

EARLY MODERN IBERIAN LANDSCAPES: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND
THE POLITICS OF IDENTITY

By

Jonathan William Wade

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Spanish

August, 2009

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor Edward H. Friedman

Professor Earl E. Fitz

Professor Carlos A. Jáuregui

Professor Marshall C. Eakin

Copyright © Jonathan William Wade
All Rights Reserved

To my late father, Robert Wade, who showed me the way

and

To my beautiful wife, Emily, who never stopped believing in me

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Celestial hands have carried me past the doubts, discouragement, and distractions that held me back during graduate school. I thank Them for everything I have and am.

I cannot begin to imagine these years without my dear wife, Emily. With all the ups and downs, she never doubted. I have reached these heights, and will yet achieve others, because we fly together. I know that she will always be by my side, and I by hers.

Although he passed away almost fourteen years ago, dad continues to inspire me to excellence. I am happy to carry his example into the next generation. Mom remains the constant force for good that she has always been. I am grateful for her tireless love and kindness. I also want to recognize my brother, Rob, who has always been one of my biggest fans. I thank him for always caring. To the rest of my large family of Wades, Redds, and the like, thank you for your love, friendship, and support.

Few graduate students ever get to work with anyone as brilliant and kind as Edward Friedman. I consider myself privileged to be called one of his students, and feel honored to call him my mentor. I also recognize Dale, Valerie, Kit, and Earl, whose past and present mentoring have made all of this possible. Not to be forgotten is Dave, my academic big brother, and Ted, who started me on this journey years ago.

I conclude by expressing gratitude to Vanderbilt University, which has been very good to me. I thank the College of Arts and Science, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and, especially, the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities for their generous support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I. <i>PORTUGALIDADE, SAUDADE, AND THE NATION: LEARNING THE LANGUAGE OF PORTUGUESE NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS</i>	19
II. VICENTE, FERREIRA, AND CAMÕES: TRACING THE ROOTS OF PORTUGUESE ANNEXATION LITERATURE.....	53
III. PORTUGUESE NATIONALISM IN A SPANISH COSTUME: THE CASE OF MANUEL DE FARIA E SOUSA.....	85
IV. STAGING THE NATION: CORDEIRO, AZEVEDO, AND THE PORTUGUESE COMEDIA.....	158
CONCLUSION.....	204
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	223

INTRODUCTION

IN SPANISH, ABOUT PORTUGAL: RETHINKING PORTUGUESE LITERATURE OF THE ANNEXATION

António de Sousa de Macedo's treatise, *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (1631), closes with a question borrowed from Luís de Camões's national epic *Os Lusíadas* (1572). He asks the reader whether it is better to be king of the entire world without Portugal, or Portugal alone. This inquiry appears in the final chapter of one of the most radical works of Portuguese nationalism ever written. Although the author follows with an answer, his position on the matter is made abundantly clear during the course of the work. What, as twenty-first century readers, are we to take from such an ostentatious proposition? Moreover, under what social, political, and historical conditions was such a question put forward in the first place? While Sousa de Macedo's answer is interesting, it is not nearly as consequential as the assertion inherent in his appeal to Camões. In a time before nations and nationalism—at least by modern standards—what are we supposed to make of the author's overt exaltation of his native Portugal?

During Spain's annexation of Portugal from 1580 to 1640, many Portuguese authors voiced something similar to what we find in *Flores de España*. Making sense of that voice, however, is not as easy as it might seem. The writers I am considering, for one, made their affection for Portugal known almost exclusively in the language of the empire. What does the free use of Spanish and Portuguese tell us about these writers and the time in which they lived? Furthermore, annexation authors invoke a rhetoric of nation

and nationalism well before the rise of the modern nation-state. They do this with a degree of consciousness that is difficult to define because it is attuned to a collectivity that transcends any one writer individually. Is this national consciousness? If so, what could that possibly mean in the context of early modernity? I believe that Portuguese annexation literature offers a response to these issues by challenging readers to make sense of the wheres, whens, whys, and hows of its production. The fascinating intersection of identity, language, history, and politics found within these texts leads to further questions about this often misunderstood period of Portuguese letters.

Pilar Vázquez Cuesta, like many others over the centuries, chooses to see the annexation in terms of loss, so far as Portuguese literature is concerned:

No debe de sorprendernos el *bajón* que da la Cultura portuguesa durante los sesenta años de monarquía dual y los primeros tiempos de la Restauración si pensamos que mucha de la savia que en otras circunstancias habría servido para revitalizarla se emplea en enriquecer a la Cultura española, en donde no faltan los nombres de emigrantes o hijos de emigrantes portugueses. (628; my emphasis)

Did Portuguese culture really drop off as much as Vázquez Cuesta suggests in this passage? The answer to this question, of course, is a matter of perspective. If the category “Portuguese culture,” as we currently understand it, only makes room for literature written in the Portuguese language, then the annexation indeed represents a severe drop off from the literary glories of the century previous. If, however, works written by the Portuguese in the Spanish language, or vice versa, are incorporated into what we might better describe as a Peninsular heritage (rather than any specific national culture), we would see the annexation not as a time of artistic scarcity but as a period of plenty. That is not to say that the seventeenth century produced a legitimate rival to either Gil Vicente or

Luís de Camões—each of whom, lest we forget, wrote a significant amount in Spanish as well—but that does not mean that the period was as decadent as some have suggested.

Notwithstanding the various ways in which we might praise annexation literature, both the Spanish and Portuguese literary traditions have been reluctant to allow these authors into their respective canons. Edward Glaser explains the marginalization of these works from the Portuguese perspective: “Students of Portuguese culture tend to leave aside an author who willfully neglected to cultivate the national language at a moment when its very existence as a tool of artistic expression was at stake” (Preface 5). This view of annexation literature, however is anachronistic, as it defines the relationship between language and literature much more rigidly than it was understood at the time (although such ways of thinking about literature, as I will describe in chapter one, were not unheard of on the Iberian Peninsula). Some scholars, in fact, consider Portuguese annexation authors writing in Spanish revolutionary nationalists. Hernani Cidade, for example, claims that there was never a time of greater national pride (27), which is precisely why Glaser thinks the Spanish have generally shown little interest in Portuguese-biased texts (Preface 5). No matter how one values Portugal’s literary output during the annexation, the Portuguese Nation was one of the most widespread topics of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Portuguese literature; a reality augmented, not stifled, by Spain’s sixty-year occupation. In truth, Portugal—as a place, a past, and a people—pervades early modern Peninsular literature from beginning to end. Although Portugal ceded its independence to Philip II and the Spanish Empire, its literary celebrity was only enhanced by the annexation, which served as a stimulus for artistic expression (Cidade

50). This is due, in part, to the outpouring of texts—of every genre—dedicated to the glories of Portugal.

My approach to this body of works falls into a category of critical analysis I call comparative Iberian studies. Ricardo Jorge offers the term *hispanologia* as a way of describing the same thing (a binational, interdisciplinary approach to Iberian literature)

(46). Building on Jorge's thinking, Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos describes the scholar engaged in such criticism as a *hispanófila*:

[I]sto é, como quem, indagando e explorando, sempre, desde os inícios do seu labutar filológico, havia abraçado, com ardor e amor igual, *Portugal e Espanha*, estudando interessada as relações mútuas dos dois países, as provas de consideração e afecto que se deram, no decorrer dos séculos, mas também as diferenças da sua psique e as exteriorizações de ódios, ciúmes e rivalidades, em que a fatalidade histórica os envolveu. (Preface xiv)

While this model of reading and interpretation is not limited to the period of annexation, early modern Spanish and Portuguese literature lends itself particularly well to comparative methodologies, as it was a time defined by linguistic, artistic, and political crossings. Early modern Iberia may very well be, in fact, one of the richest periods of artistic cross-pollination the Peninsula has ever enjoyed. My choice to cast such exchanges in a positive light is intentional, as I believe that the blending of literary traditions ultimately enriches both the writing and the reading of such works. Cidade, a major enthusiast of Peninsular approaches to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish and Portuguese literature, gives this assessment of comparative Iberian studies through the mid-twentieth century: “No obstante la importancia de este campo de la investigación para mejor comprender ambas literaturas, ha despertado en conjunto escasa atención,

quizá por la dificultad que ofrece localizar los textos necesarios” (ix). By this Cidade does not mean to ignore the work of Teófilo Braga, Francisco de Sousa de Viterbo, and others—who, as he recognizes, have taken the first promising steps—only to emphasize that more needs to be done to recover this “importante rama de la investigación hispana” (xi). Clearly, as Cidade continues, there is a great need to “examinar más a fondo una faceta de la historia literaria peninsular desatendida por entero hasta hace poco tiempo” (xii).

Neither Domingo García Péres’s *Catálogo razonado, biográfico y bibliográfico de los autores portugueses que escribieron en castellano* (1890) nor any work since clearly distinguishes between one Portuguese author who wrote in Spanish during the annexation and the others. The scope of García Péres’s work, in fact, is much larger, as he wanted to catalogue all of the Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish through the late nineteenth century. This by no means lessens the value of the bibliographer’s project; rather, it invites future generations to discover additional ways to approach this fascinating group of writers. Unfortunately, however, most literary critics and historians tend to homogenize and marginalize these authors and their works (especially those of the annexation), often confining them to economic opportunism, language disloyalty, and other reductive categories. In contrast, this investigation maintains that during the annexation a sub-set of Portuguese authors used their Spanish proficiency to construct and promote a national imaginary throughout and beyond the Iberian Peninsula. By distinguishing the present study from García Péres’s late nineteenth-century work, I do not wish to distance myself from his valuable contribution. His text is not one hundred

percent exhaustive, but it is the most complete bibliography of Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish currently available and a great point of departure for this and any other related study.

In his fundamental work *A literatura autonomista sob os Filipines* (1959), Hernani Cidade identifies a movement among early modern Portuguese authors that he calls resistance literature. He organizes his approach around three specific genres from the time: epic, historiography, and essay. His analysis shows how several Portuguese authors used their writings to articulate some form of objection to the Spanish takeover. He makes his intentions clear from the outset:

Não é outra senão a pequena Casa Lusitana, de que fala Camões, a que enche este livro. É a Nação inteira, na totalidade dos seus valores, que eu procuro mostrar como reagiu, numa crise mais grave da sua história. E o assunto não me empolgou apenas por motivos estreitamente nacionais: no drama de uma grande personalidade colectiva, reagindo contra a pressão temporal que procurava submetê-la, contra as próprias forças espirituais que ameaçavam de dissolução, como não ter presentes algumas das mais impressionantes tragédias desta convulsa idade de ferro em que o destino nos condenou a viver? A expressão literária que toma tal reacção bem poderia eu chamar-lhe literatura da resistência, se não fora o desejo de evitar as apariências de chantage. (7)

As this passage demonstrates, Cidade has little difficulty speaking of early modern Portugal as a nation. It is not, however, a distant, inanimate collectivity, but one to which he feels a present sense of belonging. His work describes Portugal's collective reaction to the annexation: what he considers one of the most significant national crises in Portuguese history.

Cidade disguises his endorsement of "resistance literature" in the rhetoric of paralipsis above, but he makes his subversive reading of these works increasingly more

apparent throughout the text. Further into *A literatura autonomista* he appears more willing to commit to the idea of a literary resistance: “É esta literatura—*quase* podíamos chamar-lhe da resistência—que nos próximos capítulos se estudará” (47; my emphasis). Whatever inhibitions hold him back initially, however, are completely abandoned by the end of the study:

Este livro procura dar relevo, esclarecer sob mais viva iluminação da inteligência atenta, a literatura que podemos qualificar como da *resistência*, empregando epíteto actualíssimo. Foi a expressão e o incentivo da *resistência* da *lusitanidade* à absorpção por um país que politicamente nos dominava, ao mesmo tempo que material e culturalmente nos excedia. *Resistência* das camadas cultas como das incultas da Nação . . . O resultado prático de tal resistência espiritual foi preparar o ambiente e suscitar os estímulos do acto revolucionário que nos libertou. (284-85; my emphasis)

Here the author emphasizes the purpose of his work: to describe the literary road of resistance walked by many Portuguese authors during the annexation. The lifeblood of this artistic uprising, according to Cidade, is the collective sense of identity embodied in the word *lusitanidade*, what we might describe as “Portugueseness” or “Portuguese identity” in English (though both expressions fall short of the richness of the original). He sees these works as a foreshadowing of the 1640 Restoration and Portugal’s twenty-eight-year campaign to achieve autonomous recognition from their Peninsular neighbor.

While Cidade’s text represents an important precursor to the present study, *A literatura autonomista sob os Filipes* focuses primarily on literature written in Portuguese, ignoring the immense body of Portuguese-authored works in Spanish. By juxtaposing Portuguese and Spanish, he misses the opportunity to investigate the blend of both traditions inherent in the Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish. What is

more, by focusing primarily on works in Portuguese, Cidade overlooks the majority of Portuguese literature written at that time, as Spanish was the predominant literary language of the annexation. Temporally speaking, both his study and mine favor the writings produced during the annexation (a valuable frame for investigating the interaction between politics and literature on the Iberian Peninsula). In terms of theme, one could argue that I also take up the topic of resistance literature, although my interests center on works that are more affirmative by nature. That is, the nationalism of which I speak is much more pro-Portuguese than anti-Castilian.¹ I agree with Cidade that his text addresses an important and understudied facet of Peninsular literary history (xii), but I likewise acknowledge that the big picture is still largely incomplete without a consideration of the body of works written by the Portuguese in the Spanish language during the period of annexation. In many ways, these works are a more realistic representation of early modern Iberian culture and its border-crossing tendencies. Writing in Spanish allowed the Portuguese to participate in the greater cultural current of the Peninsula. The frame of my work, however, not only expands linguistically and geographically, but also generically, as I am proposing a broad-based literary phenomenon, not merely the interest of epic poets, historiographers, and essayists. In this way, the authors that occupy the remaining chapters of this study should be seen as representative of their particular genres. Notwithstanding the secondary attention that Cidade gives to works written in the language of the empire, his genre-specific approach,

¹ Throughout this study, I use the categories Castilian and Spanish synonymously. While Castilian is more true to the language, geography, and politics of the early modern period, Spanish is more relevant in the twenty-first century. As a result, I will generally favor the latter over the former, pointing out differences when it will be helpful to the reader.

and other points of contrast, his book makes important connections and raises valuable questions regarding the relationship between the literature and politics of early modern Iberia.

In his article “España en la época filipina,” Eugenio Asensio offers a critical response to Cidade’s book, explaining that Cidade’s reading of Portuguese texts produced during the annexation “provoca en el lector del otro lado de la raya fronteriza la reflexión y no pocas veces la contradicción” (66). Rather than react to Cidade’s work as a Spaniard (even though there is evidence of his own loyalties), Asensio takes on the Portuguese scholar’s work as a literary critic: “el autor, al ordenar y valorar el material, se ha dejado guiar por un criterio nacionalista más que estético. No pocas veces su tesis le ha empujado a violentar el sentido de los textos, a falsear la perspectiva” (70). He takes issue with what he sees as a blatant disregard for aesthetics in Cidade’s work, accusing the author of imposing a nationalist reading on the works he considers and mischaracterizing Philippine domination in Portugal. His purpose is not to disregard Cidade’s account of resistance literature altogether, but to offer a more balanced view of Portuguese literature written during the annexation. Those familiar with both Cidade and Asensio’s work will soon realize that the decision is not which of the two is right, but how they are both right in different ways. Asensio does not say this explicitly, but I believe that this is what he accomplishes in his article: the disintegration of either/or approaches to Portuguese literature of the annexation. Within his critical corpus are a number of relevant books and articles, although nothing informs the current study as much as his response to Cidade.

Cidade and Asensio were not the only ones to focus on the unique Iberian intercultural of the early modern period. Edward Glaser, for one, made repeated efforts to highlight the literary relations between Spain and Portugal at this time. He dismisses the misconception that writing in the language of the empire indicates disloyalty, arguing that the motivations driving this phenomenon are too diverse and complex for such a generalization (see “On Portuguese”). One could even describe Glaser as the answer to the question Asensio puts forward at the end of his response to Cidade: “Habrá un historiador que trate de salvar para Portugal algunas de sus más nobles figuras tachadas de filipinismo?” (“España” 109). Certainly his efforts to revalue the work of Faria e Sousa fit the kind of critical redemption for which Asensio calls. Glaser’s introduction to *The “Fortuna” de Manuel de Faria e Sousa*, in fact, is the closest anyone has come to a biography of the author. In addition to his invaluable work on Faria e Sousa, Glaser authored several articles and books on early modern Spanish and Portuguese literature, always promoting the literary relations of the two countries. He almost always frames his literary studies in terms of the Peninsula, seeing the artistic exchange of the time as evidence of a broader Iberian culture. What further distinguishes Glaser is the fact that he comes from the North American academic system, while nearly every other critic I have consulted is from Europe, if not Iberia.

