christian or pre-Christian texts and ideas.

Nevertheless, although Zamora cites both Cyril and Jerome as sources for his argument, these two fifth-century saints provide very different interpretations of the law regarding captive Gentiles. Cyril, in fact, does not see a figurative reference to texts at all in Deuteronomy 21. For him, the captive woman is a figure of the Israelites themselves, delivered as slaves from Egypt by a God who deems them worthy of his love ("dignam quae amaretur censuit" [*Glaphyra*, fol. xx_{2r}]). Since

Scripture commonly signifies “mind” (*mens*) by “head” (*caput*), Cyril proposes that the shaving of the captive’s head represents the eradication of old ideas, such as the idolatrous religion of Egypt. So, too, in the other stages of the cleansing, Cyril sees corresponding referents in God’s dealings with Israel: the trimming of fingernails figures the removal of filth and uncleanness; the changing of garments depicts the shedding of servitude and the putting on of God’s laws like a beautiful vestment (“quasi splendidam quamdam tunicam institutionem legalem sibi induit” [fol. xx_{2v}]), and so on. Ultimately, Cyril relates the figure to the Christian doctrine of redemption from Satan’s captivity by means of Christ’s Crucifixion. Christians freed from the vestments of slavery under Satan now “put on” Christ (“induiti ipsum Emmanuelem” [fol. xx_{2v}]), and are joined to God in a spiritual union. Unlike Jerome, however, Cyril makes no suggestion that the sanitized Gentile woman should symbolize secular texts rendered acceptable and usable. In the *Apología’s* reference to Cyril, then, it becomes clear that Zamora is reading Cyril’s exegesis in light of Jerome’s interpretation. The result is a productive conflation of the two: a restatement of Jerome’s application of the figure to texts, in which Zamora, taking up Cyril’s unique emphasis on redemption, introduces additional images of physical washing and portrays the selection and emendation of a secular text in terms of a redemptive act, a purifying union between a Christian mind and secular philosophy for the production of “soberanos” and “provecho[sos]” offspring. Where Zamora differs most markedly from his sources is in the detail with which he expounds the main idea: the bleach, the smutty, greenish layer of lascivious words—even to the point of adding elements to the original figure as found in Deuteronomy. Zamora, characteristically, paints a more vivid picture.

How might an early seventeenth-century writer apply Zamora’s vivid figure of the attractive secular text as a pleasing captive woman to his own work? How might the notion of shaving, trimming, and disinfecting a secular text play out in practice? To address these questions, I will examine one illustrative example from a poet with connections to Zamora, one who made public his admiration of the treatise which contains Zamora’s apology for the use of secular literature. The poet is Alonso de Ledesma, a writer whose production overshadowed that of Cervantes in his lifetime: thirty-two editions and more than 50,000 copies sold – staggering figures for early seventeenth-century Spain (Almagro 15; d’Ors 32).

Ledesma looked to Zamora as something of a literary father figure. Rarely satisfied with his poems until they had been vetted in literary tournaments and worked over by proof-readers (d’Ors 32), Ledesma

sent Zamora drafts of his work, and the two corresponded. Two of their letters serve as prefatory material to Ledesma's *Juegos de Nochebuena moralizados* of 1611, presumably because Zamora's response to the manuscript is full of glowing praise. Here, in the collection of Ledesma's poetry, is acceptable, Christian literature or, to use the words of Zamora's laudatory letter, the "discursos tan provechosos, [...] versos tan elegantes, [y] consejos divinos" which his *Apología* envisions (*Juegos*, fol. ¶_{4r}).

For the purpose of exploring the questions of application I have raised above, the remainder of this study examines Ledesma's *a lo divino* or *contrafacta* version of a *romance morisco*: Lope de Vega's "Sale la estrella de Venus," which Ledesma rewrites as a *romance vuelto* "Al Nacimiento, en metáfora de un agraviado." Ledesma's "Sale la estrella de Oriente" reworks Lope's ballad of a jilted, vengeful Moorish lover as an allegorical account of Christ wooing the human soul, with sketches of the Gospel narrative flanking Christ's address to the unfaithful *Alma*.

Lope de Vega		Alonso de Ledesma Al Nacimiento, En metáfora de un agraviado Romance Buelto
	Sale la estrella de Venus al tiempo que el sol se pone y la enemiga del día su negro manto descoge,	Sale la estrella de Oriente al tiempo que Dios dispone, que el enemigo del día pierda la presa que coge.
5	y con ella un fuerte moro semejante a Rodamonte sale de Sidonia airado, de Xerez la vega corre, por donde entra Guadalete	5 Y con ella la esperança de sus falsas pretensiones, formando Dios carne humana, para que el hombre le goze. Por donde Santa María
10	al mar de España, y por donde Santa María del Puerto recibe famoso nombre. Desesperado camina, que siendo en linaje noble,	10 <i>recibe famoso nombre,</i> de ser Madre, siendo Virgen, de quien siendo Dios, es hombre. Muy pobrementemente camina, con ser tan rico, y tan noble,
15	le deja su dama ingrata porque se suena que es pobre, y aquella noche se casa con un moro feo y torpe porque es alcaide en Sevilla	15 que amores de cierta dama, le traen en habito pobre. La qual dizen que le dexa por un monstruo feo, y torpe, que goza, como tirano,
20	del Alcázar y la Torre. Quejándose tiernamente de un agravio tan enorme, y a sus palabras la vega con dulces ecos responde:	20 desta hermosissima torre. Quexandose viene della, y de agravio tan enorme, viendo que à la Real casta, como deve no responde.
25	'Zayda, dice, más airada que el mar que las naves sorbe,	25 Alma, dize, la mas dura <i>que las entrañas de un monte,</i>