Another important voice in this discussion is that of Pilar Vázquez Cuesta, whose “La lengua y la cultura portuguesas,” an invaluable section of *Historia de la Cultura Española: El siglo del Quijote*, offers an impressive panoramic view of Portugal before, during, and after the annexation. Similar to Cidade, Vázquez Cuesta’s work sweeps

across the artistic landscape of the time in an effort to create a general understanding of the interplay between the texts and contexts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Portugal. Although her study summarizes the major cultural trends among the Portuguese, it does not lack in detail and depth. The bibliography alone is a testament of the author's lifelong commitment to early modern Iberian literature. One additional critic that deserves mention is José Ares Montes, whose *Góngora y la poesía portuguesa del siglo XVII* stands out as another valuable addition to the critical body of comparative Iberian studies. In his text, Ares Montes traces the poetic relations between Spain and Portugal, specifically the Gongorism saturating seventeenth-century Portuguese verse. I believe that this investigation complements the work of Cidade, García Péres, Glaser, Asensio, Vázquez Cuesta, Ares Montes, and others, at the same time that it advances fresh arguments and raises new questions. My research builds upon extant scholarship related to Portuguese annexation literature and works towards a new understanding of the relationship between literature, language, identity, and politics in early modern Iberia.

My approach to Portuguese annexation literature is in many ways similar to Richard Helgerson's work on the Elizabethan writing of England in *Forms of Nationhood* (1992), a work defined by crossing boundaries and analyzing discursive forms (Helgerson 6). I have identified a number of works of Portuguese annexation literature in an effort to shed light on the ways in which these authors used their proficiency in Spanish to promote Portugal within and without the greater Iberian world. Despite the inherent challenges of such a position, which I will detail in the first chapter, I believe that the texts produced by these authors represent an early form of national consciousness

that merits greater attention. Just as Helgerson describes in his assessment of Elizabethan literature, the Portuguese authors I consider in this study—in spite of their many differences—share a common interest in the nation: “They did not know where either they or history were going. But they did have a firm grasp on the interests they served, and they sensed that identifying those interests with the nation and the nation with those interests would satisfy several needs at once” (11). Helgerson recognizes the layeredness of the texts in question and focuses on how wrapping their ideas in the rhetoric of the nation could serve many different ends. The same can be said of the Portuguese. Writing about Portugal in Spanish was not motivated by any one factor, but by a host of possibilities which I hope to lay bare from chapter to chapter. Thus, I am not trying to make the authors of this investigation one and the same on all accounts, but am trying to highlight one of the points at which they intersect: a common interest in celebrating the Portuguese nation. Just as Portugal is the protagonist of their texts, the Portuguese nation—rather than any one author or genre—is the protagonist of this study.

The first chapter, “*Portugalidade, Saudade, and the Nation: Learning the Language of Early Modern Portuguese National Consciousness,*” establishes the historico-conceptual apparatus through which I frame my approach to Portuguese nationhood. Portugal does not easily fit into general theories of nation and nationalism, especially among constructivists who insist on the modernity of the nation. The Portuguese nation boasts a stable border as early as the twelfth century and a strong sense of collective identity (what I will refer to as *Portugalidade*) leading up to and following the maritime age of discovery. In order to reaffirm the national imaginary, early modern

Portuguese texts repeatedly evoke a sense of collective identity through the invention and celebration of Portuguese history, language, geography, folklore, and other identifying characteristics, including *saudade*. Rather than ignore the ways in which general nation theories (e.g., Hobsbawm, Gellner, Anderson) challenge my understanding of early modern Portugal, however, I will situate my conceptual framework in a way that allows them to work in concert with Portuguese historians (e.g., Godinho, Mattoso, Lourenço, Albuquerque) and the early modern texts that occupy this study.

The second chapter, “Vicente, Ferreira, Camões: Tracing the Roots of Portuguese Annexation Literature,” looks closely at three of the most important Portuguese authors of the sixteenth century and their influence on annexation authors. This chapter is not an exhaustive attempt to trace the impact of sixteenth-century authors on Faria e Sousa, Cordeiro, Azevedo, and others, but an attempt to identify a pattern of nationalist thinking in their works that annexation authors would later imitate. Nobody left a more permanent mark on annexation authors than Luís de Camões, whose masterpiece, *Os Lusíadas*, proved to be a powerful vehicle for nationalist sentiment. From the time of his death through the end of the seventeenth century, to say nothing of the centuries thereafter, virtually every Portuguese author had something to say about Camões and were deliberate in their efforts to lay bare his influence on their writing and thinking. Overall, then, the purpose of this brief chapter is to emphasize the legacy Vicente, Ferreira, and Camões left for authors of the annexation to build upon. They provided a pattern of nationally-interested literature for future generations to follow.

The third chapter, “Portuguese Nationalism in a Spanish Costume: The Case of Manuel de Faria e Sousa,” questions the Castilianized view of the Portuguese historian, poet, and literary critic. The heart of Faria e Sousa’s nationalism, and the central text of this chapter, is his commentary *Lusiadas de Luis de Camoens, Príncipe de los Poeta de España*, published in Madrid from 1639 to 1640, on the eve of the Portuguese Restoration. My approach to this work consists of analyzing the numerous instances in the text where Faria e Sousa manifests his nationalist character, including the significance of the title page; the geographic superiority of Lisbon and the Portuguese nation; the glorification of the Portuguese language; providentialism; the loyalty, bravery, mastery at sea, and other values of the people; and the repeated references to a collective identity. It is anticipated that this will demonstrate the underlying patriotic fervor guiding Faria e Sousa’s corpus of works and reveal the mechanisms at work among other Portuguese authors participating in this movement. Beyond the analysis of his commentary, this chapter considers his poetic legacy, emphasizing the similarities and differences between Faria e Sousa and his Iberian contemporaries, including his preference for and imitation of Camões and his attempts to integrate politics into his verse. Faria e Sousa’s deeply patriotic approach to historiography will also factor into this chapter. My analysis focuses, among other things, on the various inaccuracies and exaggerations within his historical writings—much of the same evidence other critics have used to degrade his historical contribution. As I will argue, however, nationalism has less to do with truth and accuracy than it does with imagining the past in a way that casts the nation in the best possible light. Although his writings were dressed in Spanish, a careful analysis reveals

the writings of a Portuguese patriot, committed to the preservation of Portugal's identity and independence.

Nowhere did Portuguese national consciousness take center stage more than in early modern Iberian theater, the focus of chapter four, "Staging the Nation: Cordeiro, Azevedo, and the Portuguese *Comedia*." The nation becomes an increasingly important dramatic theme in Iberian theater during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not to mention an effective form of mass media. Portuguese themes, language, and history, appear in numerous plays authored by both Spanish and Portuguese playwrights. Works about Portugal by Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, and Pedro Calderón de la Barca alone number in at least the twenties. This chapter traces the roots of the nation-theme in Iberian theater from the works of Gil Vicente and Bartolomé de Torres Naharro onward. Despite the widespread participation of the Spanish in the dramatization of both Spanish and Portuguese themes, the majority of this chapter privileges the Portuguese playwrights Jacinto Cordeiro and Ângela de Azevedo, whose plays overflow with *Portugalidade*. Cordeiro, for example, was both an accomplished craftsman of the *comedia* and a self-identified Portuguese poet-dramatist given to the praise of his *patria*, whose legacy he was committed to preserve. From beginning to end, his plays display this very objective. My analysis of Cordeiro's work focuses on two clear examples of nation-minded drama: *La entrada del rey en Portugal* and *Los doze de Inglaterra*. Beyond Cordeiro's dramatic corpus, one of the most stimulating instances of Portuguese national consciousness in early modern Iberian drama appears in the three *comedias* of the female playwright Ângela de Azevedo. A close reading and analysis of her plays showcase the unique way

in which her dramatic works perform *Portugalidade*. While Azevedo does not openly criticize the Spanish empire in her works, they clearly establish the preeminence and uniqueness of Portugal, highlighting, among other things, geographic and linguistic superiority. Whether it is where they go or what they say, Azevedo's characters regularly manifest the Portuguese character of their creator, openly affirming a place, a history, and a language that surpass all others.

The conclusion of this study, titled "Anticipating and Remembering the Restoration: Violante do Céu, Melo, and Sousa de Macedo," considers the key works leading up to and following the return of Portuguese independence in 1640. Perhaps more than any other text written during the annexation, António de Sousa de Macedo's *Flores de Espanha, Excelencias de Portugal* stands out for the extremity of its nationalist expression and foreshadows the author's active role in the defense of Portuguese autonomy in the aftermath of the Restoration. In the same way that *Flores de Espanha* was not Sousa de Macedo's only nationalist work of importance, Sousa de Macedo was not the only Portuguese author actively preserving and defending Portugal's newfound autonomy. In fact, as one might expect, a myriad of works highlight the events surrounding the Restoration and support Portugal's right to independence. This is evident among poets (e.g., Violante do Céu), playwrights (e.g., Manuel de Araujo de Castro), and many others. One of the most important voices of post-Restoration Portugal was Francisco Manuel de Melo (1608-66). Melo's subversive portrayal of Spanish decadence in his account of Spain's conflict with Catalonia, among other writings, is a clear reminder that between his Spanish mother and his Portuguese father, Melo ultimately

identified with the nationality of the latter. Overall, this concluding section looks at some of the ways in which Portuguese authors sustained nationalist discourse in a post-Restoration Portugal.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—especially the sixty-year Spanish occupation—provide the perfect stage for analyzing the character of the Portuguese nation.² A. H. Oliveira Marques dedicates several pages of his two-volume *História de Portugal* to this influential period of Portuguese history as well, emphasizing the heightened degree of national consciousness in Portugal during the annexation (323-33). Cidade reads a spirit of opposition in this body of works, arguing that this generation of Portuguese authors resisted foreign domination in their writings:

[O]s escritores que durante o domínio filipino representaram o escol [sic] da Nação por todas as formas ao seu alcance foram a consciência lúcida e a voz vibrante da emoção unânime da Pátria humilhada, sangrada, diminuída, exausta. Resistiu, na verdade, e cada vez mais exacerbado pela literatura que aqui se estuda, o sentimento de autonomia da Nação durante a crise com que a subordinação do Estado a ameaçou. Resistiu como pôde —recorrendo à erudição histórica, à poesia, à exageração propositada, à própria invenção do apócrifo. (8)

To whatever extent one agrees with Cidade’s affective statement, there is little doubt that many early modern Portuguese authors put forward a harmonious view of the Portuguese nation, even if this view was hardly as representative of the entire population as Cidade wanted it to be. I agree with Cidade that there is a clear school of nationalist thinking (“escol da Nação”) within annexation literature. Tracing the boundaries of this “generational location” is the aim of the present study (Helgerson 4). My readings have

² While, on the one hand, Passerin d’Entrèves calls the sixteenth century the spring of European nationalism, Albuquerque designates the Portuguese annexation as a time of heightened national consciousness (206, 256).

allowed me to see a movement within Portuguese annexation literature written in Spanish that collectively affirms *Portugalidade* more than it articulates resistance of Spanish hegemony. My approach to the early modern Portuguese nation rests primarily on these texts (written from 1580 to 1640) and the critics and historians who have dialogued with, overlooked, and silenced them throughout the centuries.

CHAPTER I

PORTUGALIDADE, SAUDADE, AND THE NATION: LEARNING THE LANGUAGE OF PORTUGUESE NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The year 1580 stands out as one of the most significant in Iberian cultural history. This year saw the deaths of King Henry of Portugal and Luís de Camões, the birth of Francisco de Quevedo, Cervantes's liberation from Algiers, and the dawn of the Iberian Unification. Camões's passing in July not only marked the end of one of the greatest periods of Portuguese letters, but also foreshadowed Portugal's loss of political autonomy in December of the same year. It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of these two events in the construction of Portuguese identity. In the decades following his death, Camões became a symbol for a people trying to reconcile their glorious past with their precarious present. The stakes of this new reality are difficult to identify. In theory, very little was to change under Hapsburg rule. After all, the *Carta-patente* assured, among other things, that Portuguese would remain the official language and that Portugal would maintain control over its commerce and the administration of its colonies. As Vázquez Cuesta points out, the Iberian Unification, at least initially, favored the Portuguese: "pocas veces la soberanía de un pueblo que se une a otro más poderoso habrá quedado mejor protegida por un documento" (618). Before long, reality set in: "Pronto empezará a darse cuenta Portugal de que muchas de las promesas de Felipe II iban a quedarse sólo en palabras" (620). Culturally speaking, for example, Portugal was not the same place in the wake of the Spanish takeover. How could Portugal possibly measure up to what it once

was when there was no permanent Court presence? The generation of Portuguese writers that emerged from the shadow cast by 1580 demonstrated a newfound awareness of the changes sweeping across the Peninsula. Without specifically asking the question, so many of their writings put forward an answer as to what it means to be Portuguese in a greater Iberian world. That so many would be thus engaged is not nearly as surprising as the fact that, in general, their works consistently present Portugal in the same light. Overall, the unsettling of the Portuguese self-image that occurred during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries produced a nation-minded generation of writers who applied their pens to the celebration and preservation of the fatherland.

In many cases, loss defines existence. That is, the acknowledgement of presence often occurs at the moment of absence. In the case of Portugal, the annexation certainly had this effect. Real or imagined, the disappearance of sovereignty in 1580 enabled a group of authors to see Portugal with new eyes. As Martim de Albuquerque points out, what was signified by *patria*, or fatherland, changed for many Portuguese authors during the period of annexation: “Assim como logrou ser incentivo de resistência em 1580, a ideia de pátria transformou-se durante o jugo filipino igualmente numa arma do espírito autonomista” (166). Many Portuguese authors of the period brought a newfound vision of Portugal to his or her writing, constructing, word by word, an identity separate from that of the Spanish empire. Rather than a disjointed view of Portugal, these texts establish a common vision of the “nation” consisting of essential linguistic, geographic, historical, religious, and ethnic characteristics. They lay bare the roots of early modern Portuguese national consciousness and contextualize the fundamental, yet problematic, relationship

between language, identity, literature, and politics. Additionally, they highlight an unparalleled period of artistic cross-pollination on the Iberian Peninsula. In order to unpack the phenomenon I am describing, a number of concepts will need clarification, including *Portugalidade*, *saudade*, and nation. Furthermore, the literature produced during the annexation is unintelligible without a general understanding of Portuguese history, especially the decades leading up to 1580. This chapter, therefore, puts forward the conceptual and historical framework that holds up the rest of the study. In order to understand the collectivity annexation authors invoke (invent), it is necessary to learn the language of early modern Portuguese national consciousness.

The early modern brand of Portuguese identity constructed by annexation authors is based on a creative fusion of fact and fiction. Many nation theories contend that this kind of primordial identity is a far cry from the constructions of nationness emerging at the end of the eighteenth century and thereafter. That it is not modern, however, does not preclude it from being a nation nor its members from being nationalists. By that I do not mean to suggest that early modern Portugal measures up to *all* of the standards applied to modern nations. What modernity offers, as many historians have pointed out, is the possibility of forming a collectivity that seemingly includes *all* of society. The ability to reach the masses through media, education (literacy), infrastructure (transportation), and other developments sparked nationalist movements throughout the world beginning at the end of the eighteenth century. These advances made it possible for a broad range of individuals to simultaneously conceive of a collective national body (see Benedict Anderson). That the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were generally devoid of these

modern developments, however, does not mean that a national imaginary could not exist, only that it would be limited in scale.¹

It would transcend the scope of this study to comb through legal archives in search of the commoner's voice in an effort to prove that all those living in early modern Portugal identified themselves as Portuguese (as opposed to residents of their particular village or region), although some have taken on this laborious task with varying degrees of success.² As far as national identity is concerned, the Portuguese historian José Mattoso acknowledges a repeated effort among the elite to identify themselves as part of a collective, but he is quick to point out the demographic narrowness of this conception:

Vários autores explicaram a sua [identidade nacional] existência e o seu constante reaparecimento sob formas diversas . . . pelo facto de em Portugal se verificar a constante reprodução de elites culturais de formação literária, reduzidas em número de membros, mas afastadas das áreas de decisão da política educacional o cultural, e mais afastadas ainda do povo, olhado de maneira paternalista ou então considerado rude, ignaro e irremediavelmente atrasado. (97-98)

At the very least, the Portuguese nation embodied in the texts of early modernity consists of the educated—what we might call a “Lettered Nation,” to borrow, and slightly modify, Ángel Rama's concept—although a larger cross-section of society may have participated

¹ Cidade speaks confidently of annexation Portugal as “uma inconfundível personalidade colectiva” (37). Mattoso, however, warns of the tendency to falsely attribute the characteristics of one group to another by virtue of their proximity or other shared features: “não é lícito atribuir simultaneamente a todos os habitantes de um país as operações de diferenciação, de significação e de valorização quando envolvem apenas um determinado grupo” (6).