más dura e inexorable
 que las etrañas de un monte,
 ¿cómo permites, cruel,
 30 después de tantos favores,
 que de prendas de mi alma
 ajena mano se adorne?
 ¿Es posible que te abracés
 a las cortezas de un roble,
 35 y dejes el árbol tuyo
 desnudo de fruta y flores?
 ¿Dejas tu amado Gazul,
 dejas tres años de amores
 y das la mano a Albenzaide,
 40 que aun apenas le conoces?
 Dejas un pobre muy rico
 y un rico muy pobre escoges,
 pues las riquezas del cuerpo
 a las del alma antepones.
 45 Alá permita, enemiga,
 que te aborrezca y le adores
 y que por celos suspires
 y por ausencia le llores
 y que de noche no duermas
 50 y de día no reposes
 y en cama le fastidies
 y que en la mesa le enojés
 y en las fiestas, en las zambras,
 no se vista tus colores,
 55 ni aun para verlas permita
 que a la ventana te asomes;
 y menosprecie en las cañas,
 para que más te alborotes,
 el almaizar que le labres
 60 y la manga que le bordes
 y se ponga el de su amiga
 con la cifra de su nombre,
 a quien le dé los cautivos
 cuando de la guerra torne;
 65 y en batalla de cristianos
 de velle muerto te asombres
 y plegue a Alá que suceda,
 cuando la mano le tomes,
 que si le has de aborrecer,
 70 que largos años le goces;
 que es la mayor maldición
 que te pueden dar los hombres.
 Con esto llegó a Xerez
 a la mitad de la noche;
 75 halló el palacio cubierto
 de luminares y voces,
 y los moros fronterizos
 que por todas partes corren,
 con sus hachas encendidas
 80 y con libreas conformes.

y la mas desconocida,
 que cielo, y tierra conoce,
 Por que permites cruel,
 30 *despues de tantos favores*
 que tal prenda como tu,
 ageno dueño la goze?
 Por que tus duros oydos
 no prestas a mis razones,
 35 pues haran enternecer
 a las piedras que las oyen?
 Dexas tu querido esposo,
 perdido por tus amores,
 y das la mano a un infame,
 40 que por tu mal le conoces.
Dexas un pobre muy rico,
y un rico muy pobre escoges,
 que la riqueza del cuerpo
 à la del alma antepones.
 45 Yo morire, porque tu
 le aborrezcas, y me adores,
 y por el cielo suspires,
 y que en su ausencia me llores.
Y que de noche no duermas,
 50 *y de día no reposes,*
 hasta ver aquellas fiestas,
 que en tu dulce patria gozes.
 Y hasta verlas, no permitas,
 que à tus ventanas se asomen
 55 licenciosos pensamientos,
 para que no te alboroten.
 Y que tu vida (de oy mas)
 con mil virtudes la bordes,
 de suerte, que sus roturas
 60 parezcan vistosos golpes.

 Para que en la que es eterna,
 eternos años me gozes,
 que es la mayor bendicion
que te pueden dar los hombres.
 65 Con esto llegó a Belen
a la mitad de la noche,
 do hallò un pesebre por cama,
 y unas pajas por colchones.
 Y los Angeles alegres,
 70 *que por todas partes corren,*
 de conformes voluntades,
 y de libreas conformes.

<p>Delante del desposado en los estribos alzóse; arrojóle una lanzada,</p> <p>85 de parte a parte pasóle; alborotóse la plaza, desnudó el moro un estoque y por mitad de la gente hacia Sidonia volvióse.</p> <p>c. 1588, printed in <i>Flor de varios romances</i>, Huesca 1589, Barcelona, 1591. (Blecua ed., 73-75)</p>	<p>75</p> <p>80</p>	<p>Crece el niño, llega el tiempo, que ha de morir por el hombre enclavado en una Cruz, en medio de dos ladrones. Y arrojándole una lança, aunque muerto la recoge, y al corazón de su Madre, <i>de parte à parte passole.</i> Amansase el Padre eterno, y envayna luego su estoque, y en haziendose estas pazes, Dios a su patria bolvióse.</p> <p><i>Conceptos espirituales y morales</i>, Madrid 1600. (Juliá Martínez ed., 45-49)</p>
--	---------------------	---

I have printed the two *romances* in parallel, aligning, as often as possible, their corresponding lines. In the only book-length study of Ledesma's poetry, Miguel d'Ors uses a similar technique of parallel printing to compare excerpts from Lope's ballad and Ledesma's *contrafactum* (138-41). These he includes as a specimen in a chapter treating Ledesma's *a lo divino* verse, but he does not offer an analysis of the poem. I will examine Ledesma's refashioning in more detail now.

My italics distinguish those lines which Ledesma lifts verbatim—eleven in all. Ten additional lines differ in only one or two words. Ledesma's version, though four lines shorter, retains details like the anaphoric copulative conjunction of lines 47-50, and preserves the *o-e* assonance, which recurs every even line according to the conventions of Spanish ballad form. More than half of the rhyming words in Lope's ballad reappear without alteration in Ledesma's *contrafactum* (twenty-six out of a possible forty-four rhyming words, with two additional rhyming verbs differing only by their inflexion).

Beyond form, Ledesma closely follows the structure of Lope's *romance*. The first twenty-four lines of both ballads are devoted to setting the narrative scene and establishing the precipitating action, while roughly the last quarter of each piece recounts the narrative's dramatic climax in swift, declarative statements. Between these narrative sections, a long apostrophe dominates both *romances*. The centerpiece of "Sale la estrella de Venus" is Gazul's bitter imprecation against his former lover. The corresponding part of Ledesma's *contrafactum* consists of Christ's admonitions and promises to the wayward soul. Finally, Ledesma even matches Lope's ballad with an

abrupt, startling ending—a “sudden snapping of tension,” as Alan Trueblood describes Lope’s conclusion (65).

Examining Ledesma’s alterations reveals more about his method. In counterposition to invocations of Allah (Lope’s ll. 45 and 67) or allusions to pagan deities like Venus, “Sale la estrella de Oriente” opens with an introduction to a cosmos ordered and governed by *Dios*. Instead of Venus, the “estrella de Oriente,” the Star of Bethlehem, presides over the action, as God directs. Lope’s second line, “al tiempo que el sol se pone,” becomes “al tiempo que Dios dispone,” echoing a popular adage which, in the *Quijote*, Sancho recalls in reference to his short-lived governorship: “el hombre pone y Dios dispone” (II.55; Rico ed., 1082).⁹ This *refrán*, operating on the contrast between divine and human sovereignty, must have suggested the change to Ledesma.

In the world Ledesma portrays of divinely ordered events—a sinful world Christ reclaims in the course of the ballad—Lope’s abstractions which bear negative connotations are transformed into positive, contrasting ideas through wordplay or simple substitution. Thus, just as the sinister portent of nightfall and impassioned vengeance is replaced by the dawn star in line 1, so too “celos” (47) become “cielos” (47), and “la mayor maldición” (71) becomes “la mayor bendición” (63). In other substitutions, Ledesma plays with antitheses. “Amansase” (81) replaces “alborotóse” (85), the act of sheathing a sword supplants the act of baring a sword; and Ledesma seizes the opportunity offered by the word “palacio” (75) to evoke a favorite contrast between the celestial *palacio* from which Christ descends and the humble *pesebre* in which he is laid as a newborn.¹⁰ There is also an ascending progression in one series of substitutions. The ‘moro’ of Lope’s line 18 becomes, with a satisfying assonance, a ‘monstruo’ in the corresponding line of Ledesma’s version, as a contemporary reader might expect.¹¹ But, by line 69 in the *contrafactum*, Lope’s “moros fronterizos” (77) have been replaced by “Angeles alegres”, and God the Father ultimately stands in for the murderous Moor of Lope’s startling conclusion. These substitutions of lexical and narrative elements reflect a substitutionary theory of redemption underlying Ledesma’s narrative of the Incarnation and Crucifixion. The demands of divine justice, symbolized by the “estoque” of God the Father (82), can only be diverted and assuaged by God Himself in the form of Christ standing in for a fallen, monstrous humanity.

In addition to the idea of substitutionary Atonement, another theory traditionally used to explain the need for the Incarnation and Crucifixion informs Ledesma’s *romance* and is more conspicuously operative in it: the idea that Christ became man and died in order to demonstrate love and to inspire love in the human soul. “Yo morire,

porque tu / le aborrezcas, y me adores / y por el cielo suspieres" (ll. 45-47), Christ declares to the *Alma* who has spurned him. On this, the central analogy of Ledesma's *contrafactum* hinges. Christ is here the *agraviado* of Ledesma's title, the jilted lover, departing to settle affairs with a fickle beloved who has left him for the allures of the "enemigo del día" and the transient world. But the Moor's curse of his erstwhile lover is replaced by Christ's appeal to the soul, the *maldición* superseded by promises of *bendición*. It is the correlation with Christ's divine Passion which allows Ledesma to rewrite a narrative which originally dealt with unrestrained human passions.

In rewriting Lope's *romance*, it seems there are elements which Ledesma could not or would not incorporate. Omission or excision is another means by which Ledesma turns Lope *a lo divino*. Note where such omissions occur. The second appeal to Allah and a reference to warfare against Christians in lines 63-67 are not evoked by any corresponding *contrafacta* in Ledesma's version. Neither is the Moor's wish that his unfaithful lover would become repulsive, bothersome, or boring in bed (51). This excision produces the first obvious lacuna in Ledesma's *romance* when the two are placed side by side. Undoubtedly, such a reference would qualify as the sort of poetry Zamora would condemn, "Poesía, que [es] invención Satánica, de los que en el albergue de Venus tienen sus devotas" (fol. B_{2v}). Still, in Ledesma's *romance* as a whole, excisions play a relatively minor part in his strategic reworking. He bases his *contrafactum* more on positive refashioning than on censorious deletions. He probes the possibilities of fresh correspondences rather than slavishly, mechanically replacing opprobrious words with admissible alternatives.

In light of what Ledesma retains and reworks in his *romance* "Al Nacimiento," we could reconsider the several elements of Zamora's figure for textual conversion. Ledesma's omissions correspond to the shaving, paring, and bleaching, his substitutions to the change of vestment. Ledesma's methods in this case are sufficiently systematic to allow for such a correlation to be drawn. However, although he manipulates by lexical excisions and substitutions what one might consider the cosmetic elements of Zamora's figure for attractive secular texts, he preserves the ballad's essential, conceptual core—the character of the aggrieved lover, as advertised in the *romance vuelto's* title—and adheres to its structure for the elaboration of his theological argument, as I shall discuss below.

Of course, in the absence of additional documentation, one cannot prove that Ledesma's *contrafactum* is informed by Zamora's advice, or that he had the figure of the captive Gentile woman in mind when he rewrote "Sale la estrella de Venus." Certainly, the date of publication

for Ledesma's *contrafactum* means that he would have had to have read Zamora's *Apología* in manuscript for it to have played any part in this particular case of *a lo divino* poetry. The record of correspondence between Zamora and Ledesma reveals that Ledesma had read Zamora's treatise at least as early as December 1608; but beyond this, the likelihood of an earlier reading can only be assumed (*Juegos*, fol. ¶_{4r}). Nevertheless, other circumstantial evidence supports a connection between "Sale la estrella de Oriente" and Zamora's advice on the appropriation of secular texts. Zamora's contemptuous reference to poetry from the pens of "los que en el albergue de Venus tienen sus devotas", which I previously quoted, appears directly after the exposition of the law regarding the captive Gentile woman and inevitably calls to mind Ledesma's rechristening of Venus in Lope's opening line. Similarly, the identification of the *romance* genre as a particularly noteworthy candidate for revision may be inspired by Zamora's special execration of "romancillo[s]" and of the "tonadilla [de] romance[s] perverso[s]" in the same passage (fol. B_{2v}). These are ballads set to music, as so many of Lope's were.¹² Finally, Ledesma himself develops a text-as-slave figure in another *romance*, the last of his one-hundred *Enigmas hechas para honesta recreación*. The book, portrayed as "un esclavo con dos caras, una blanca, y otra negra", speaks in first person, describing itself:

Soy esclavo blanco y negro,
 quando blanco sé tan poco,
 que por boçal, y sin letras,
 me llaman el blanco todos. (fol. Ii_{3r}, ll. 1-4)

Thus, there is some evidence that Ledesma had long been familiar with his mentor's *Apología*.

In any case, whether Zamora's interpretation of Deuteronomy 21 factored into Ledesma's "Sale la estrella de Oriente" consciously, subconsciously, or not at all, may not matter greatly in the end. The analysis of a specimen of *a lo divino* poetry in the light of Zamora's trope can still advance our understanding of the driving ideology behind this literary vogue for adapting secular texts for religious ends.

"Sale la estrella de oriente" exemplifies one class of *a lo divino* verse, one category of technique within the devotional parodic mode. An *a lo divino* poem could adhere closely to its source, especially in its formal characteristics, as Ledesma's does here. This is the sort of exacting technique employed most famously by Sebastián de Córdoba in his *Obras de Boscán y Garcilasso trasladadas en materias Christianas y religiosas* (1575). Other *contrafacta* might gloss only the first lines, the opening

stanza, or the refrain of a well-known secular lyric, giving its familiar phrases a sacred turn. Such a method is especially prominent in the *villancico* genre as cultivated in Ledesma's time, with the *villancico*'s penchant for recasting a refrain to multiple ends within a single piece. Still other *a lo divino* verse, particularly that of the *cancionero* tradition, might modify only a few words in order to change a worldly love song into a representation of Christ's love for the Church, a martyr, or the human soul.

John Crosbie points to the sheer variety of strategies for *a lo divino* versification as a grounds for calling into question several long-standing generalizations about the nature and intention of such poetry. Crosbie's study, *A lo divino Lyric Poetry: An Alternative View*, goes far towards debunking sweeping inferences about *contrafacta* verse, particularly Dámaso Alonso's and Bruce Wardropper's suggestions that *a lo divino* poetry was the result of a deliberate, widespread, and systematic attempt to censor secular poetry, to replace pernicious texts in the literary market with morally wholesome alternatives. Crosbie's main contention is that *a lo divino* poets seldom, if ever, disguise their sources, as one might expect them to do if their aim were truly censorship and their motivations were moral indignation (39). Rather, their poems clearly allude to generally well-known antecedents, sometimes explicitly citing sources in their titles; and the goal, more often than not, seems to be the presentation of religious ideas while evoking as much of the source text as possible for contrast and comparison. The result is a more striking, memorable presentation of the *contrafactum*'s argument and a more lucid exhibition of the artifice it achieves.

Ledesma's "Sale la estrella de Oriente" supports Crosbie's thesis. There is no evidence that Ledesma had anything but the highest regard for Lope's poetry. Lope, for his part, praises Ledesma on several occasions.¹³ By all accounts, their literary relations were characterized by mutual admiration. Although Ledesma does not explicitly identify Lope's ballad as his source for "Sale la estrella de Oriente", the typical genre tag "Romance Buelto" signals the nature of the piece from the start, and the *contrafactum* never masks the *morisco* original too opaquely. Ledesma's readers would almost certainly have recalled Lope's enormously popular ballad, and it would not be out of place here to note that a prefatory poem for the third *parte* of Ledesma's *Conceptos espirituales y morales* describes the collection, in which such *contrafacta* are well represented, as a "libro de memoria" (Juliá Martínez ed., 11). A well-known source text like Lope's ballad (and one likely to be already associated with musical accompaniment) could serve as an effective memory hook for Ledesma's message—a ready-made foundation onto which Ledesma could graft his *concepto*. The deliberate

preservation of rhyming words most clearly suggests such a purpose. Like the end rhymes, the form, structure, and vocabulary of Lope's ballad are never far beneath the surface, as I have tried to show in my discussion of the elements which Ledesma's imitation retains. In fact, "Sale la estrella de Oriente" depends on the reader's recognition of its antecedent; the recognition of Ledesma's text as a palimpsest is necessary for its evocation of the aphorism "el hombre pone y Dios dispone", or for the reader's appreciation of such contrasts as that between *palacio* and *pesebre*, as we have seen.

The notion of effective, artful contrast is depicted in another figure from Zamora's *Apología*. His fourth *regla* permits the use of secular literature for the purposes of "declarar" or "ponderar" sacred truths. To illustrate this potentially positive function of secular texts, his metaphor presents the hybrid religious-secular text as gold and silver jewelry. Zamora glosses *Song of Songs* 1.10:

Hazerte hemos, Esposa mia, unos collares, o unos çarcillos de oro, con gusanillos de plata. Caen muy bien los gusanillos de plata sobre el oro, deleyta la vista aquella variedad agradable que hazen, y parece que la plata sobre el oro, aunque es de menos quilates, le da un no se que, con que se levantan mas los resplandores de su lustre. Oro es (dize Cipriano Cisterciense)¹⁴ la doctrina Evangelica, oro de veynte y cinco y mas quilates, oro acrisolado en el pecho de Dios, y escupido por su boca. Plata fina es la verdadera Filosofia de las humanas letras: y assi hazen galana junta en el cuello y oreja de la Esposa, cadenillas de oro con gusanillos de plata: parece muy bien el oro de la palabra de Dios, con unos puntos de plata de la sabiduria de los antiguos Filósofos y Poetas, un dicho agudo, una sentencia bien trayda, un verso bien apropiado, dale un no se que, que suspende el oydó, y le haze estar atento, para recibir la enseañança del cielo. (fol. C_{1v})