² Birmingham does not shy away from speaking of Portugal as a transcendent collectivity in his short history on the Portuguese nation. He resists calling the 1640 Restoration a popular revolution, but points out that such an uprising occurred three years previous in Évora: “The lack of popular initiative in launching the Portuguese independence movement does not mean that there was not a degree of popular enthusiasm for liberation from the Spanish union. Centuries of war with Castile had created deep antagonism between the Portuguese and their only land neighbors” (36). While Birmingham may overstate the rivalry between the two countries, there was indeed a rivalry. Daviken Studnicki-Gizbert's *A Nation Upon the Ocean Sea* demonstrates the ways in which many Portuguese merchants of the Atlantic world identified with their native Portugal. The author, however, struggles to come up with a definition for the Portuguese nation that adequately encompasses the many merchants within his study.

in the construction of this collectivity. In some cases, these authors were not as removed from political activity as Mattoso suggests. António de Sousa de Macedo, for one, was commissioned by João IV to write in defense of Portuguese sovereignty following the Restoration. Cidade sees the Portuguese nationalists writing on behalf of their *patria* as a mouthpiece for the entire nation (8). Portuguese annexation authors writing in Spanish, in reality, did not worry themselves with the collective essence of their pens as much as the widespread consumption of their ideas. Spanish was the only language of expression which would allow the Portuguese to promote their nationhood throughout the world. Some might take issue with the widespread use of “nation” and its various forms (i.e., national, nationalism, nationalist) in this study, hastily categorizing such an effort as anachronistic, but as I will explain in this chapter and detail throughout this work, nation is the only word that adequately captures the literary movement to which so many early modern Portuguese authors subscribed.

Portugal is particularly subversive in its questioning of nation theories, especially of constructivists who insist on the modernity of the nation. This may explain why Portugal is left out of most nation studies, despite the fact that many are implicitly Eurocentric. Too often, in fact, the “Euro” of Eurocentrism excludes the Iberian Peninsula in favor of mainstream European nations (i.e., Germany, England, France, Italy)—hardly justified in any context, the least of which being the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³

Most Portuguese historians, on the other hand, take a straightforward approach to the

³ Reading through many general theories of nation and nationalism, it appears as though the authors of these works are not familiar with Portuguese history. Portugal has an unsettling effect on a lot of the arguments put forward in these studies, so it comes as no surprise that the country is overlooked and/or superficially cast aside. While Portugal may fall outside of mainstream Eurocentrism today, there is no excuse for ignoring one of the world powers of early modernity when considering nations and nationalism before the late eighteenth century.

nation, unencumbered by the “modernity complex” of many recent theories. For most of them, the early modern identity of the Portuguese nation is a given, seeing that Portugal’s collectivity has been developing since at least the twelfth century, when its borders were originally established. In fact, Vitorino Godinho *ends* his study on the emergence of the Portuguese nation in 1480. This seems to suggest that by the late fifteenth century, some form of the Portuguese nation was in place (which makes sense when one considers what happened with Portuguese literature in the sixteenth century).

My general conception of nation, nationalism, national identity, and national culture borrows from the extended metaphor of the *theatrum mundi*.⁴ As Shakespeare’s well-known verses from *As You Like It* propose, “All the world’s a stage / and all the men and women merely players” (2.7.139-40). There are many different stages within this macro-vision of life, the nation being one such theatrical space. By *nation* I mean both narration (script) and imagined community, the relationship of which will be discussed in detail hereafter. The identity of this community emerges from its attempts to weave characteristics into a pattern of self-definition. That is, *national identity* refers to the collective personality that evolves from performing the nation (the “list” that every nation unflinching creates to define itself). The product of this performance by the imagined community, then, becomes the content of the *national culture*. The common element of this whole process is *nationalism*. Nationalism wants to discover the nation, define its identity, and participate in its culture. In dramatic terms, nationalism is the audience. In other words, just as there is no play without an audience, there is no nation, no national

⁴ For more information on *theatrum mundi*, see Bernheimer, Hawkins, and Righter’s studies.

identity, no national culture without nationalism.⁵ The product of this performance is not a sure foundation, but a list of characteristics as imaginary as the nation itself, but with the potential to become a culture if the identity is repeatedly learned and performed across society. Throughout this essay I will lay bare the intertexts that inform the conceptual apparatus driving these definitions, including their relation to early modern Iberia.

Although my definition of the Portuguese nation borrows from a number of different sources, my point of departure is Bhabha's equating of nation to narration. The Portuguese nation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is a nation of texts, of which I am specifically concerned with written forms. Studying the rhetoric of nationhood contained in these works clarifies what we are to understand by the frequent early modern references to the Portuguese nation. These works represent a deliberate effort to imagine Portugal (an effort that only grew during the course of the annexation). Jorge Dias's general assessment of the unique imaginative capacity of the Portuguese, could very well be applied to the specific context of the annexation: "O português é um misto de sonhador e de homem de acção, ou, melhor, é um sonhador activo, a que não falta certo fundo práctico e realista. A actividade não tem raízes na vontade fria, mas alimenta-se da imaginação, do sonho, porque o português é mais idealista, emotivo e imaginativo do que homem de reflexão" (19). Nation-minded authors focus on past glories and a hopeful future in order to deal with the realities of the annexation. With the loss of autonomy

⁵ My view of nationalism is informed by Ernest Gellner's definition: "It is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way around. Admittedly, nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively, and it most often transforms them radically" (54).

came an unparalleled insistence on nationhood in Portuguese literature. Indeed the writings of many Portuguese authors reflect a new kind of awareness, often trying to (re)construct a nation in-between presence and absence.

Benedict Anderson's discussion of simultaneity and its role in the development of national consciousness, not to mention his emphasis on textuality, provide a compelling point of contact with Portuguese annexation literature. In dialogue with Erich Auerbach and Walter Benjamin, Anderson defines time as "a simultaneity of past and future in an instantaneous present" (24). This statement captures the essence of the Portuguese authors guiding this study, each of which (re)builds Portugal's *past* (historical, linguistic, literary) in a textual *present* (commentary on *Os Lusíadas*, *comedias*, *Flores de España*) in an effort to restore their autonomy in the *future*. Anderson explains that this simultaneity creates an imagined community in which a plurality of seemingly unrelated subjects collectively participate (27-32). While writing connects the Portuguese authors from 1580 to 1640, the collective imaginary defined in their works appears independently of one another. Of particular value to my reading of Portuguese annexation authors is Anderson's observation regarding one of Marco Kartodikromo's short stories. In reference to the repeated use of the possessive adjective "our," Anderson suggests that this utterance signifies a collectivity among readers that constitutes the embryo of the "representative body" (32). Textually speaking, this collectivity would appear in-between the lines, as evidenced, for example, in Faria e Sousa's commentary; nearly invisible on the one hand, while clearly marking the community on the other.

While Anderson has certainly popularized the idea of simultaneity in the construction of the national imaginary, similar ideas have circulated since at least the late nineteenth century. Ernest Renan's essay "What is a Nation?" (1882), for example, states that "the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common" (11). He goes on to analyze several aspects that might be considered in this collectivity, most of which echo the same topics Luís de Camões emphasizes in *Os Lusíadas*, several annexation authors popularize in their works, and Portuguese writers have crystallized over the centuries. While Renan shows the insufficiencies of defining a nation by race, language, and religion, he recognizes that they all play a part in the "legacy of memories" (19) that must be in place for a nation to exist. Eric Hobsbawm considers all of these characteristics part of what he designates proto-nationalism, or "feelings of collective belonging" (*Nations* 46). More specifically, his model defines popular proto-nationalism in terms of religio-ethnic identification and politico-historical consciousness. According to Hobsbawm, then, early modern Portugal would be something of an early nation.

Finally, and in addition to the legacy of the past mentioned above, Renan describes another critical aspect of the nation: "present-day consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage that one has received in an undivided form" (19). While the nation-building authors of the Portuguese Annexation appear united in a common cause, the same cannot be said of the entire country (otherwise, Portugal arguably would never have lost its sovereignty). Despite the temporal distance, Portuguese annexation literature opens up a meaningful dialogue with

those currently engaged with issues of nation and nationalism. That there is something deeply modern about early modern Portugal cannot be denied. Somewhere between the primordialists and the constructivists rests early modern Portugal, bursting with national consciousness at a time well before the modern nation took the global stage.

Although twenty-first century definitions of the nation certainly differ from that of centuries past, the distinction is not, as some would contend, a matter of existence. The frequent references of Manuel de Faria e Sousa to the “Nación Portuguesa” in his commentary of *Os Lusíadas*, demonstrate, for example, that the term “nation” abounded in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Iberian texts.⁶ However, while prevalent, a consensus definition of the nation is not only difficult to ascertain from one author to the next, but sometimes even within the works of a single writer. Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco’s *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (1611) challenges Hobsbawm’s assertion regarding the meaning of “nación” before 1884 (*Nations* 46-47). On the surface, Covarrubias’s definition seems to conform with the constructivist conception of the early modern nation: “reyno o provincia estendida, como la nación española” (823). While this definition seems to limit the nation to a particular geography as Hobsbawm suggests, it is still too vague to lead to any immediate conclusions. An analysis of *nación* according to other related entries in Covarrubias’s dictionary, however, opens up the seventeenth-century concept of nation significantly. In his definition of *España*, for example, Covarrubias (1) acknowledges the synonymity between Spain and Iberia, (2) mentions

⁶ A brief search of “nación” in the Corpus del Español (CdE) and “nação” in the Corpus do Português (CdP) does not indicate a statistically significant difference between the frequency of the word in the eighteen and nineteen hundreds versus the fifteen and sixteen hundreds (Davies). While the signified has evolved over the centuries, the signifier remains consistent.

the three major provinces therein (Bética, Lusitânia, and Tarraconense), and (3) identifies *its* language (550-51). The inconsistencies between this definition and that of *nación* are immediately apparent. If nation, for example, is a vast province, and an example of this is the *nación española* as cited before, how can a province be composed of provinces? Are there different kinds of provinces? It would follow that while *España* normally serves as a synonym for Iberia—as both its own definition as well as the entries for Castilla, Aragón, Porto, and *Lusitânia* suggest—it can also refer to a specific part of the Peninsula. After all, Covarrubias was aware of the many languages spoken throughout the Peninsula. Nevertheless, he refers to the single language of the *españolado*. If nation only meant Iberia in its entirety, a reference to “la lengua” would be inaccurate (550).

Covarrubias defines *provincia* as “una parte de tierra estendida” (885), which hardly elucidates our understanding of nation except that it sets up a synonymous relationship between *nación* and *provincia*, in which *reyno* could also be included. Here, as in other places, Covarrubias appears trapped between etymology and contemporary usage, which is much more difficult to standardize. In his note to the reader at the beginning of the text, Covarrubias uses the word *nación* in context: “castellana antigua, compuesta de una mezcla de las que introduxeron las naciones que al principio vinieron a poblar a España. La primera, la de Túbal, y después ésta, otras muchas, de algunas de las quales haze mención Plinio; conviene saber: los hebreos, los persas, los fenices, los celtas, los penos, los cartagineses” (20). In this passage *nación* represents a people more than a place, which coincides with Covarrubias’s definition of *gentes*: “las naciones esparcidas por el Orbe” (636). Considered altogether, entries on *España*, *reyno*,

provincia, and *gentes* suggest that Covarrubias's nation consists of both a place—synonymous to his entries on province and kingdom on the one hand, and Iberia on the other—as well as a people with linguistic and other identifying characteristics. In the context of early modern Portuguese literature, this amplified view of the nation stands out even more clearly.

Notwithstanding the well-documented ambivalence surrounding the term “nation” and its development since early modernity, no other word better describes the object of interest of so many Portuguese texts written during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Two initial questions emerge from situating the issue of nation and nationalism within Portugal during this time of crisis: (1) what did the Portuguese actually lose in 1580 and, similarly, (2) what did they gain in 1640? I believe that the nation, in all its complexity, is at the heart of these two questions. Developing ideas regarding nationhood made pre-annexation and post-Restoration Portugal two distinct places. Yes, 1580 was the year of the Spanish takeover, but it was really the end of something much larger that had been occurring for decades: the decline of Portugal's imperial dominance. The sixty years separating 1580 and 1640 saw a generation of writers collectively look back on Portugal's history for inspiration, fueling a heightened sense of *Portugalidade* in their writings. In order to fully understand what I am getting at with my use of nation and how it informs my reading of annexation literature, it becomes necessary to provide a historical overview of Portugal beginning in the twelfth century, including the major figures, places, and events of this, the first act of Portuguese history. These centuries

provided annexation authors with the necessary material to weave together the fabric of the Portuguese nation.

As voluminous as Portuguese history is, its pre-modern identity rests primarily on the following features: its naming, the fixing of its borders, its successes in conflict, its maritime discoveries, and the development of its own vernacular. The natural point of departure for this historical journey to Portugal is the actual name of the country. While history has provided some consensus regarding the origin of the name, the “official story” behind the name of Portugal and its beginnings remains elusive. Historians widely agree that Portugal comes from the Roman name *Portus Cale*, with *Cale* being the name of a preexisting northern settlement near present-day Porto. Once the Romans conquered this area (around the third century BC), *Portus* (i.e., port) was added to the name. Over the next thousand years *Portus Cale* became *Portucale* and then *Portugale*. By the eleventh and twelfth centuries the area between the Douro and Minho rivers was finally known as *Portugal*. Portugal, however, was not the only name by which the country was known. By the end of the fifteenth century, and especially in the sixteenth, the name Lusitânia was used as a way of evoking Portugal’s antiquity (Albuquerque 276-82). In his work on Portuguese grammar, Fernão de Oliveira reflects on the mythic qualities of the names Lusitânia and Portugal:

Luso, que também enobreceu esta terra, não foi grego, mas de Portugal nascido e criado, filho de Liceleu, e este recebeu em seu reino a El-Rei Dionísio, ou Dinis, com festas de sacrificios e devoções, porque já desde então os Portugueses sabem conhecer e servir e louvar a Deus. E deste rei Luso se chamou a terra em que vivemos Lusitânia, a qual depois chamaram Turdugal e agora, mudando algumas letras, Portugal, não do porto de Gaia, como quer Duarte Galvão na *História de El Rei D. Afonso Henriques*, mas dos Túrdulos e Galos, duas nações de homens que vieram

morar em esta terra, segundo conta Estrabão no terceiro livro da sua *Geografia*. E assim desta feição, já também este nome de Portugal é antigo e agora, com a virtude da gente, muito enobrecido e com muitos bons tratos e conversações, assim em armas como em letras engrandecida. (2.40-41)

Apparent in this description is the distinction between Oliveira's etymological understanding of the name Portugal and the widely-accepted version explained above. In both cases there is an effort to memorialize Portugal by situating it in antiquity. The what, therefore, is not nearly as important as the how and when. Despite a differing view of Portugal's etymology, Oliveira's conception of King Luso directly coincides with the widely accepted legend of the time. Within decades of Oliveira's publication, Luso would motivate the title of Camões's epic poem *Os Lusíadas*, inspire Portuguese authors of the annexation, and eventually become a way of speaking of all things Portuguese—a distinction it still maintains.

The political inception of Portugal came during the twelfth century, coincidentally around the same time that its name evolved into its present form. Due to his role in the reconquest of Galicia and northern Portugal, Henrique of Burgundy was simultaneously appointed Count of Portugal and married to King Alfonso VI's illegitimate daughter Theresa in 1093. At the time, Portugal belonged to Castile and León's large feudal network. Following Henrique's death in 1112, his son, Afonso Henriques, inherited his father's position as count. Within twenty years Afonso had knighted himself, raised an army, exiled his mother, triumphed in battle, and proclaimed himself Prince of Portugal. This independent spirit would aid Afonso in the coming decades as he declared, and eventually achieved, political autonomy through the *manifestis probatum* (1179) issued

by Pope Alexander III. By the time Rome entered the picture, however, Afonso Henriques had already ruled for four decades. Perhaps more than any other year, 1139 proved pivotal to the future of Afonso and the country that would crown him its first King. During this year both the Battle of São Mamede and the Battle of Ourique took place, wherein Afonso and his men faced forces led by his mother and the Almoravids, respectively. These battles served as a prologue to the declaration of sovereignty that would come that same year and set Afonso on a course that would have him unofficially recognized as king in 1143, thirty-six years prior to the papal stamp of approval. Many of the prized virtues of Portuguese identity and the foundational myths that would later embody the nation are based on Afonso's character and the storied events of 1139.

A prominent feature of Portugal's pre-modern history and a fundamental aspect of its development as a nation is the creation of its borders, which, by the end of the thirteenth century, reflect their present-day position. Over the centuries, historians have emphasized the unique stability of Portugal's border, a characteristic commonly reserved exclusively for "modern" nations. As Orlando Ribeiro observes, no other national border in the world approaches the longstanding fixity of Portugal: "A fronteira portuguesa, fixada nas linhas gerais quando terminou a Reconquista, é o mais antigo limite político mundial, perdurando há sete séculos com essa função" (59). While David Birmingham clearly agrees with Ribeiro, he takes the observation a step further: "The Portuguese created Europe's first 'modern' nation state whose frontiers have not changed since the fall of the old Muslim 'Kingdom of the West' in the Algarve" (1). In saying this, Birmingham must be aware of the constructivist camp (Anderson, Gellner, Hobsbawm, et

al.) that took shape during the 1980s. Nonetheless, he describes medieval Portugal in modern terms. Those who might attempt to explain away Portugal's longstanding borders and polity as the mere product of chance, might consider the following observation by A.