With the figure of the sanitized Gentile captive, Zamora accounts for emendations and excisions in a Christian writer's adaptation of a secular text. Here, with the figure of *collares* and *zarcillos*, he allows for the appropriate practice of adding and retaining material from secular texts. In the blended jewelry, we no longer have the cheap alloy of "doctrinas ajenas" mixed with Christian truth which Zamora earlier puts forward as an illustration for the sanctimonious naysayers' third reason. Now he counters Isaiah's images of scorious silver and watery wine with another biblical image to suggest that not all mixing involves contamination but can mean the introduction of elements which constructively accentuate and enhance sacred material.

Zamora's analogy of the efficacious alloy provides graphic justification for Ledesma's technique of stringing silver material from Lope's *romance* among the gold of Gospel narrative and Christian allegory. Additionally, figures like this of the composite *collares* and that of the captive Gentile woman enable us to go beyond Crosbie's study. Crosbie's survey of Spanish *a lo divino* poetry from the late Middle Ages through the seventeenth century convincingly questions received generalizations about the root and nature of this literary trend. His study is thin, however, on offering positive explanations for the motives behind *contrafacta*, apart from suggesting that the poets were stimulated by the challenge of a formidable exercise in imitation and the opportunity to display *agudeza* in a literary culture that increasingly valued conspicuous artifice. One could certainly point to symptoms of such motivation in Ledesma's *a lo divino* work, but Zamora's colourful figures can take Crosbie's main argument further. The *contrafactistas'* goal is not necessarily expurgation and bowdlerization, as Crosbie demonstrates. Alternatively, as Zamora's figures imply, the goal could be the redemption of an attractive secular text, rendering it useful so that the resulting offspring or alloy is a more effective vehicle for truth than either the unadorned doctrine or the unreformed secular text was before.

We can examine how such a goal manifests itself in practice by turning again to the strange anthropomorphism at the close of Ledesma's ballad in the light of Zamora's metaphor of the *collares*. Appeased, God the Father sheaths His sword and returns to heaven. Here we have more evidence for Ledesma's familiarity with Zamora's *Apología* at the time of writing "Sale la estrella de Oriente," since Zamora cites similar images to illustrate his fifth *razón*. Zamora presents several examples of anthropomorphisms from the Old Testament (God's hand outstretched, God's hand uplifted in an oath), and argues that Christian writers can better explicate such language with reference to pagan literature. After collating these figures from Hebrew Scripture with passages by Cicero, Plutarch, and Julius Caesar, Zamora glosses Isaiah 10.4: "Aún no envaynó Dios su cuchillo" (fol. C_{4r})—a representation of God's sure judgment, inexorable apart from atoning sacrifice. In Zamora's view, this serves as a prime example for how secular texts can aid biblical exegesis. In relation to Ledesma's *romance*, it suggests that Ledesma might have sought to mine Lope's secular ballad, as a source text, to support an interpretation of this anthropomorphism and, as a referential base, for support of his broader theological theme. Clearly, the image of the sword-sheathing Deity becomes almost inscrutable without recourse to the climactic close of Lope's ballad. A recollection of Lope's vindictive protagonist, however,

guides the reader to an identification of the *agraviado* with the “Padre Eterno” of Ledesma’s line 81. In the light of Gazul’s bared *estoque* and dramatic exit, the reader reaches a fuller understanding of the contrasting image of propitiation in Ledesma’s ballad. God, as the *agraviado*, has been satisfied. The narrative antecedent provides the foundation for Ledesma’s figurative explanation of substitutionary or expiatory Atonement. In Ledesma’s *a lo divino* alloy, the silver substructure of “Sale la estrella de Venus” shows off the *contrafactista*’s “golden” soteriology to good effect.

I have previously mentioned two theories of the Atonement which inform Ledesma’s *romance*. Traditionally, there are three principal categories of theories which attempt to elucidate the mysteries of the Atonement, though these categories are by no means mutually exclusive and all three have some basis in the language of the New Testament (Packer 19-21). Varied images or models of thought tend to cluster around each of the three.

The first view, often called the “ransom theory,” was the widely (though never officially) accepted doctrine in the Middle Ages. As articulated by Origen (185 – c. 253), among others, this theory imagines fallen mankind as captive to the devil or to death, and proposes that Christ’s death releases us from this bondage by making payment to the devil for his claim on humanity (Grensted 37). Christ, however, being more powerful than death and by nature incorruptible, is a ransom which death cannot hold. God thereby cheats or tricks the Evil One, and Christ emerges as victor, harrowing Hell. Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335 – c. 385) pictures the divine strategem in terms of angling. Christ, in the guise of human flesh, serves as an attractive bait for the devil, “in order that, after the manner of greedy fish, the hook of the deity might be swallowed down along with the bait of humanity” (80-81). The devil devours the ruse-as-ransom, only to be overpowered by Christ; the predator now finds himself in the position of prey. In another *romance*, “A la cruz de Christo en diuersas metaforas,” in the *primera parte* of his *Conceptos espirituales*, Ledesma develops a comparable image. An apostrophe to the Cross declares:

Soys la caña con que Dios
 en nuestra laguna pesca,
 poniendo a Christo por ceuo,
 que es gusano de la tierra. (ll. 53-56)¹⁵

This “ransom theory” of Atonement is most evident in the first part of Ledesma’s *romance vuelto*, with its references to “el enemigo del día” losing “la presa que coge” under “falsas pretensiones” (ll. 3-4, 6).