H. Oliveira Marques:

A fronteira portuguesa, tal como existe desde o século XIII, não é um simples produto dos acasos da Reconquista sobre os Muçulmanos. Nem sequer se pode considerar o resultado fortuito de aventuras militares contra os vizinhos cristãos. As suas origens e características permanentes têm de procurar-se no passado remoto e explicar-se principalmente pelos sistemas administrativos romano e muçulmano, acrescidos ainda do quadro eclesiástico cristão. (25)

The stability and longevity of Portugal's border remain virtually undisputed from one Portuguese historian to the next and provide an important point of departure for discussing Portuguese geography in particular, and its nationhood before the late eighteenth century in general. As Mattoso maintains, both these factors play crucial roles in the formation and solidification of the national identity (7).

In the same way that São Mamede and Ourique shaped Portugal's early history, other armed conflicts played a decisive role in the formation of the Portuguese self-concept (Mattoso 16). The Portuguese Reconquest, for example, gave an identity to the events of the twelfth century described above: "Portugal nasce desta luta contra os mouros. É uma guerra política e religiosa. Enquanto que se reconquista o solo da Pátria expulsa-se o inimigo da Fé" (Dias 17). Afonso's crusading successes were a catalyst for the papal bull issued in 1179, convincing the pope that he was indeed worthy to rule. The legitimization of Portugal by Rome, however, did not keep the neighboring kingdoms from attempting to retake what they felt was rightfully theirs. In fact, during the four

centuries separating the 1179 decision from the annexation of Portugal in 1580, Portugal and Castile were involved in several conflicts, each of which intensified Portugal's independent identity. Ribeiro describes the positive impact that these victories had on the Portuguese: "Numa época de proliferação de efémeras formas políticas, numa Península sem unidade, Portugal aparece como uma nação viável, capaz de resistir à unificação empreendida por um poderoso Estado vizinho e de, desenvolvendo um destino histórico em parte paralelo, não mais se confundir com ele" (21). It was not only the outcome of these conflicts, but the mere confrontation of the Portuguese with those of other lands that fortified their collective sense of self through differentiation: "Estes acontecimentos deram aos habitantes comuns do campo e da cidade, sobretudo na Estremadura, a noção clara do outro enquanto oposto aos nacionais" (Mattoso 17-18).

The fact that the Portuguese were always outnumbered and often victorious, instilled in them a sense of electness that would carry them with confidence into the age of expansion that followed. While they had fought side by side as Christians during the Reconquest, once the Peninsula divided into competing kingdoms, new loyalties pitted them one against the other. An aversion to foreigners grew out of the wars between Castile and Portugal occurring during the reign of Fernando and João I (Mattoso 17). This nationalist sentiment, however, was not limited to the upper ranks of Portuguese society: "O povo todo este tempo, ainda que nunca foy ouvido, sempre insistio em não se unir com castella nas cortes e fora dellas com muito esforço, e desejo pedindo, e buscando guerra ate as molheres" (Albuquerque 237). The single most important Portuguese victory over Castile came on the fields of Aljubarrota in 1385, the

significance of which comes into view through Dias's words: "Esta afirmação da força nacional parece ter despertado novas energias e surge a ideia de ir contra o antigo inimigo de tantos séculos. Portugal já possuía então embarcações que lhe permitiam uma expedição militar ao Norte de África e, em 1415, os portugueses conquistam Ceuta aos mouros. Era o começo da fase de expansão marítima" (18). Portuguese authors of the annexation often invoke Aljubarrota—with its many layers of meaning—in their works (e.g., Manuel de Faria e Sousa and Jacinto Cordeiro). Portugal's ability to repeatedly resist Castile contributed to a growing sense of national consciousness that would lead them from the battlefields of the late fourteenth century to the wave of exploration and discovery of the fifteenth (Ribeiro 60).

Any approach to Portuguese history falls short if it fails to mention the importance of the sea, as all aspects of Portuguese culture lead, one way or another, to the nation's rich maritime tradition: "A força atractiva do Atlântico, esse grande mar povoado de tempestades e de mistérios, foi a alma da Nação e foi com ele que se escreveu a História de Portugal" (Dias 15). By virtue of its geography, if not anything else, Portugal was destined to rest its future in the unpredictable ebb and flow of the sea. Dias explains: "A cultura portuguesa tem carácter essencialmente expansivo, determinado em parte por uma situação geográfica que lhe conferiu a missão de estreitar os laços entre os continentes e os homens" (14). After centuries of struggle to establish sovereignty and territory, Portugal asserted its collective strength abroad, expanding her borders well beyond the confines of Iberia. Dias argues that this influenced the unification and permanence of the nation more than anything else:

Portugal, porém, apresenta uma curiosa particularidade de unificação. Embora a origem da Nação se deva também à política, à vontade dum príncipe, que naturalmente se aproveitou de certas aspirações de independência latentes nas populações de Entre Douro e Minho, a unificação e a permanência da Nação deve-se ao mar. Foi a grande força atractiva do Atlântico que amontoou no litoral a maior densidade da população portuguesa do Norte, criando como que um vácuo para o interior. (12)

The sea had a unifying effect on the Portuguese, bringing together those who would navigate unknown waters and acting as a link between those who stayed at home and those who sailed to other lands. While initially contact with the *Other* would come within its borders, Portugal's maritime expansion intensified the process of differentiation and had a major impact on the development of *Portugalidade*: "A Expansão portuguesa, que pôs milhares de portugueses em contacto directo com outros povos e outras civilizações, veio evidentemente reforçar o sentimento nacional" (Mattoso 18). Although Mattoso is careful not to overestimate the scale of Portuguese identity at this time, he acknowledges the widespread effect of the maritime expansion, emphasizing its ability to reinforce commonalities among the Portuguese: "Embora não fossem directamente vividas por toda a população nacional, sabemos que a sua experimentação envolveu, de maneira directa ou indirecta, uma porção enorme de gente de todas as condições e origens e por isso as suas consequências no processo de categorização da identidade nacional se fizeram sentir mesmo nas áreas rurais e no interior do País" (18).

For much of Iberia, the fifteenth century was a time of political consolidation and reconquest. With the unification of Castile and Aragon in 1469 and the subsequent fall of Granada in 1492, the five kingdoms making up Iberia were reduced to three. While the nation that would eventually become Spain was beginning to take shape, however,

Portugal was busy running its borders and influence far beyond the Iberian Peninsula. Exploration and conquest gave birth to the Portuguese Empire, which, in the century following the conquest of Ceuta in 1415, grew to include Brazil, parts of the Middle East and Asia, sections of Africa, and a number of islands. One remarkable aspect of this imperial expansion was the proportion of the Portuguese (roughly two million) to those they ruled over (several million), not to mention the size of the homeland in proportion to the empire. Nevertheless, the Portuguese never let their quantitative deficiency get in the way of their ambitions. As far as they were concerned, the odds were always in their favor. The Portuguese identity of previous centuries—rooted in the lands of reconquest and defense—was now inseparably connected to the timelessness of the sea. It is this feature of *Portugalidade*, according to Cidade, that distinguishes Portugal more than anything else: “A independência de Portugal, não é tanto uma fatalidade geográfica ou étnica, como uma solicitação, ao mesmo tempo que oferta, do Oceano” (20).

The armed conflicts that defined Portugal’s territory and the exploration that expanded its reach well beyond Iberia, all form part of the shared historical experience that is central to the development of national consciousness (Gellner 43). Also of fundamental importance to the founding of a nation is the idea of a common past and shared existence:

Com efeito, [a identidade nacional] é fundamentalmente um fenómeno da consciência colectiva, que se vaseia, por um lado, numa percepção das diferenças comuns verificadas em relação à população de outros países, ao nível das estruturas sociais, das manifestações culturais (nomeadamente de língua, dos hábitos e dos valores) e, por outro lado, de uma certa percepção do passado comum. (Mattoso 102)

By the end of the pre-modern era, Portugal had enough history to claim a collective identity. While this brand of national identity was not the fully-developed version that would appear during the late eighteenth century and thereafter, it contained many of the markers of a developing nation: defined territory, shared history, a cohesive polity, and its own vernacular. Not to be forgotten in the development of the Portuguese nation is the role of language, which plays a decisive, albeit confusing, role in identity formation on the Iberian formation (especially during the annexation). As Livermore observes, “the general replacement of Latin by Portuguese occurred in the course of the thirteenth century” (55). With the advent of the printing press—which fostered an unprecedented degree of standardization and dissemination—language became increasingly more important and complex as a function of identity.

The heightened awareness of language—both native and foreign—pressed upon the late fifteenth-century European imaginary, naturally led to an outbreak in multilingualism, and, consequently, polyglot literature during the early modern period. As Hugo Beardsmore points out, “polyglot literature has been produced in Western Europe since at least the Middle Ages” (91). This type of literature, as Beardsmore explains, consists of two main variants. In the first group, one author uses two or more languages in separate texts, while in the second, a single author utilizes more than one language within the same text (91). The development of Vulgar-Latin and proto-Romance in the Western Roman Empire during the Middle Ages finds its echo in the subsequent emergence of polyglot literature. Leonard Forster’s *The Poet’s Tongues* (1970), provides a unique look at the development of polyglot texts in Europe from the medieval period to

the baroque. In his work he emphasizes the prominence of bilingualism among the educated of the day: “Latin was not a mother tongue for anyone; all those who used it had to learn it. In one sense therefore the whole vast Latin literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance is polyglot poetry” (19). According to this criterion, one could situate the beginnings of literary polyglotism in Western Europe with the production of texts that include both Vulgar and Classical Latin.

With the standardization of new vernaculars in Iberia came many literary innovations, including the increased production of polyglot writings. Beyond the juxtaposition of Romance and Classical Latin, some writers began to work between different Romance languages. During the thirteenth century, for example, King Alfonso of Castile, whose native tongue was Castilian, followed the poetic current of the time and produced his lyric poetry in Galician-Portuguese. Dias sees this multilingualism as a longstanding characteristic of the Portuguese: “O português foi sempre poliglota. Já os nossos clássicos escreveram quase todos em mais de uma língua” (31). Although literary trends definitely popularized languages for specific uses, socio-political changes had the greatest impact on the spread of polyglotism in Iberia. The rise of empire often translated into the growth of certain languages and the disappearance of others. It can be said that all texts, to some degree, bear the mark of the time and place in which they were produced. Indeed, the increase of polyglot literature in Iberia during the early modern period is a direct reflection of the events leading up to and following the Iberian Unification. As Forster explains, polyglot literature is “the functional reflexion of an actual social situation” (35). From 1500 to 1700, a time spanning from the Catholic

Monarchs (Spain) and Manuel I (Portugal) to the end of the Hapsburg dynasty, Iberia saw the culmination of literary polyglotism as a direct response to the many socio-political changes that occurred during this age of empires. As Cidade explains, an early example of this type of literature is Garcia de Resende's *Cancionero*: "a sétima parte da poesia é em castelhano; a restante, em grande parte de influência castelhana. Domina já desde o último quartel do século XV o bilinguismo, a que darão continuidade os poetas de Quinhentos e os de Seiscentos" (23).

The period of discovery and conquest led by Spain and Portugal created an unprecedented world network that relied heavily on language and correspondence. Indeed, the various colonial encounters benefited greatly from the ability to communicate with native cultures. From Cortés and La Malinche in Mexico to Jesuit missionaries and the Tupi in Brazil, language took on a very important role in the colonization of the Americas and the development of empire worldwide. Antonio Nebrija emphasizes this reality in the prologue of his *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492), stating, "siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio" (97). Nebrija understood the inseparable nature of language and power. The Spanish were hardly the first to discover this reality. In fact, studies on virtually every European language—as well as several indigenous languages of the Americas—popped up throughout the sixteenth century. Language, however, always held the promise of power, so it would be wrong to say that humanity figured this out at the beginning of the early modern period. Nebrija's work, nevertheless, was not conceivable a century previous because the printing press had not been invented. Among the many ways Gutenberg's invention changed the world, was the revolutionizing effect it

had on language. This is, in part, what Nebrija addresses in his prologue. The fact that his work was published the same year that Granada fell and, consequently, the *Reconquista* ended, not to mention the “discovery” of the New World by Christopher Columbus, seems all too serendipitous.

In addition to these socio-cultural changes, the political landscape changed drastically in 1516 as power shifted from the homegrown Catholic Kings to the foreign Hapsburgs, beginning with the polyglot king Charles V. These changes intensified relations between Iberia and the rest of Europe and, consequently, amplified the Peninsula’s exposure to other vernaculars. Improvements in communication and the spread of imperialism, not exclusively independent of one another, led to an unprecedented degree of literary interaction that crossed both political and linguistic borders. In consequence of these developments, multilingualism spread among the educated throughout Europe, with certain languages often assuming specific roles in society. Forster captures this in a well-known anecdote attributed to Charles V:

The idea that certain languages were specially proper for specific purposes lasted into the sixteenth century when Charles V, King of Spain, Emperor of Germany, and Duke of Burgundy, maintained, so it is said, that French was the language to speak with one’s ambassadors, Italian with one’s women, German with one’s stable boys (according to another version, with one’s horse) and Spanish with God. (17)

Similar passages frequently appear in the literature of the time, often expressed in an apparent effort to exalt one’s native tongue and, in some cases, put down another. While the specificity of vernaculars changed in a general sense as Forster suggests, the widespread use of Spanish by the Portuguese in the literature of the annexation demonstrates that such ideas concerning the appropriate use of language did not

disappear entirely. That is, the idea that a particular language was uniquely suited for a specific function (e.g., writing a *comedia*), persisted until the end of the seventeenth century.

An intriguing collection of sixteenth-century anecdotes provides the perfect context for framing the linguistic reality of the time. In one of them, Pedro de Alaçova Carneiro, a Portuguese ambassador living at the Court in Madrid, apparently speaks Spanish with everyone except the king, Philip II, whom he always addresses in Portuguese. Perplexed by this phenomenon, the king finally asks him why he never speaks to *him* in Spanish. The Portuguese diplomat replies, “porque com vossa magestade falo de sizo, e com os mais de zombaria” (*Anedotas* 145). This passage links Portuguese to good sense and judgment, while referring to Spanish in terms of mockery and the mundane. In other words, important and sacred matters, addressed to high profile individuals, require a language worthy of such topics—echoing the previous passage attributed to Charles V. According to this particular anecdote, Spanish only measures up to common, menial matters. Although comical, this attack is significant due to the clear relationship it draws between language and identity. It would follow that any slight of the Spanish language ultimately reflected poorly on the people.

A resurgence of the Portuguese language as a means of identification accompanied the Renaissance and continued well into the seventeenth century. Fernão de Oliveira’s *Gramática portuguesa* (1537) and João de Barros’s *Diálogo em louvor da nossa linguagem* (1540), helped trigger this revaluation of language. In actuality, praise of the Portuguese language became a standard fixture in the prologues of many

Portuguese texts produced during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This occurred, in part, because of the mixed feelings that many had about writing in Spanish over their native Portuguese. In the prologue to Fernão Álvares do Oriente's *Lusitânia transformada* (1607), for instance, the author explains that part of his motivation for writing in Portuguese is to offset the proliferation of texts in Spanish that, in his view, discredit his native tongue (9). Albuquerque points to Oliveira and Barros's profound awareness of the political value of language as one of the main factors motivating their active defense and preservation of the Portuguese language (93). Oliveira argues that empires of the past (e.g., Greek and Roman) maintain a certain degree of relevance in the sixteenth century because they spread their respective languages in oral and written forms. Rather than further glorify their languages, the grammarian insists on the dissemination of the Portuguese language throughout the world: "tornemos sobre nós agora que é tempo e somos senhores, porque melhor é que ensinemos a Guiné que sejamos ensinados de Roma, ainda que ela agora tivera toda sua valia e preço. E não desconfiemos da nossa língua porque os homens fazem a língua, e não a língua os homens" (4.42-43). Among the many ideas put forward in this passage, the relationship established between man and language stands out. Oliveira's well-known statement suggests that a language cannot exceed the source of its utterance. That is, only a great people are capable of a noble tongue.

Of all the aspects of the Portuguese language one might consider in an effort to understand the connection between the Portuguese people and their language, nothing stands out more than *saudade*: the most triumphant single expression of *Portugalidade*.

Despite its longstanding place within Portuguese language and identity, the origin of *saudade* is, and will likely remain, obscure. In the *Dicionário etimológico resumido* (1966), for example, Antenor Nascentes traces the origin of *saudade* to the Latin *solitudo* through the archaic forms *soydade* and *suydade*, attributing some influence to *saúde* (677). Francisco da Silveira Bueno, in his *Grande dicionário etimológico-prosódico da língua portuguesa* (1967), concludes more or less the same. While most accept this etymology, others diverge from the work of these two important Portuguese etymologists. João Ribeiro, for one, links *saudade* with the Arabic *saudá*, “which in Classical Arabic means ‘black bile’, ‘hypochondria’, ‘melancholy’, related to the adjective *aswad* ‘black’” (cited in Pap 99). Leo Pap, borrowing from Ribeiro, explains, “*saudá* literally refers to the ‘blackened’ or ‘bruised’ blood within the heart, and figuratively, to a feeling of profound sadness” (99).

The thirty-fifth chapter of Dom Duarte’s philosophical essay *Leal conselheiro* (1438), “Do nojo, pesar, desprazer, avorrecimento e suydade,” includes a lengthy treatment of *saudade*. His is the only known definition of the word to predate the Portuguese Renaissance. The brief chapter summarizes what are still considered the most fundamental characteristics of the expression: (1) originates in the heart, (2) untranslatable, (3) relates to people, places, and/or things, and (4) produces anything from happiness to sadness to melancholy. Among the most important passages in the work is the following excerpt concerning the uniquely Portuguese nature of *saudade*: “este nome de saudade tão próprio, que o latim nem outra linguagem que eu saiba não é para tal sentido semelhante” (129). For our present concerns, it is of little importance whether

saudade really is translatable or not. What matters is that, beginning in the fifteenth century, the term is presented in a way as to render it inexpressible in any other language. Returning to Oliveira's statement about the relationship between a people and their language, one might suggest that *saudade* came from the need to express something uniquely Portuguese—perhaps the collective feeling of a people reacting to an unprecedented age of exploration, and the inevitable comings and goings that resulted. The full significance of *saudade* as a trope of *Portugalidade* begins to emerge in the sixteenth century, bearing even more fruit during the annexation and the period of self-definition that followed the Restoration.

A number of events from the sixteenth century had a direct impact on Portugal's eventual loss of sovereignty. The intermarrying between the various Peninsular kingdoms left Portugal a tragedy or two away from political chaos. More than anything else, King Sebastian's devastating passing in 1578 at the Battle of Alcácer-Quibir (Northern Africa), set Portugal on a path of political ruin, as his successor—King Henry—was not able to marry before his death in 1580, leaving Portugal with a crisis of succession that would see its political autonomy slip away for the next six decades. Portugal might have maintained control of its own destiny had António (the people's choice) or Catarina of Bragança succeeded in their claims to the throne. Philip II of Spain, however, had the support of the Portuguese elite (nobility, clergy, upper bourgeoisie), and managed to orchestrate his rise to power and the subsequent unification of Iberia (Vázquez 577-84). Clearly stated, "los derechos de Felipe II eran superiores a los de los demás pretendientes" (584). After more than five hundred years of sovereignty, a foreign ruler

would assume control of the Portuguese nation, the seemingly inevitable consequence of the frequent intermarrying among the Spanish and Portuguese royalty (577).

While changes across many parts of society were minimal, the annexation of Portugal in 1580 greatly intensified the cultural Castilianization that had been escalating in Portugal for most of the sixteenth century. During the decades of foreign rule, Spain and Portugal converged in “la difusión de los gustos y los modos que, a pesar de las peculiaridades regionales, generaliza influencias y estilos artísticos, literarios, musicales [. . .] que conduce al bilingüismo y al nacimiento de nuevas modas” (Carabias 31). These changes in the arts reflected widespread societal developments. With the increased Castilian presence, Portugal slowly began to stray from its cultural uniqueness. Although this convergence happened at many levels of society, linguistic developments stand out the most. Not only did the two languages influence each other, but, among the Portuguese, bilingualism was spreading rapidly. Carabias signals several reasons for the widespread knowledge of Spanish among the Portuguese:

La proximidad semántica de ambas lenguas, la contigüidad de las regiones geográficas en las que se afincaron y las circunstancias político-sociales derivadas de la presencia constante de castellanos en la corte lusitana—por un lado—, y de la unificación de los reinos bajo los Felipes—por el otro lado—, han sido los argumentos fundamentales esgrimidos como justificación del bilingüismo portugués, donde el castellano se convirtió en la segunda lengua. (38)

Logically, the growth of bilingualism led to an increasing number of Portuguese authored works written in Spanish. In fact, according to one historian, “Castilian was the language of the majority of literary works published in Portugal during these decades” (Payne 245). As Pilar Vázquez Cuesta points out, “el cultivo del castellano se había generalizado

tanto por esta época entre los escritores portugueses que lo verdaderamente excepcional es encontrar quien no haya sucumbido nunca a la tentación de emplearlo” (605). Indeed, most of the “who’s who” of seventeenth-century Portuguese literature—Melo, Violante do Céu, Padre Vieira—all published in both Spanish and Portuguese.

Historically, the widespread use of Spanish in Portuguese literature during the annexation has not been remembered as fondly as corresponding works from the sixteenth century. As Vázquez Cuesta explains, the politicized eyes of history hold annexation authors to a standard that does not pertain to their literary predecessors:

Ya en el período de la monarquía dual, cuando la opción lingüística cobra aún mayor significado porque no se trata sólo de emplear o no un idioma extranjero, sino precisamente el de los que estaban robando sus libertades a la patria, esa mayor universalidad del castellano y la conveniencia de aprovecharla para dar a conocer en el exterior las glorias portuguesas será lo que aleguen muchos de los que han puesto su pluma al servicio de una tradición literaria extraña para probar a los demás, y sobre todo demostrarse a sí mismos, que actúan como buenos patriotas. (613)

The applause they enjoyed in their day has been silenced by a centuries-old misconception: that annexation authors dishonored themselves and their works by writing in Spanish during a time of national crisis and, therefore, should be erased from the archives of literary history. With or without Sebastian’s death and the Iberian Unification, Spanish was the literary language of prestige in early modern Iberia. The political developments on the Peninsula certainly impacted this phenomenon, but Spanish was a major aspect of Portuguese literature before the annexation and it maintained a prominent role through the end of the seventeenth century (decades after the Restoration).

More than any other issue, questions of loyalty are often at the root of campaigns waged against annexation authors, even if they are cleverly disguised as critical responses

to their work. Portuguese authors writing in Spanish preempted such attacks in their day by defending their use of the Spanish language and residence in Castile either in the prologue or body of the work. It is very common, in fact, to read some kind of apology in the opening sections of a Portuguese-authored work written in Spanish during the early modern period. Most justify their choice with an appeal to the greater diffusion that Spanish offered, as knowledge of Portuguese has always been rare in Europe (Tamayo viii). A larger audience could serve ideological as well as economic aspirations. Vázquez Cuesta explains several other important considerations: “al principio porque estaba de moda en la Corte, más tarde porque era en Castilla en donde radicaban los centros de decisión que afectaban a su patria y la lengua de Castilla les ofrecía mayores posibilidades de promoción social y económica” (601). With more of a nationalist slant, Cidade offers his interpretation of the phenomenon: “Prefere-se o espanhol, porque *é fácil para todos*. Para comunicar ao Mundo a admiração das façanhas dos heróis portugueses, para mostrar a superioridade portuguesa nas várias competências da vida de acção como da vida de pensamento; ou apenas . . . para garantia da voga mundial, da perduaração através do séculos de uma grande criação artística” (60). For Portuguese authors of the annexation there was no easy answer to this linguistic problem. There were positive and negative consequences either way.

The choice of language is really part of a larger issue that haunts early modern Iberia. The tidy categories that scholars impose on the past say more about their time than they do about early modernity. Many Portuguese authors wrote in Spanish and Portuguese and lived in Portugal and Spain because they were part of a greater Iberian

identity. While many felt a stronger pull to one side or the other, they have always belonged to both. Despite the efforts of Portuguese annexation authors to clear their names—an undertaking that may have been necessary in a time characterized by blood purity, but should not be the case today—they could not rescue themselves from the disfavor that would consume their writings in the centuries that followed. The time has come to reread these works and rethink their value. From a twenty-first century perspective, a time characterized by the trans-, inter-, and post-, we should be able to see that Portuguese authors writing during the annexation are not either loyal or disloyal. We should be able to see past the canonical orthodoxy that would silence these works because of their perceived “impurities.” We should be able to appreciate the heterogeneity of early modern Iberia, and read these works as a manifestation of the Peninsular inter-culture defining this remarkable age of artistic production.

This study would fall well short of its potential if all I were to do was argue that annexation writers were loyal Portuguese patriots after all. One of the issues that makes these authors and body of works worth studying is the ways in which they navigate their own hybridity. The question is not whether their works demonstrate a commitment to Portugal or not. It is clear that they do. What is perhaps most fascinating about these texts is what they have to say about language, identity, and literature. These Portuguese authors certainly lay claim to their Portuguese heritage, but this will always be questioned on account of the times in which they lived. To be Portuguese during much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is to be hybrid. Portuguese language, politics, and literature were absolutely heterogeneous. These writers were Portuguese and they were Spanish.

Each author seems aware of his or her mixed state of being, manifesting this through an unyielding insistence upon their *Portugalidade*. That is why I say that they *lay claim* to Portuguese identity. While it was, in part, their birthright, it was also a choice. The increased mobility of early modern Iberia, resulting from the unique socio-political circumstances of the time, left Portuguese authors with a number of options. Some writers elected a Castilianized existence (e.g., Juan Matos Fragoso). Others—as we will see in chapter two with António Ferreira—remained strictly Portuguese. A larger number of the Portuguese, including many of the authors I highlight in this study, walked the middle ground. Among other ways, they reconciled their Spanish and Portuguese identity by writing about one in the language of the other. The balance clearly tips in favor of their native Portugal, but the dominant culture clearly had an impact.

What I intend to demonstrate throughout this dissertation is that the texts produced in Iberia during the early modern period capture the social, political, and cultural landscapes converging on the Peninsula at the time of the Unification. While I am clearly not the first to put forward this idea, what I do offer readers is a fresh vantage point from which to see these converging landscapes. I have selected a sample of works written by Portuguese authors in Spanish because I believe that they can speak in ways that other literature from the time cannot. It is not that they are offering entirely new ideas. In many ways they merely tell a story. The early modern Portuguese nation was born out of this telling. Manuel de Faria e Sousa, Ângela de Azevedo, Jacinto Cordeiro, and António de Sousa de Macedo, among others, lace their works with various aspects of Portuguese identity, including the legendary moments of Portugal's storied past. What

existed during pre-modernity and was named during sixteenth century, became, in the seventeenth century, the Portuguese nation. The Battle of Ourique, as Hernani Cidade explains, demonstrates this very point: “Surgira no século XV a lenda da aparição de Cristo a D. Afonso Henriques, em Ourique, mas foi a século XVII que a pormenorizou, com ela formando a Portugal a auréola de *povo eleito*, por vontade expressa de Cristo” (162). The authors I focus on in this dissertation embody the ideas that Cidade puts forward in this passage. Not only do they nationalize Ourique, but also write many other moments from Portuguese history into the narration that becomes the Portuguese nation.

CHAPTER II

VICENTE, FERREIRA, AND CAMÕES: TRACING THE ROOTS OF PORTUGUESE ANNEXATION LITERATURE

In the same way that Portuguese annexation authors draw upon and invent historical precedents in their construction of the Portuguese nation, we can also trace the literary pedigree from which these authors emerge. From their thematization of *saudade* to their creative constructions of Portuguese history and identity, Gil Vicente, António Ferreira, and Luís de Camões pioneered many of the nationalist ideas circulating in the works written during the annexation period. Vicente's dramatic works of the early sixteenth century and Camões's poetry thereafter, left Portuguese authors of future generations a literary inheritance rich in nationalized themes, cross-cultural exchange, and linguistic diversity. What began predominantly as a literary trend among these pre-annexation pioneers evolved into something much more political by the time we reach the Philippine era of Portuguese cultural history. The remainder of this chapter offers an analysis of a number of works by Vicente, Camões, and some of their contemporaries as an introduction to the literary techniques and writings strategies that will be on full display in subsequent chapters that deal directly with Portuguese authors writing during the Iberian Unification. Not only do Faria e Sousa, Azevedo, Cordeiro, Sousa de Macedo, and others build upon the artistic foundation established in the sixteenth century, but they resignify the practices that led to its founding in an effort to (re)invent the Portuguese nation.

Among other things, Portuguese annexation authors inherited their predecessor's proficient and, sometimes, playful use of Spanish in their literature. The use of Spanish among Portuguese authors during much of the early modern period reflects an artistic and historical phenomenon that began in the fifteenth century. Pedro of Portugal (1429-66), for example, the first Portuguese author to incorporate Spanish into his writing, did so for strictly biographical reasons (Vázquez 601). Spanish was simply a part of his living reality. This would also be the case for the proliferation of talented authors emerging at the turn of the century: "Poetas como Duarte Brito, el conde Vimioso, don João Manuel, Luis Anriques, Henrique de Sá, Fernão Brandão, João Rodrigues de Castelo Branco, el propio Garcia de Resende, Gil Vicente, Sá de Miranda, etc., alternan las dos lenguas sin que debamos buscar para este fenómeno explicaciones de carácter personal" (Vázquez 601). Whereas Pedro of Portugal wrote in Spanish as a personal reflection of his own character, the authors Vázquez Cuesta lists above embody a widespread phenomenon that would gain momentum throughout the sixteenth century, eventually culminating during the first half of the seventeenth.

With the many inter-dynastic marriages between Portugal and Spain during the early sixteenth century came an extraordinary level of linguistic proficiency among the educated, and, consequently, an increase in Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish. As in the case of Jorge de Montemayor (formerly Monte-mor; changed by the author) and *La Diana*, these works occasionally brought writers notoriety and widespread acceptance in Spain. The Portuguese and Spanish languages thrived in the Portuguese Court of Manuel (1469-1521), as all three of his wives were Castilian and spoke very

little or no Portuguese. This includes, in succession, Isabel (1470-98) and María of Aragon (1482-1517), both daughters of the Catholic Monarchs, as well as Leonor of Austria (1498-1558), sister of Carlos V. According to tradition, Isabel's predecessor, Leonor of Portugal (1458-1525), is partially responsible for the "birth" of Portuguese theater:

Conta a tradição que Gil Vicente, poeta-ourives favorito da rainha viúva D. Leonor, entrou na noite de 7 para 8 de Junho [sic] de 1502 pelos aposentos da soberana reinante D. Maria adentro para improvisar, junto do berço de D. João III, recém-nascido, o *Monólogo do Vaqueiro*, tendo 'inventado' ali mesmo o teatro português. (Picchio 25)

Gil Vicente's famed literary career can be traced to this initial encounter with nobility, João III's birth giving life to "el primer autor cómico moderno," as Erasmus once designated him (qtd. in García Péres 564). It should come as no surprise that he would immediately integrate the Spanish language into his drama, considering the strong Castilian personalities at court: "estas cuatro reinas—orgullosas del prestigio y el poder de la familia en que habían nacido—no se adoptan dócilmente (como sería de esperar, dada la sumisión femenina de la época) al modo de vida y la cultura de su patria de adopción, sino que tratan de configurarlas a imagen y semejanza de la de origen" (Vázquez 587). Vicente's work provided a connecting point between the foreign queens and their new surroundings. Following the success of *Monólogo* with *Auto pastoril castellano*, Vicente became a regular at the Royal Palace and a favorite at Court, where he would have the opportunity to develop his theatrical genius over the next quarter-century.

Of Gil Vicente's forty-six dramatic works, twelve are exclusively in Spanish, including his first five published: *Monólogo do Vaquero* (1502), *Auto em Pastoril Castelhana* (1502-09), *Auto dos Reis Magos* (1503-09), *Auto de São Martinho* (1504), *Sermão à Dona Lionor* (1506). It is worth noting that while the verse in these works appears completely in Spanish, the stage directions are in Portuguese. Thus, even these works maintain a certain degree of polyglotism. In addition to the works comprising his *teatro castellano*, Gil Vicente has nineteen other dramatic works in which characters alternate between Spanish and Portuguese. As one critic observes, "o bilinguismo, ou melhor, o plurilinguismo, em seguida será sempre um dos traços característicos da obra de Gil Vicente" (Picchio 45). Altogether, Paul Teyssier calculates that thirty six percent of Vicente's literary corpus is in Spanish, which amounts to more than 14,000 verses (296). His contribution in both languages makes him a fundamental figure in the literary history of both Portugal and Spain—a Peninsular artist in every sense of the word.

Gil Vicente's prominent use of Spanish in his dramatic works has been the focus of numerous critical studies. Most concur that Vicente uses language distinctions primarily as a technique of characterization. Critics sometimes diverge, however, in their interpretation of this characterization. While most limit it to dramatic convention, others read subversion into Vicente's use of Spanish. In other words, some see a critique of Castile in Vicente's use of language. No matter what position one takes on the playwright's creative use of language, it seems clear that Vicente successfully staged the dramatic potential of language. That is, he demonstrated the artistic richness of introducing more than one vernacular to theater—a legacy he passed on to dramatists of

the annexation. My analysis of his plays concentrates on what I see as one of the most consistent themes of Vicente's dramatic corpus, and one that playwrights of the annexation definitely put into practice: the glorification of Portugal. Perhaps more than any other pre-Lope playwright, Gil Vicente mastered the art of dramatizing the nation. During the early sixteenth century, he developed a model for future playwrights to follow. While not all of his works focus on the Portuguese nation, the sustained interest in Portugal that characterizes many of his plays serves as a standard for the nation-minded *comedias* of the Golden Age. In some instances the author dedicates entire works to the glorification of Portugal (e.g., *Auto da Lusitânia*, *Auto da fama*), whereas in others the reader experiences a variety of patriotic outbursts (*Auto da festa*, *Exhortação da guerra*). Altogether, the influential Portuguese dramatist's creative use of allegory, personification, and linguistic flourishes establish a pattern for staging the nation that Spanish and Portuguese playwrights echo in the seventeenth century.