A second conceptual pattern, sometimes called the “exemplary” or “moral influence” theory, emphasizes the demonstrative and inspirational quality of Christ’s Incarnation and sacrificial death. Ledesma works within the terms of this theory in a sonnet “Al inclinar Christo la cabeça en la cruz,” in which Christ, “para mostrarnos” with an emblematic gesture the loving humility by which one may attain salvation, “abaxa quando muere la cabeça” (ll. 10 and 14; Juliá Martínez ed., 123). The focus of this subjective theory is the effect which the Crucifixion has on humankind, rather than its effect on death or the devil, in its capacity to demonstrate and inspire love by means of an ultimate display of God’s love for us on the Cross. According to Peter Abelard (1079–1142) and others who follow his line of reasoning, by Christ’s sacrificial demonstration we are made capable of loving God self-sacrificially in return (Fiddes 139). We find this idea pictured in the central part of “Sale la estrella de Oriente,” with its portrayal of Christ admonishing and wooing the Soul.

The third view, that of the “satisfaction” theory of Anselm (1033–1109) or the “penal substitution” theory of the Reformers, turns its attention to the effect which Christ’s Crucifixion has upon God. By this doctrine, sinful mankind stands estranged from the Creator and condemned, deserving of judgment, but Christ’s death on the Cross satisfies the need for divine retribution (Grensted 120-25). “De la cantidad que dio, / quedara el Rey satisfecho,” Ledesma writes of an allegorical Christ in another *romance* (ll. 51-52; Juliá Martínez ed., 114-15). Christ receives the punishment of death in our place, as our vicarious substitute; God’s justice is discharged and propitiated, his wrath assuaged. This, of course, is strikingly portrayed in the third part of Ledesma’s *romance vuelto* where God, appeased, resheaths his sword, returns to heaven, and the ballad ends.

Thus we see how Ledesma makes use of the principal dilemma, the protagonists, and the underlying, tripartite structure of Lope’s ballad to support a compatible, orderly presentation of three traditional views of what Christ’s Incarnation and death accomplished, with three corresponding anthropomorphisms: God as Victor, ransoming the soul; God as Wooer; and God as satisfied Judge. Moreover, in this diversity of figures for the role of the Deity in reconciling humankind to Himself, Ledesma achieves precisely the sort of effective, varied use of tropes which Zamora recommends when explaining the figure of the gold and silver *collares*. Elements of variety in verbal expression, Zamora argues, whether culled from sacred or secular texts, have an inherent value for appealing to one’s readers or listeners and for conveying one’s message with forceful elaboration. “Por esso [...] se viste Dios de tantas libreas en el Evangelio: ya se haze Rey, ya pastor, ya padre de familias,

ya juez, ya desposado, y otras cosas semejantes" (fol. C_{2r}). With this list of anthropomorphisms drawn from Christ's parables and the Pauline letters, Zamora rests his case. Material from sources outside of Scripture can serve the same purpose, he concludes. Tropes which aid in understanding facets of God's character and Christian truth, regardless of the sacred or secular nature of their provenance, are legitimate resources for the conscientious writer or preacher. As such, they can and should be incorporated into Christian texts—provided, of course, that they be used with "la moderacion devida" (fol. C_{2v}). I will bring the present analysis to a close by suggesting one way in which Ledesma's textual alloy takes up elements of "Sale la estrella de Venus" with the "moderacion devida" Zamora prescribes.

One of the greatest challenges in formulating an imaginative account of the Atonement, like the three general theories we have surveyed, is to maintain an appropriate balance in the action or volition ascribed to each of the parties involved. In the theories which rest on firmest theological ground, God the Father or Christ remains the subject of the action, rather than the object (Fiddes 71). If an explanation disproportionately elevates humankind's participation or the devil's agency, for instance, there is a danger of portraying the work of the Cross as somehow insufficient, as a mere pawn in the wranglings of a dualistic cosmos, or as an act in some way forced upon God—alternative conceptions which would violate the orthodox teachings of the Church. This balance can be particularly delicate in expositions of the "penal substitution" or "satisfaction" theories of the Atonement. Such theories, as I have said, stress the Crucifixion's effect on God, but they must carefully avoid the suggestion that an extrinsic agent is acting upon God or doing something to God to bring about propitiation. Likewise, the "moral-influence" theory, though it avoids inferences of any external condition imposing a constraint upon God, can risk overemphasizing human agency, placing excessive weight on a subjective response from humankind in its explanation of the Atonement. The Deity of "Sale la estrella de oriente," like His analogue in Lope's *romance*, remains consistently in the role of principal, acting subject within the scope of the Ledesma's narrative. Even in the ballad's concluding section—that which corresponds to the satisfaction theory of Atonement—the reflexive "amansase" preserves the idea that God is bringing about an effect on Himself, propitiating His own demands for justice rather than being acted upon, as a transitive verb would have otherwise indicated. It is a thin theological line which Ledesma walks here, but by controlled selection and manipulation of elements from Lope's ballad, he successfully navigates the three precarious anthropomorphisms in constructing his allegory.

Ledesma's textual amalgam, his emendation of an appealing secular *romance* in preparation for marriage with Christian doctrine, makes deliberate use of Lope's trio of characters (jilted Gazul, fickle Zayda, and rival Albenzaide) to narrate compellingly and memorably a triangle of dramatic tension among God as *agraviado*, the human *alma*, and "el enemigo del día." Clearly, "Sale la estrella de Oriente" is an example of a text which achieves "its religious effect," to borrow Edward Wilson's phrase, "by means of profane reverberations" (52). Ledesma's achievement here is the way in which he artfully "redeems" and integrates those profane reverberations to enhance his message.