In *Auto da fama*, Gil Vicente exalts his native land through the allegorization of Fama, a beautiful young shepherdess whose devotion to Portugal comes at the expense of her other potential suitors: France, Italy, and Castile. One by one these admirers attempt to woo Fama away from Portugal, but none of them can persuade her to descend from her *Portugalidade* to a lowlier state of national existence. Despite their repeated advances, Fama affirms that "esta moça é portuguesa" (60, 284). The spirit of competition at the heart of this play prefigures the many Golden Age texts that likewise pit poet against poet, text against text, and nation against nation. The work begins with the unsuccessful attempt of a Frenchman: "Y por qué no seréis vus francesa?" he asks, to which she coolly

responds, “Porque nam tenho razão” (61-62). Despite his advances, Fama finds no reason to assume another identity. This is due, in part, to the fact that France has nothing to offer Fama that she does not already have in greater quantity and quality. She finds his plight amusing: “Isso é cousa pera rir” (66). By the end of their exchange, she tells him that his efforts are futile: “Francês i-vos muito embora / que isto é tempo perdido” (79-80).

Next on the scene is the Italian. While Fama initiates the dialogue by asking who he is, as soon as the answer comes she asks him to leave. Just to emphasize the difference between Portugal, her current love interest, and Italy (or any of the three pretenders, for that matter), Fama asks what he has to offer by way of riches: “e que riquezas tendes vós?” (185). Similar to the others, the Italian has much to say about his riches, although it ultimately falls short of Fama’s expectations. This is important because it provides a valuable point of contrast between Portugal and the other characters, each instance giving Fama cause to describe the supremacy of her one true love. Fama seems to shirk at the others, as if to ask “what can you offer me that I do not already have?” After Italy gives his answer to the question, Fama offers a brief lesson (“eu vos ensinarei logo” [195]) in greatness, Portugal acting as the case in point. Fittingly, her tour of Portuguese glories will be a sea navigation—“Começai de navegar” (196)—leading the Italian from place to place, glory to glory, fame to fame:

Com ilhas mil
deixai a terra do Brasil
tende-vos à mão do sol
e vereis homens de prol
gente esforçada e baronil.
Aos comércios preguntareis
de Arábia, Pérsia a quem se deram
ou quando os homens tiveram

este mundo que vereis.
E nam fique
perguntar a Moçambique
quem é o alferes da fé
e rei do mar que o é
ou s' há outrem a que s'aplique. (200-13)

After taking a figurative cruise around the world, visiting some of Portugal's greatest maritime successes, all the Italian can say is "Ó Diu" (231). Fama, however, is just getting started: "Esperai vós / que ind'eu agora começo" (231-32). She contends that wherever you go, you will find "gente português" (248). When the Italian and the Frenchman get together to lament Fama's disdain for them, the Frenchman observes, "la famosa portuguesa / no le pude far francesa" (304-05), and then adds that she has defamed him (313). The Italian echoes his words, also suffering from the effects of unrequited love (311).

Last on the scene, and with arguably the best chance to win her favor, the Castilian takes his shot at Fama, entering with a little more confidence than the others: "Cúya sois linda pastora?" (328), followed by a smooth "you from these parts" ("Sois de aquí deste casal?" [330]). Fama comes back quite self-assured: "Daqui fui sempre e agora" (331). The Castilian seems to be a bit full of himself, a smooth talker, and a lover of his own voice, which Fama picks up on right away: "Oh Jesu vós falais tanto / que já estou enfastiada" (380-81). As is the case with France and Italy, praises for Portugal roll from Castile's tongue. When he says "y sois vida de las glorias / y corona de las gentes" (348-49), or "tan alta y preciosa cosa / como nel mundo ha nacido" (353-54), not only is Castile exalting Portugal within the context of the work—from one character to another—but, by extension, Vicente cleverly establishes a hierarchy among European

nations as well. Despite Castile's compelling credentials, in the end he is left wanting, unworthy of Portugal's grandeur. Castile cannot imagine anyone eclipsing his own glory, which leads the character to ask Fama about Portugal's quality. In response, Fama describes the true meaning of fame and glory:

I-vos por aqui a Torquia
e por Babilónia toda
e vereis se anda em voda
com pesar de Alexandria.
E vos dirá
Damasco quantos lhe dá
de combates Portugal
com vitória tam real
que nunca se perderá. (400-08)

One of the main ideas Fama establishes in these lines is the fact that Portuguese presence reaches every corner of the earth. After a long description of Portugal's worldwide presence, Fama concludes where she ended up with everyone else: "Bem e é razão que me vá / donde há cousas tam honradas / tam devotas tam soadas? / O lavor vos contará. / I-vos embora" (436-40). The Castilian's previously longwinded ways are silenced by Fama's unyielding commitment to Portugal, whose glory cannot be surpassed.

As the three get together to discuss their failures in courting Fama, France, Italy, and Castile conclude that God must be on the side of the Portuguese. The Castilian explains that for this reason, among others, he did not insist: "Por eso no porfié / con ella ni es razón / porque sus vitorias son / muy lejos y por la fe" (479-82). After the Italian adds his voice of agreement, the Castilian once again speaks of the Portuguese in terms of providentialism: "El muy alto Dios sin par / la quiera siempre ayudar / y nos vámanos de aquí" (485-87). In case there remains any doubt as to the greatness of the Portuguese,

Vicente concludes his play by sending Fé and Fortaleza to pay tribute to Fama, reinforcing, through the final verses of the play, Portugal's superiority:

Vossas façanhas estão colocadas
diante de Cristo senhor das Alturas
vossas conquistas grandes aventuras
são cavalarias mui bem empregadas.
Fazeis as mesquitas ser deserdadas
fazeis na igreja o seu poderio
portanto o que pode vos dá domínio
que tanto reluzem vossas espadas.
Porque o triunfo do vosso vencer
e vossas vitórias exalçam a fé
de serdes laureada grande rezão é
princesa das famas por vosso valer
nam achamos outra de mais merecer
pois tanto destrocós fazeis a Ismael
em nome de Cristo tomai o laurel
ao qual senhor praze sempre em vos crecer. (500-15)

The electness of Portugal is on full display in these final verses of the play. Fé and Fortaleza come in Christ's name to honor Fama and Portugal, who are treated as one. Portugal, in this case, does not only allegorically come to represent the Portuguese nation, but also Christ, who is the author of Portugal's accomplishments. Looking back on the entire work, it is interesting to note Vicente's use of language. While there is certainly some overlap between the vernaculars spoken, each suitor speaks his respective language. The characters not innately associated with a particular tongue—Fama, Fé, Fortaleza, and the author—all speak Portuguese. This kind of linguistic posturing is significant in a work whose primary aim seems to be the divinization of Portugal. Altogether, *Auto da fama* cleverly weaves allegory, language choice, and providentialism into a single fabric of early sixteenth-century national consciousness. While Golden Age playwrights relied much less on allegory in their attempts to stage the nation, in this play Vicente offers a

model of characterization and competition that will receive much attention by dramatists of the seventeenth century seeking to establish national preeminence.

Auto da Lusitânia (1532) also makes use of allegory and manifests a similar teleology to that of *Auto da fama*, although the overall approach is unique. *Lusitânia* presents a national protagonist through which Vicente personifies many of the fundamental characteristics of his native land. His play defines the Portuguese nation by inventing a foundational myth about the marriage of Lusitânia and Portugal, the two main characters of the work. Interpreting the allegory that Vicente constructs, however, it is clear that the protagonist of the work is neither the beautiful young Lusitânia nor the Greek soldier Portugal. Instead, the author incorporates these and other characters into the larger national identity his work casts. *Lusitânia* is unique compared to Vicente's other patriotic plays, in that the work characterizes the Portuguese nation through the creation and mystification of a collective national protagonist. Thus, rather than a synecdochic view of Portugal through the eyes of a "moça portuguesa," as in his *Auto da Fama*, Vicente portrays the nation through a number of characters who collectively represent Portugal. That is, it is not just the actual character, Portugal, but the blend of identities within the work that embodies this protagonist. While I agree with the critical consensus that the play lacks unity of action, time, and place, I disagree with those who claim that the work lacks unity altogether (Zimic 359). The unifying element of this metatheatrical work is, in fact, the nation. Not that all parts of the play figure in to this greater whole, but the majority of them do, from the principal allegory guiding the play within the play, to the classic dialogue between *Todo o Mundo* and *Ninguem*.

The first scenes of *Lusitânia* revolve around a Jewish family. Lediça, the daughter, is busy with domestic concerns when a courtesan appears on the scene and tries to woo her. He immediately disappears as soon as Lediça's father returns home. Jacob, a Jewish friend of the family, then engages in a conversation with the father about the proper way to commemorate the birth of Prince Manuel. They decide that the best way to celebrate this event is to stage a work of drama. Naturally they go to the theater to receive inspiration for their work, where they are to enjoy an *auto* by Gil Vicente (Zimic 359). These initial scenes, as Ronald Surtz explains, have a specific function: "The pseudo-mythological plot which forms the play proper is framed by what the Elizabethans would have called an induction, i.e., an introductory scene with multiple characters that develops a situation more or less complete in itself" (42). Before the actual play within the play begins, the audience is given the basic story-line:

As fortune would have it, Lisibea, daughter of the queen of Berbéria and a sea-prince, lives in the mountains of Solérica (now Sintra) three thousand years ago. Lisibea was so beautiful that the Sun, who witnessed daily the perfections of her undressed body and the beauty of her gentile soul, elected her daughter, Lusitânia, goddess and lady of the province. At the same time there was a famed and amorous knight and hunter from Greece by the name of Portugal, who comes from Hungary to the Solérica Mountains in search of game. Upon seeing the supernatural beauty of Lusitânia, Portugal immediately falls in love. Lisibea, who has developed deep feelings for Portugal, dies of jealousy and is buried at the Félix Mountain, later to be named Lisboa in memory of Lusitânia's mother. (between 460-61; my translation)

My analysis of this work will consider the following themes: the love triangle of Lisibea, Lusitânia, and Portugal as a collective characterization of the Portuguese nation, the use of myth in the invention of history, and the ways in which the metatheatrical structure of

the work supports the content. It is anticipated that these three topics will illuminate the national protagonism at work in Vicente's play.

The layered structure and the allegorical nature of the work, not to mention its general lack of unity, leave *Lusitânia* somewhat fragmentary. While dialogue predominates and characterization is fairly straightforward, it is difficult to configure all of the parts into a single whole. This has led at least one critic to conclude that almost any of the parts could have been developed into separate dramatic works (Parker 96). Stanislav Zimic, on the other hand, sees in *Lusitânia* an allegorical comedy, “cuyo sentido fundamental se desprende precisamente de la relación lógica y significativa entre todas sus ‘partes’” (360). While he argues that the unifying element of these parts is the interaction of past and present, fantastic and real (362-63), I contend that a proto-nationalist impulse to characterize Portugal motivates Vicente in this work. Lisibea, Portugal, Lusitânia, and others, then, come together as the invention of a collective self, a national protagonist. Reis Brasil describes the participation of each of the three main characters in the birth of *Portugalidade* as follows: “Um príncipe vindo de longes terras, de nome ‘Portugal’, casou com ‘Lusitania’, dando origem à portugalidade, mas o nome de ‘Lisibea’ ficou immortalizado na cidade de ‘Lisboa’, que deu origem à portugalidade, mas que quis morrer, como parte independente, para ficar a fazer parte integrante dessa mesma portugalidade” (121).

In case the spectator/reader misses the national character of the work, the play within the play begins with a description of the teleology of the text by the *Lecenciado argumentador*: “Em especial / o antigo de Portugal: / Lusitânia que cousa era / e o seu

original / e por cousa mui severa / vo-lo quer representar (440-50). If the subject matter of the work is not enough to convince spectators of Vicente's allegiance, the *Lecenciado* goes on to speak of "este mui leal autor" (457). In context, it is hard to imagine this verse referring to anything but the dramatist's loyalty to Portugal. Once he has characterized his own fame and fidelity, Vicente moves on to Lusitânia, Portugal, and Lisibea, each of whom contributes to our overall understanding of the national protagonist. In the following passage, Vénus offers her description of Lusitânia, which not only applies to the beautiful girl, but also to the country itself:

Oh Lusitania señora
tú te puedes alabar
de desposada dichosa
y pámpano de la rosa
y serena de la mar.
Frescura de las verduras
rocío dell alvorada
perla bienaventurada
estrella de las alturas
graça blanca namorada. (889-98)

What make these verses particularly insightful are the multiple references to the natural world, which would seem to support the claim of Lusitânia as the embodiment of Portugal. Similar portrayals of Lusitânia appear throughout the play. Another instance occurs shortly after Portugal first meets her: "Solérica que vou buscar / senhora hei de preguntar / se as que nadem nesta terra / tem o céu a seu mandar / que em Grécia nem ultramar / tal fermosura nam vi" (539-44). Here Portugal extends his awe of the surrounding beauty to all natives of this exotic land. Once he has met Lusitânia, however, he exalts her above all others from this most choice of places: "Pois das lindas sois rainha / das fermosas gram supremo" (563-65). The glorification of her beauty is

important, since it emphasizes her supremacy. The idea of Portuguese preeminence frequently arises in early modern Portuguese literature and is a key aspect of Portugal's conception of self at this time. While this feature of Portuguese identity did not originate with Gil Vicente, clearly he furthers the argument in his play.

In contrast to his focus on Lusitânia's physical beauty, the author's descriptions of Portugal focus on his nobility, honor, valor, and amorous nature. It is significant to note that Portugal is a noble knight from Greece. This likely hearkens back to the fictionalized founding of Lisbon by Homer's Ulysses, one of the clearest intertexts informing Vicente's allegory. While this popular myth may be his point of departure, what the author accomplishes in the dramatization of Lusitânia, Lisibea, and Portugal is completely innovative, as Zimic describes: "nuestro autor inventa totalmente la leyenda de Portugal y Lusitania que dramatiza en su obra—no hay evidencia alguna de su existencia en la tradición folklórica o literaria" (360). Thus, the allegory at work in this play is actually a fiction within a fiction, another example of Vicente's literary layering. Within this frame of understanding, the unity of Portugal and Lusitânia within the work acts as a symbol of the mixing of foreign and native identities that mark the founding of Portugal (Zimic 365). Fundamental to our consideration of a collective identity, then, is the marriage of the native and the foreign, the land and the sea.

Towards the end of the play, before the couple is married, one character compares the virtues of Portugal to those of Lusitânia's other suitor, Mercúrio:

Que este noble Portugal
es fundado sobre amor
y es marido natural
estotro es un bestial

una siba sin sabor
un caldo de briguigones.
Y Portugal si crer me quieres
es varón de los varones
servidor de las mujeres
más que todas las naciones. (1051-60)

As if to validate the qualities stated above, Mercúrio himself tells Lusitânia that if he were her, he would take Portugal over him (1076). Hence, in the same way that Lusitânia exceeds the beauty of all other women, Portugal stands above all other men. Therefore, the only way to exceed either is to bring them both together. This is precisely what Vicente seems to postulate with his allegory. He creates a national protagonist by bringing his characters together into one great whole. In this way his glorification of Lusitânia and Portugal extends beyond the characters of this specific work to the Portuguese nation in general.

The national protagonist, however, is incomplete without considering Lisibea as well. After all, it is her character that inspires—at least according to Vicente's legend—the name Lisboa, the famed city the author and his literary compatriots immortalize throughout early modernity. While Lisibea is not as central of a character as Portugal and Lusitânia, her death is important in considering the Portuguese identity. One of the most highly esteemed and essentialized characteristics of the Portuguese is their loyalty. Lisibea's cause, like that of the nation Gil Vicente describes, is Portugal. Her commitment to Portugal eventually costs Lisibea her life, bringing to mind another characteristic commonly, and sometimes comically, associated with the Portuguese: their profound love. While the play specifically depicts the love of Lisibea for Portugal, the general love of the Portuguese for their nation is also present in the allegory. Lisibea's

final words confirm the inevitability of her death, a fate the character seems willing to accept: “Minha morte é cerca e certa / e eu dou-te vida escura / vou-me à minha sepultura / que está na serra deserta / feita per mão da ventura (587-91). This is not the only instance in which Vicente alludes to the hand of providence. In fact, there are a number of times in which Vicente makes reference to God’s divine purposes for Portugal. When the *Lecenciado* states, for example, that he writes “a trovar e escrever / as portuguesas façanhas / que só Deos sabe entender” (421-23), not only does he lay bare the guiding principle of the work (the glorification of Portugal), but he also manages to connect the designs of the Portuguese nation with providence. That is to say, only God can understand Portugal’s great deeds because he is their author. The title of *Lusitânia*, therefore, does not point to the beautiful young girl that eventually marries Portugal so much as to the antiquity and collectivity of the Portuguese nation as a whole. Vicente has set his sights much higher than love and marriage, with the final outcome being the personification of the imaginary to which he identifies.

Fama and *Lusitânia* are particularly relevant works for considering Vicente’s interest in nationalized themes. In light of Benedict Anderson’s claim that “nationalism thinks in terms of historical destinies,” it is safe to describe both as works charged with nationalist ideology. Each puts forward a foundational allegory that promotes many of the essential features of Portuguese identity. The collective protagonist resulting from the allegory in *Lusitânia* is unmatched in beauty, valor, loyalty, fame, love, and divine favor. Through this characterization, then, Vicente successfully establishes a view of Portugal that only intensifies during the century-and-a-half following his death. Moving into the

late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we discover an abundance of dramatists who likewise create myth and manipulate history to fit their concepts of national identity. In fact, “proto-nationalistic historical drama” (68), to borrow Cory Reed’s useful term, abounds in Iberian drama of the early modern period. From Spanish *comedias* such as Lope’s *Fuenteovejuna*, to Portuguese *comedias* such as Jacinto Cordeiro’s *Los doze de Portugal*, it is apparent that Golden Age playwrights throughout Iberia maintained Vicente’s early sixteenth-century fascination with the nation.

Not all Portuguese authors of the sixteenth century, however, approached matters of national identity as Vicente did. While overshadowed in many ways by his contemporaries, nothing can obscure António Ferreira’s (1528-69) important contribution to the literary landscape of Portugal in the sixteenth century and the shadow he cast thereafter. *Castro* (1587) remains his most well-known literary work, although its value transcends the tragic qualities typically highlighted by literary critics and historians. In fact, I would argue that the tragedy’s greatest achievement is that it realizes in practice what Ferreira otherwise emphasizes predominantly in theory. That is to say that Ferreira elevates the language and literature of Portugal in *Castro* to the same degree that he insists of his friend and, by extension, literary contemporaries, in *Carta a Pero d’Andrade Caminha*, among other texts. Thus, what the latter states in word, the former manifests in deed. What results is an unmistakable view of Ferreira’s rigidity concerning the relationship between literature and language, as well as a clear sense of his esteem for Portugal. Virtually all Portuguese authors of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries broke away from Ferreira’s purist view of Portuguese literature, but, like

Ferreira, many would reappropriate the discourse of patriotism he enacted, becoming thereby the gatekeepers of “good” citizenry in the centuries that followed.

Reactions against the widespread use of the Spanish language in Portugal did not appear right away. As discussed, Gil Vicente made the varied use of vernacular one of the most fundamental characteristics of his drama. By the mid-sixteenth century, nonetheless, things began to change. In reaction to the increasing preference for Spanish as the literary language of choice, many intellectuals, including António Ferreira, reacted: “No es de extrañar, pues, que algunos intelectuales más conscientes comenzasen a advertir el peligro que corría su lengua de verse suplantada por una extraña dentro de su propio territorio y tratasen de conjurarlo contando sus excelencias, al mismo tiempo que indagaban las causas de este hecho” (Vázquez 606). No amount of publications in favor of the Portuguese language, however, could slow down the Peninsular move towards Spanish. The language of Castile took over in much the same way that Galician-Portuguese had done the previous century. This did not bring works in Portuguese to a halt altogether, but it certainly impacted the literary landscape. Ferreira was not about to see his native tongue discarded in favor of Spanish. According to the apologist, a loose attitude towards the Portuguese language indirectly undermined the collectivity with native claim to it. For Ferreira, there was no justifiable way to separate literary expression from one’s native tongue.

Among the poems that comprise Ferreira’s posthumous poetic anthology *Poemas lusitanos* (1598), are several that directly oppose the increasing Castilian influence in Portugal. As Albuquerque explains, Ferreira symbolizes a larger movement that was

occurring among some of the Portuguese at this time: “Foram, contudo, os homens do século XVI, a quem se deve o primeiro grande combate pela ilustração a defesa da língua. [. . .] Para esses homens profundamente conscientes do valor político do idioma” (93). More than any other poem, *Carta a Pero d’Andrade Caminha* reveals Ferreira’s attitude towards the cultural Castilianization sweeping across Lusitânia. He begins by emphasizing that anciently, the highest literary achievement was to honor ones own language (1-3). While he offers Virgil as a classical example of this practice, he also mentions Boscán and Garcilaso (7-15). With these and other examples, the poet repeats the same idea: it is the duty of every writer to celebrate his native land in his native tongue: “nascem, vivem e morrem para os seus” (33). It would follow that to reject this honor is to bring shame to ones literary accomplishments and blur his or her commitment to the *patria*.

Ferreira jumps from this general introduction to the specific case of his friend, Andrade. His accusation is clear: “Mostrate-te tégora tão esquecido, / Meu Andrade, da terra em que nasceste, / Como se nela não foras nascido” (52-54). He questions why Andrade would waste his “doces versos” on another language and people, thereby robbing his Portuguese tongue and land of such sweet enrichment (55-60). Ferreira wants Andrade to recognize that this choice shows disdain for his native language. The poem shifts when Ferreira beckons to his friend, “Volve, pois, volve, Andrade” (64), at which point he goes on to outline why he should always write in Portuguese, adding, thereafter, in good faith, that Andrade will put into practice the “correct” behavior he has described. He threatens his friend with the hatred of his compatriots and rejection by the muses if he

insists on writing in another language. Furthermore, he explains that every writer has the duty to glorify his homeland—“Demos a quem nos deu e devemos mais” (75)—not only for its implications in the present, but especially for the legacy it leaves future generations.

To what, exactly, does Ferreira want his friend to return? (“Volve, pois, volve”). He seems to be nostalgically holding on to a past that may no longer exist. His longing is for a simpler time when the world was smaller and everything had its right place (not that such a world ever existed). The linguistic tidiness that Ferreira endorses, however, hardly matched the times in which he lived, and certainly not the fast-approaching period of unification. With the annexation came a shift in perspective, among many, as to the author’s responsibility to publish strictly in his or her native tongue. Ferreira’s unequivocal plea to Andrade is to not let go of yesterday’s literary values. He warns his friend of the consequences that will surely come if he continues to neglect Portuguese in his writing. His appeal to loyalty reads convincingly, but Ferreira was ultimately up against a complete societal shift. Portuguese annexation authors did not have the luxury of writing and publishing in their native language as freely as Ferreira. Unfortunately for those authors, the standard against which history has judged their choice to write in Spanish reads much like Ferreira’s injunction against his friend.

While his incrimination of Andrade is significant in isolation, it is especially meaningful in consideration of what occurred in Portugal in the century following Ferreira’s death, where it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a Portuguese author who did not cultivate the Spanish language. Surely these writers were aware of Ferreira’s

powerful injunction: “Floreça, fale, cante, ouça-se e viva / A portuguesa lingua, e já, onde for, / Senhora vá de si, soberba e altiva. / Se tèqui esteve baixa e sem louvor, / Culpa é dos que a mal exercitaram, / Esquecimento nosso e desamor” (76-81). If we take Ferreira’s words at face value, nearly every Portuguese author of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is to some degree a traitor and deserving of the disdain of his compatriots both past and present.¹ In “Ode I” Ferreira likewise asserts that such authors lack love for their homeland, not to mention literary skill (20-24). Judging from the marginalized status of these works in the Portuguese canon, literary critics and historians seem to have bought into Ferreira’s vision. While this condemnation may hold true in many cases, there are, however, exceptions. In the cases of Manuel de Faria e Sousa, Jacinto Cordeiro, and António de Sousa de Macedo, for example, the stated intent is to use the Spanish language to spread the glories of Portugal to a broader audience. Traditionally, this explanation, no matter how well-substantiated, has not been sufficient to significantly alter the longstanding, negative view of any author willing to abandon his or her native tongue during such a crucial moment in Portuguese history.

António Ferreira validated his strict view of language loyalty by refusing to publish anything outside of his native Portuguese tongue. While this is certainly the case in *Poemas lusitanos*, nowhere does Ferreira prove his friendship with the Portuguese language—“da lingua amigo!” (“Ode I” 30)—more than in *Castro*. Not only does it constitute Ferreira’s work par excellence, but also represents a masterpiece of the Portuguese literary canon. What is more, *Castro* is the first tragedy written in the

¹ Based on the way this period of Portuguese literature has been remembered, it would seem that Ferreira’s view prevailed.

Portuguese language and one of the first in all of Europe. It is in practice what many of his poems are in theory: the glorification of all things Portuguese. This historical work centers on Inês de Castro, her amorous relationship with D. Pedro, and the intervening power of D. Afonso IV (the State). The subject-matter is well-suited for someone of such clear nationalist leanings as Ferreira. While originally mentioned by Garcia de Resende, and famously alluded to in a section of *Os Lusíadas*, Ferreira's dramatic work is the apogee of the Inês de Castro theme in the sixteenth century. Basing his text on this well-known episode of Portuguese history gave the author the opportunity to not only highlight this isolated occurrence, but also to invoke many other aspects of his "grande Portugal" (1.39): *saudade* (3.9, 62, 154; 5.31), the divinity of the *Quinas* (2.286-87), and the collective identity of Portugal (2.71, 93, 104). Beyond these explicit references, however, is a work beautifully crafted in the Portuguese language that has left a definite mark on European drama, particularly on the Iberian Peninsula. Indeed, the greatest manifestation of Ferreira's commitment to the Portuguese language was the writing of *Castro*.

There is no all-encompassing explanation as to why Portuguese literature did not continue in the seventeenth century as gloriously as it had in the sixteenth with Gil Vicente, Bernardim Ribeiro, Sá de Miranda, Luís de Camões, António Ferreira, and others. Perhaps the inevitable decline of empire is also the fate of literature (at least in the short term). Seventeenth-century Portuguese literature could not escape the shadow cast by the sixteenth, just as the Spanish enlightenment had little hope of producing an encore worthy of the Golden Age. By this I do not mean to suggest that seventeenth-century

Portuguese literature lacks its literary giants—consider, for example, the prominence of Manuel de Faria e Sousa, Jacinto Cordeiro, António de Sousa de Macedo, Francisco Manuel de Melo, and Violante do Céu—only that these authors (and others) are generally understudied and underappreciated. Several socio-political factors reshaped Portuguese literature for the better part of two centuries. While this phenomenon culminated after Ferreira’s death, Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish were already commonplace during the lifetime of the author (e.g., Vicente and Camões), making the purity of his literary corpus all the more impressive. Overall, *Poemas lusitanos* shows, in theory, where Ferreira stands on the issue of writing in other linguistic registers. *Castro*, on the other hand, is the realization of those theories. With this work Ferreira truly “walks the walk,” thereby becoming in deed, what he already had established in word.

National consciousness underlies much of the writing and thinking of Vicente and Ferreira. In the first full century following the invention of the printing press, these and other Portuguese authors of the 1500s made sure that Portugal received her deserved attention: “Eles [nossos intelectuais de Quinhentos] esforçaram-se por construir uma imagem nacional própria, que permitisse distinguir Portugal e os portugueses de todos os outros países e de todas as outras gentes” (Albuquerque 273). In addition to the defining aspects of the national imaginary put forward by Vicente and Ferreira, Portuguese authors of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries frequently call upon Luís de Camões in an effort to define and fortify Portuguese identity. As Vergílio Ferreira explains, Camões “é a expressão melhor de todos nós” (13). Similarly, Agustina Bessa-Luís states that Camões “representa, como tipo humano, o português de todos os tempos. É poeta,

soldado, aventureiro; intelectual e mundano; vítima e herói; experiente e desprezado” (121). Writing in the first part of the twentieth century, Teófilo Braga describes Camões’s intimate link to Portuguese identity as follows: “When in any country in Europe they talk about Portugal, they confuse us unconsciously with Spain; but when you say ‘I’m from the land of Camões’ immediately our national individuality is recognised” (cited in Freeland 61). Perhaps one of the clearest indications of Camões’s significant contribution to the Portuguese collectivity is the celebration of *Dia de Camões, de Portugal e das Comunidades Portuguesas* on June 10, one of the most important national holidays in Portugal.

Although his complete works reveal a prolific writer of several literary forms (especially lyric poetry), his epic poem, *Os Lusíadas*, defines Camões’s iconic status and his formative role in the development of Portuguese national identity. In his assessment of the value of *Os Lusíadas*, José Mattoso admits that the impact of the epic on the national imaginary is difficult to exaggerate (35). Cidade also sees in Camões’s most famous work an immense contribution to the development of *Portugalidade*: “Surja o poema [*Os Lusíadas*] para os Portugueses o que a *Iliada* e a *Odisseia* haviam sido para os Gregos e o que a *Eneida* foi para os Romanos, pois nem aqueles elevaram tão alto a projectaram tão longe o heroísmo” (31). Cidade pulls a nice rhetorical trick in this passage by first associating Camões with some of the greatest epics of all time, only to explain that none of these works were able to achieve what Camões did in his national epic. Camões, as William Atkinson observes, was well aware of the famous epics of the past: “Virgil, to the Renaissance the greatest among the poets of antiquity, had sung of

arms and the man. The *Aeneid* was to Camoens at once model and challenge, but from the opening words he made clear that his would be an *Aeneid* with a difference. ‘Arms and the men’ was his theme, the epic exaltation of a whole race of heroes” (20-21). It is important to recognize the double-edged success of *Os Lusíadas*. It cuts both ways, brilliantly exalting the achievement as well as the achievers, making it “the best possible introduction to Portugal and the Portuguese” (Atkinson 7).

Os Lusíadas presents Portugal at the height of its glory (its successful voyage to India), describing in poetic perfection the roots of the Portuguese nation by referencing the most significant people, places, and events of Lusitânia. Mattoso describes its popular appeal:

No século XVI, porém, a gesta dos portugueses tornou-se epopeia, pela pena de Camões. O seu fundamento não era o mito, mas a História, tal como na sua época ela se entendia. A transposição da História para a epopeia deu-lhe, porém, a força do mito, não só para a gente pouco instruída, mas também para muitos dos autores mais cultos do século XIX, que continuaram a imaginar a gesta dos Descobrimentos a partir d’*Os Lusíadas*. (103)

According to Mattoso, the strength of *Os Lusíadas* rests on its brilliant blend of historicity and artistry. It is based on real events, yet it is more than mere history. By fictionalizing the heroic deeds of Vasco da Gama and his fleet, Camões managed to package Portugal in a way that would appeal to readers within and without the collectivity he eulogizes. Da Gama’s successful passage to India—which introduced good hope to a place that had only known storms—was considered the greatest voyage of its time, surpassing even that of Columbus:

Columbus’s New World may have loomed larger to Europe since [but] [a]t the turn of the fifteenth century da Gama’s discovery was held much the

greater, and with reason. For the spices and precious stones he brought back from India symbolized not merely the ruin of Venice, the turning of the Mediterranean into a backwater, and the emergence of Portugal, a country insignificant in size and population, as the richest nation in Europe. (Atkinson 12)

In many ways, this epic became a sort of Portuguese constitution to which all could subscribe (this is, of course, ironic considering how few crew members in Da Gama's fleet were actually Portuguese). Subsequent chapters portray specific instances in which Portuguese authors appropriated Camões and his epic in defense of their individuality as a nation. For Portuguese authors of the annexation, *Os Lusíadas* was the culminating expression of the *Portugalidade* they sought to preserve in their writings. Consequently, prominent features of the poem, such as *saudade*, providentialism, and the characterization of a collectivity, as well as direct passages from the work, frequently appear in Portuguese texts of the annexation.

Camões's death in 1580 marked the beginning of what would be a haunting year of loss for Portugal, culminating a few months later with the Spanish occupation. As the epitome of the Portuguese identity, it was only natural for seventeenth-century authors to return to Camões and his epic to reconstruct their national imaginary: "Camões e *Os Lusíadas* foram, nos momentos de angústia histórica, a chamada às armas para a renovação espiritual e política da Nação" (Namora 61). Faria e Sousa's immense critical commentary on Camões's work is, perhaps, the most patriotic text published by a Portuguese author in the seventeenth century. It not only contains numerous references in praise of Portugal, but, more importantly, it exalted Camões's place in Iberia, Europe, and, eventually, the world. Altogether, thirty-six editions of *Os Lusíadas* were published

in the decades of the annexation (more than one every two years). That extraordinary number captures just what the epic meant to the early modern Iberian world. His work had broad appeal on the Peninsula and the rest of Europe. While translations of his works to Spanish made them more accessible, he wrote a significant amount in Spanish.