Notes

¹Zamora (c. 1561–1614) added the *Apología* to subsequent editions of the first *parte* of his seven-part *Monarquía mística* after the *editio princeps* of 1594 or 1598 was, apparently, met with criticism from "algunas personas religiosas, movidas de buen zelo, [que] suelen con aspereza reprehender en las obras semejantes a esta mía, la variedad y verdor de humanas letras, pareciendoles que se agravian las divinas, adulterando la santidad de su pureza" (fol. A₁^r). Throughout the present study, I cite from the 1604 Valencia edition, which bears a *licencia* dated May 1598 (Bodleian shelfmark B 2.21 Linc). Bibliographers disagree about the date of the first edition. Nicolás Antonio and Cristóbal Pérez Pastor describe a Madrid printing of 1594, but Pedro Campa calls into question the existence of this edition (87). F. J. Fuente Fernández considers that of 1594 an "edición fantasma" and opts instead for one from Madrid of 1598, with three re-editions in 1604, and others in 1608 and 1614 (264–65 and n. 274). To judge by the date of the *licencia* in the edition to which I have readiest access, Zamora must have composed his *Apología* by 1598 at the latest. Its date of composition will later figure among my arguments for Alonso de Ledesma's familiarity with Zamora's work. For now, a note on the sheer profusion of Spanish editions of the *Monarquía mística*, in addition to Italian and German translations from the early seventeenth century, highlights its wide reception and renown.

²All Scriptural references follow the Vulgate's numbering of chapter and verse, except where the Authorized Version is explicitly cited.

³Acts 17.28.

⁴Zamora alludes to St. Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on Deuteronomy in the *Glaphyra*, "De muliere capta, rasa, & unguibus præcisâ" (fols. xx_{1r}–xx_{3v}).

⁵Ep. 66.8 *ad Pammachium de dormitione paulinae* (Hilberg and Kamptner ed., 658).

⁶Zamora may have confused his biblical references by recalling laws for the ceremonial cleansing of lepers from Leviticus 14.8–9, which command a thorough shaving and washing. If so, this would help to account for the way in which his gloss adds washing and bleaching to the instructions from Deuteronomy 21, which include no mention of such ablution. Alternatively, the apparent misattribution to Leviticus may be synecdochical, with "el

Levítico” serving as a collective name for all books of the Pentateuch or for the portion of them dealing with the Mosaic law (cf. Covarrubias, *Suplemento al Tesoro*, s.v. “Levitas”: “De aquí se dixo Levítico cosa perteneciente a los levitas”). This latter explanation seems unlikely, however, in light of Zamora’s precision in distinguishing “Éxodo”, “Deuteronomio”, “Números”, and the other books of the Pentateuch elsewhere in his treatise (e.g. fols. B_{6v}, F_{8r}, D_{1r}, and I_{7v}).

⁷The *Glossa ordinaria* also preserves Jerome’s interpretation to the extent that it equates the beautiful captive woman with attractive teachings which a Christian might encounter in pagan wisdom. Cleansed of the ‘filth of superstition’, such teachings can be rendered useful (Froehlich and Gibson ed., 401).

⁸Epistula 21.13 *ad Damasum*; Ep. 70.2 *ad Magnum oratorem urbis Romae*.

⁹The aphorism itself is a synopsis of Proverbs 16.1, “Del hombre son las disposiciones del corazón; mas de Jehová es la respuesta de la lengua” (Versión Reina-Valera).

¹⁰Cf. Ledesma’s “Quexas del demonio â cerca del Nacimiento”: “Que importa que assiente el real / en un pesebre de bestias [...]?” (ll. 37-38, *Conceptos espirituales*; Juliá Martínez ed., 60); and “A los Reyes” (*Ibid.*, 93).

¹¹Cf. Pedro Aznar Cardona’s *Expulsión justificada de los moriscos españoles* (1612) on the “bestial monstruosidad” of the *moros* and the “monstruosa composición” of the Islamic religion (fols. T_{7v} and V_{3v}).

¹²“Sale la estrella de Venus”, as one of the most popular ballads of the *romancero nuevo* tradition (Menéndez Pidal 414), enjoyed a long tradition in musical settings. Evidence abounds for its particular association with song: Not long after its presumed date of composition, it appears in the so-called *Cancionero classense* (1589) among unmistakably musical works (Pintacuda 316); the slave Luis, in Cervantes’s *El celoso extremeño*, identifies it as one of the few ditties he knows how to sing (*Novelas ejemplares*; García López ed., 338); and its famous opening lines figure in Luis Quiñones de Benavente’s “entremés cantado” *Los planetas* (c. 1631), in which Mars sings the lines as a cue for the character Venus to appear “con una estrella que la tome toda la cabeza” (Arellano ed., 495-96). Calderón incorporates the same opening lines in his “representación música” *La púrpura de la rosa* (c. 1662; ll. 1928-29). As part of Calderón’s *Púrpura*, these lines from Lope’s ballad feature in one of the earliest operas to be performed in the New World (c. 1701). A musical setting for the relevant fragment of Calderón’s libretto by Tomás Torrejón de Velasco (or Blasco; 1644–1728) can be found in the *Cancionero musical de Lope de Vega* (Querol Gavaldá ed., 26).

¹³Lope praises Ledesma in his *Laurel de Apolo* and in *La Filomena*; Ledesma’s collection of *Epigramas y jeroglíficos a la vida de Cristo* (1625) includes an *aprobación* by Lope; and Lope commended Ledesma at the literary tournament in honour of the beatification of San Isidro in 1620 (d’Ors 30 and 38). Clearly, Ledesma’s rewriting of “Sale la estrella de Venus,” among his other *contrafacta* of secular verse by Lope, was in no way considered an affront to his fellow poet. Their relations evidently remained cordial long after its publication.

¹⁴Cipriano Cisterciense must be Pseudo-Cyprian, the twelfth-century Cistercian abbot of Bonneval, Arnaldus (also Arnold, Arnaud, Ernaud, or

Ernald). I have not been able to locate this exegesis among the writings of Arnaldus, but he or Zamora may have been recalling St. Jerome's commentary on the same verse from Song of Songs in *Adversus Jovinianum*, in which Jerome contrasts the gold of the Gospel with the silver of Old Testament law before Christ's resurrection:

Antequam resurgeret Dominus, et Evangelium coruscaret, non habebat aurum sponsa, sed similitudines auri. Argentum autem quod in nuptiis habere se pollicetur, habebat varium atque distinctum in viduis, continentibus, ac maritatis. Deinde sponsus respondet ad sponsam, et eam docet, quod veteris Legis umbra transierit, et veritas Evangelii venerit. (I.30, Migne ed., col. 251-52)

In any case, Zamora's particular application of the verse to the contrast between sacred and secular literature seems to be original.

¹⁵Juliá Martínez, ed., 128. This example from Ledesma, in light of Gregory of Nyssa's highly-wrought analogy, also suggests that Ledesma's imagery, contrary to appearances, is not so consistently characterized by 'shocking', 'grotesque', or 'bizarre extravagance' as D. Gareth Walters and other recent critics argue (159-61), but may in fact be rooted firmly in Patristic and medieval tradition.

Works Cited

- Almagro, Francisco. Introduction. *Conceptos espirituales y morales*. By Alonso de Ledesma. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1978. 15-35.
- Aquinas, Saint Thomas. *Expositio super librum Boethii De Trinitate*. Ed. Bruno Decker. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
- Aznar Cardona, Pedro. *Expulsión justificada de los moriscos españoles*. Huesca: Pedro Cabarte, 1612.
- Basil the Great, Saint. "On the Right Use of Greek Poetry." *Essays on the Study and Use of Poetry*. Ed. and trans. F. M. Padelford. New York: Holt, 1902. 101-10.
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *La púrpura de la rosa*. Eds. Ángeles Cardona, Don Cruickshank, et al. Kassel: Reichenberger, 1990.
- Campa, Pedro F. *Emblemata Hispanica: An Annotated Bibliography of Spanish Emblem Literature to the Year 1700*. Durham: Duke UP, 1990.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de La Mancha*. Ed. Francisco Rico. Barcelona: Crítica, 1998.
- _____. *Novelas Ejemplares*. Ed. Jorge García López. Barcelona: Crítica, 2001.
- Covarrubias y Horozco, Sebastián de. *Suplemento al Tesoro de la lengua castellana*. Eds. Georgina Dopico and Jacques Lezra. Madrid: Polifemo, 2001.
- Crosbie, John. *A lo divino Lyric Poetry: An Alternative View*. Durham: U of Durham, 1989.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Glaphyra*. Antwerp: Heirs of Martin Nutius and Joannes Meursius, 1618.
- Fiddes, Paul S. *Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1989.

- Fuente Fernández, F. J. "Apología por las letras humanas (1604), de Lorenzo de Zamora." *Humanismo y Cister: Actas del I Congreso Nacional sobre Humanistas Españoles*. Ed. Francisco R. de Pascual. León: U de León, 1996.
- Froehlich, Karlfried and Margaret T. Gibson, eds. *Biblia latina cum Glossa ordinaria*. Facsimile reprint of the 1480/81 *editio princeps* by Adolph Rusch of Strassburg. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.
- Gregory of Nyssa. *Oratio Catechetica*. Ed. and trans. Anthony Meredith. *Gregory of Nyssa*. Routledge: London, 1999. 73-86.
- Grensted, L. W. *A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1920.
- Jerome, Saint. *Adversus Jovinianum. Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Opera Omnia*. Vol. 23 of *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*. Ed. Jacques-Paul Migne. Paris: Garnier, 1845.
- _____. *Epistulæ*. Eds. Isidorus Hilberg and Margit Kamptner. Vol. 1. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1996.
- Ledesma, Alonso de. *Conceptos espirituales y morales*. Ed. Eduardo Juliá Martínez. 3 vols. Madrid: CSIC, 1969.
- _____. *Juegos de Nochebuena moralizados a la la vida de Christo, martirio de santos, y reformation de contumbres, con unas enigmas hechas para honesta recreación*. Madrid: Alonso Martín, 1611.
- Maurus, Hrabanus. *De institutione clericorum*. Ed. Detlev Zimpel. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Menéndez Pidal, María Goyri. "Los romances de Gazul." *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 7 (1953): 403-16.
- d'Ors, Miguel. *Vida y Poesía de Alonso de Ledesma: Contribución al estudio del conceptismo español*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 1974.
- Packer, J. I. "What Did the Cross Achieve? The Logic of Penal Substitution." *Tyndale Bulletin* 25 (1974): 3-45.
- Pintacuda, Paolo. "El Cancionero classense de 1589." *Canzonieri iberici*. Vol. 2. Noia: Toxosoutos, 2001. 309-320.
- Querol Gavaldá, Miguel, ed. *Cancionero Musical de Lope de Vega: Poesías sueltas puestas en música*. Vol. 2. Barcelona: CSIC, 1987.
- Quiñones de Benavente, Luis. *Entremeses completos I: Jocoseria*. Ed. Ignacio Arellano et al. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2001.
- Trueblood, Alan S. *Experience and Artistic Expression in Lope de Vega: The Making of La Dorotea*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1974.
- Vega Carpio, Lope Félix de. *Lírica*. Ed. José Manuel Blecua. Madrid: Castalia, 1999.
- Walters, D. Gareth. *The Cambridge Introduction to Spanish Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Wilson, Edward M. "Spanish and English Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9.1 (1958): 38-53.
- Zamora, Lorenzo de. *Monarquía mística de la Iglesia, hecha de geroglíficos sacados de humanas y divinas letras*. Valencia: Pedro Patricio Mey, 1603.