Although widely recognized for his lyric and epic poetry, Luís de Camões also wrote three dramatic works—*Auto chamado dos Enfatriões*, *Auto de Filodemo*, and *Comédia d’el rei Seleuco*—each of which alternates between Portuguese and Spanish according to the character speaking.² According to at least one scholar, “o castelhano é usado no teatro camoniano como um traço caracterizador. Falam-no grande parte das personagens secundárias” (Anastácio 30). Camões not only follows Vicente’s conventional use of Spanish as a tool of characterization, but also echoes his patriotic zeal. What is more, Camões adds a touch of subversion to this theatrical works by consistently assigning Spanish to the devils, fools, and other shameful characters.

Camões’s suggestive characterization was not overlooked by Portuguese authors in the decades following the poet’s death. For example, in his edition of *Os Lusíadas*, Manuel de Faria e Sousa, perhaps Camões’s most enthusiastic admirer, refers to the degraded role of Spanish-speakers in Camões’s drama:

[E]l Poeta avia seguido en esto lo que hizieron todos los Autores Portugueses en las Comedias antiguas, que era, luego que se introduzia en ellas Diablo, Moro, Adivino, Fantasma, Bobo, i semejantes, casi siempre hablaban en Castellano, siendo todo el resto de la obra en Portugues, como si el Bobo, Fantasma, Adivino, Moro, o Diablo, no pudiesen hablar, sino en Castellano. (3.257)

² Camões likewise composed a handful of poems in Spanish: “[su] producción en castellano abarca por lo menos siete sonetos, doce redondillas y el llamado *Monólogo de Aónia*—traducción de su *Écloga I*—por no citar a los personajes en sus Autos que se expresan en esta lengua” (Vázquez Cuesta 602).

In this passage, Faria e Sousa goes beyond mere observation, insinuating, by the end, that Camões's use of Spanish in his characterization of the profane reflects, in some way, the very nature of the Castilians. Camões's polyglot work becomes a touchstone among Portuguese authors of the annexation period, particularly those most associated with the production of polyglot works.

While qualitatively he mirrors Vicente's occasional antagonism, the frequency of occurrence is much higher in Camões, as his three theatrical works clearly reveal. His characterizations build on Vicente's conventional use of various linguistic registers, but Camões ultimately establishes something that his precursor only managed to intimate. In *Filodemo*, for example, the shepherd Dorianio and his foolhardy son Alonsillo are the only two characters that speak Spanish (1148-1236; 1502-90; 1774-1963). The list of characters on the title page of the manuscript does not even make use of the designation Alonsillo, preferring, instead, "Hum Bobo filho do pastor" (Anastácio 77). The body of the work maintains this preference, always listing his speaking parts under the familiar title of *Bobo*. Camões assures his reader that the name befits the character. In their entertaining first scene together, Dorianio laments the fact that he cannot seem to silence the babblings of his son:

MONTEIRO. Dar-m' eis novas ou sinais
De um fidalgo português,
Se passou por onde andais?
BOBO. ¡Yo soy el hidalgo portugués!
¿Qué manda su señoría?
PASTOR. ¡Cállate! ¡Qué nescio es!
BOBO. ¿Padre, no me dexaréis
Ser lo que quisiere un día?
¡Oh Santo Dios verdadero!
¿No seré lo que otros son?

Digo agora que no quiero
 Ser Alonsillo, el vaquero.
 PASTOR. ¿Pues qué quieres ser?
 BOBO. Burrón.
 PASTOR. Cállate agora, ignorante!
 BOBO. Quiero dezir dos palabras
 Digo que si soy possante
 Soy cabrón: des hoy adelante
 Quiérome andar con las cabras.
 PASTOR. Cállate ahora un poco.
 BOBO. Ha de ser quanto yo quisiere.
 PASTOR. Señor, diga lo que quiere,
 Que este muchacho es loco,
 Y muero porque no muere. (1175-97)

This dialogue continues in much the same way through the end of the scene—the *Bobo* speaking nonsense, the father unsuccessfully quieting him—not to mention the other two scenes in which the Spanish-speaking duo appears. Altogether, *Filodemo* not only succeeds as a perpetuation of Vicente’s conventional switches between languages, but also assigns the unfavorable role of the fool to the Spanish-speaker (a choice that Camões replicates in his other two works).

In *El rei Seleuco*, for example, and not unlike *Filodemo*, Camões limits his use of Spanish to Físico and his cross-dressing, servant-fool, Sancho. While the connection appears coincidental, Físico and Sancho’s exchanges are reminiscent of a later Sancho and his master Don Quixote. Físico and Sancho’s interactions are the most humorous of the entire work. When, for example, Sancho is suddenly torn from his slumber by his master and told to dress quickly, Sancho appears in just that, a dress, claiming that it was the quickest thing he could find. Físico objects to his appearance, but Sancho calmly replies: “parezco un gavián, / Hermoso como una dama” (697-98). In their relatively few lines together, Físico calls Sancho a “vellaco/velhaco” (678, 737), “ladrón” (680),

“necio” (726), and “bovo” (728, 734). Rather than ennobling Sancho with his higher social status, Físico, instead, ends up nearly as degraded as his servant. The fact that Sancho and Físico, the clowns of the work, are the only ones who speak Spanish, seems to reflect more than mere dramatic convention.

Unlike the author’s approach to characterization in *Filodemo* and *Seleuco*, Camões maintains a suggestive step beyond convention in his use of Spanish in *Enfatriões*. Karl von Reinhardtstoettner, in his assessment of the play, calls the text “profundamente nacional” (cited in Braga, Marquez, 41). Besides the fact that the protagonist of this work finds himself in the familiar context of the sea, the same place of so many other fictional characters of the time, hardly justifies von Reinhardtstoettner’s claim. A brief look at the use of Spanish in the work, however, shows that there was more behind Camões’s appropriation of another tongue than mere convention. *Enfatriões* revolves around the mischief of two gods, Júpiter and Mercúrio, who take full advantage of Enfatrião’s absence at war by taking on the appearance of the absent soldier. Camões lets Júpiter and Mercúrio’s alternation between Portuguese and Spanish speak for itself. While as gods Júpiter and Mercúrio consistently speak in Portuguese, in the commoners guise of Enfatrião and Sósea they elect Spanish—which hardly makes sense considering that the real characters of the same names speak Portuguese. Echoing the anecdote previously discussed, Camões manages to deify his native Portuguese and debase Spanish through this simple, yet significant technique of characterization. The real Sosea, whose role parallels that of the *Bobo* in many ways, also speaks Spanish. The exchanges between Júpiter, Mercúrio, Sosea, and Enfatrião capture the brilliant play on doubles

found in Camões's work as well as the author's playful use of Spanish in the depiction of these two characters.

From *Os Lusíadas* to his plays, Camões's works are manifestly Portuguese. As one who personifies the Portuguese nation in his works, committing all of his thought and love to the *patria*, Camões seems to construct something ultimately more defiant than Vicente by consistently debasing his Spanish-speaking characters. Altogether, Gil Vicente, António Ferreira, and Luís de Camões epitomize sixteenth-century Portuguese letters. Their works bear the imprint of a century marked by intense linguistic, cultural, and political exchange. Vicente dominated the first decades of the century with an unprecedented use of language and nationalized themes in his plays. Camões punctuated the latter part of the seventeenth century with perhaps the single most important Portuguese work ever written. Camões and his epic enabled the generation of Portuguese writers that followed to see the impact of the pen. As Portuguese authors paid tribute to their homeland in the decades of the annexation, Camões's name inevitably appeared. The dozens of editions of *Os Lusíadas* that appeared in the decades following his death are a testament of the importance of his work during the annexation (Namora 57). Sandwiched between Vicente and Camões was Ferreira and his insistence that all Portuguese authors should write in their mother tongue. Although few subscribed to his rigid view of language and literature in the century that followed, many shared his zeal for Portugal and his desire to glorify the *patria* in his writings. Vicente, Camões, and Ferreira were not alone in their efforts either. Other Portuguese writers actively participated in the invention of *Portugalidade* (e.g., Fernão de Oliveira and João de

Barros). During the baroque, many Portuguese authors affirmed an autonomous Portuguese identity in their writings, preserving the legacy left by the pioneers of the sixteenth-century.

CHAPTER III

PORTUGUESE NATIONALISM IN A SPANISH COSTUME: THE CASE OF MANUEL DE FARIA E SOUSA

As his two autobiographies attest, Manuel de Faria e Sousa's life was a constant struggle to make sense of his own identity.¹ While the majority of his adulthood was spent in and out of Castile—where he would eventually die in 1649—Faria e Sousa's body ultimately returned to the land he most identified with: Portugal. He wrote the major part of his critical and literary work, however, in Spanish and cultivated relationships with some of the most prominent artists in Madrid during the first half of the seventeenth century. It may seem to follow, therefore, that Faria e Sousa abandoned his native land and tongue for a more accepted language and centralized place on the Iberian Peninsula. After all, this is the information that many literary critics and historians have recycled during the past four centuries.² Notwithstanding its recurrence, this approach to Faria e Sousa is, I would argue, superficial and reductive. It only tells part of the story. Although his writings were dressed in Spanish, they reveal the work of a Portuguese enthusiast committed to promoting Portugal within and without the Peninsula. Rather than perpetuate past misconceptions of his life and works, or read Faria e Sousa from the opposite extreme (as some kind of *pure* nationalist), this chapter puts forward a

¹ This includes both *The "Fortuna" of Manuel de Faria e Sousa: An Autobiography* and the autobiographical poem "Patria y Vida" from *Fuente de Aganipe*.

² Faria e Sousa's most well-known detractors include his Portuguese contemporaries D. Agostinho Manuel de Vasconcelos, Manuel de Galhegos, and Pires de Almeida, as well as several late nineteenth- and twentieth-century literary historians/critics including Teófilo Braga, Wilhelm Storck, and Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo.

perspective of the Portuguese writer that embraces the heterogeneity of the world he inhabited and the costumes (linguistic, national, literary) he donned throughout his life.

Faria e Sousa is one of the most prolific writers that the Iberian Peninsula has ever produced, although there is little consensus regarding the value of his work. As Arthur Askins explains, criticism related to the author typically remains divided: “desde a extrema ou total rejeição (mas que curiosamente continua na sua dependência) até ao uso mais cuidadoso e mais cauteloso dos textos, factos, histórias, rumores e até mesmo dos devaneios que ele fez chegar à letra de forma” (219). His literary corpus includes poetry, history, theology, philosophy, and literary criticism. However, he did not simply experiment with these genres as he had with chivalric and pastoral romances in his youth. He composed more than six hundred poems in at least fifteen different poetic forms, focusing primarily on the sonnet. While impressive, his poetic production defers to his immense body of history and literary criticism, where the Iberianist dedicated more than five thousand pages to the glories of Portugal and Luís de Camões, his beloved national poet. Whether a sonnet, a literary commentary, or a historical text, his work leads to at least one definite conclusion: Faria e Sousa was not only innocent of disloyalty, but guilty of nationalism. As it happens, Faria e Sousa has a nationalizing effect on virtually every literary project he undertakes. In his criticism, poetry, and history, the Portuguese nation consistently emerges as the protagonist. Many have downplayed his literary contributions by scrutinizing his political allegiances, often focusing on the fact that he lived most of his adult life in Castile and published the majority of his work in Spanish. As I hope to demonstrate in this chapter, however, the Spanish language masked the Portuguese

identity of his works, allowing Faria e Sousa, like many of his contemporaries, to promote a patriotic agenda in the language of the Empire and to spread the glories of his native land across the European landscape.

In highlighting the various ways in which Faria e Sousa affirms his Portuguese identity, it is not my intention to understate Faria e Sousa's Spanishness. To ignore his multilayered connections to Spain would be to commit the same error that others have maintained in regards to his affinity for Portugal, when in actuality the author and his Portuguese contemporaries may very well be something closer to an Iberian blend than either Spanish *or* Portuguese. Overall, Covarrubias's entry on *España* informs my understanding of Faria e Sousa's relationship with Spain. Towards the end of this section, the lexicographer gives the following definition of *españolado*: "el extranjero que ha deprendido la lengua y las costumbres y traje de España" (551). The cross-cultural proficiency of the early modern lettered Portuguese would appear to demonstrate precisely what Covarrubias designates as *españolado*. From language to literature, Spanishness is a learned identity, a performance many Portuguese authors mastered during the annexation. *Portugalidade*, however, is also a costume (an emerging set of characteristics that only become the basis of Portuguese national identity as they are performed). My emphasis throughout this chapter is on the author's consistent choice to masquerade his Portuguese identity, and thereby underscore the performativity of national identity altogether.

The heart of Faria e Sousa's nationalism, and the central text of this chapter, is his commentary *Lusíadas de Luis de Camoens, Príncipe de los Poetas de España*, published

in Madrid from 1639 to 1640, on the eve of the Portuguese Restoration. My approach to this work consists of analyzing the numerous instances in the text where Faria e Sousa manifests his nationalist character. This includes the significance of the title page, the geographic superiority of Lisbon and the Portuguese nation, the glorification of the Portuguese language, providentialism, the virtues of the Portuguese (e.g., loyalty, bravery, love, mastery at sea), and the repeated references to a collective identity. This demonstrates the underlying patriotic fervor guiding Faria e Sousa's corpus of texts and reveals the mechanisms at work among other Portuguese authors participating in this movement. Beyond the analysis of his commentary on *Os Lusíadas*, this chapter also looks closely at the ways in which Faria e Sousa articulates his nationalism through history. I will focus most of my attention on his condensed version of Portuguese history titled *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (1628), although I will also look briefly at *Asia Portuguesa* (1674), *Europa Portuguesa* (1678), and *Africa Portuguesa* (1681). My reading emphasizes the various inaccuracies and exaggerations within *Epítome*—much of the same evidence other critics have used to degrade his historical contribution. As I will argue, however, nationalism has less to do with truth and accuracy than it does with imagining the past in a way that casts the nation in the best light possible. The chapter concludes with a panoramic view of Faria e Sousa's poetic anthology *Fuente de Aganipe* (1624). This voluminous text stands out not only as a work rich in poetic theory and form, but also for its bilingual and patriotic character. My approach to Faria e Sousa's poetry is two-fold. First, I will consider the overall quality of his poems by comparing and contrasting some of them with those of Camões, Luís de Góngora, Francisco de

Quevedo, and other early modern Iberian poets. Second, I will investigate the Portuguese character of his poetic work and theory, namely, his preference for and imitation of Camões and his attempts to integrate contemporary politics into his verse.

As the pioneer of comparative Iberian studies and one of the most prolific writers of early modern Spain and Portugal, Manuel de Faria e Sousa is a foundational figure of this Peninsular study (Glaser, *Estudios* 60). His grasp of contemporary Iberian literature and the Western tradition is impressive by any standards, then or now. This fact, among other things, has led some scholars (Glaser, Núñez) to describe him as one of the most learned and erudite of his generation. While this may sound promising, critics traditionally limit the author to a few cursory comments, if they say anything at all. John de Oliveira e Silva sees this as an interesting parallel between Faria e Sousa and Camões: “Like the great poet to whom he dedicated almost one-half of his life, Faria e Sousa did not achieve the prominence that he deserved among his contemporaries” (75). That is not to say that he was unknown in his day—he was an illustrious member of the Republic of Letters—only that he failed to achieve the measure of success and fame that his unique abilities promised (Bouza 29). While a number of scholars over the past fifty years have argued that Faria e Sousa deserves a better place within Iberian letters,³ relatively little has been done to reappraise the author’s work—with the important exception of Edward Glaser’s critical work. Among the seventeenth-century Portuguese authors overlooked by modern scholarship, Glaser considers Faria e Sousa the primary victim (*Estudios* 3). Although his importance extends well beyond the topic of early modern national

³ See Pierce (121), Flasche (7), Pires (163), García (209), and Glaser, (Preface 6).

consciousness on the Iberian Peninsula, I see this chapter as an important step in the rehabilitation of the life and work of Manuel de Faria e Sousa.

Faria e Sousa was considered extremely gifted in the eyes of many of his contemporaries.⁴ One example of this praise came at the hand of Lope de Vega in response to the publication of Faria e Sousa's *Noches Claras, divinas y humanas flores* (1624):

Peregrina erudicion
De varias flores vestida,
Enseñansa entretenida,
Y sabrosa correccion:
Fuerças de ingenio son
Dulce pluma docta mano
De un Filosofo Christiano
Sosa de las letras sol
Demosthenes Español,
Y Seneca Lusitano. (qtd. in Glaser, "Lope" 57)

As this poem suggests, Lope held Faria e Sousa in very high esteem.⁵ Beyond the general praise of erudition, wit, and religiosity one would expect in such a poem, Lope associates him with Demosthenes, the famed Greek orator, and Seneca, one of the great writers of the Roman tradition.⁶ That such high regard would come from a writer as prolific as Lope de Vega only intensifies the weight of his words.

⁴ Fr. Fernando Camargo speaks of "el felicissimo ingenio de Manoel de Faria, e Sousa." Thomaz Tamayo de Vargas adds, "El ingenio, erudicion, y deligencia de Manoel de Faria e Sousa con increible, y loable fátiga há sacada a mejor luz de la obscuridad, en que hasta a ora estava sepultada la profundidad del ingenio del Poeta" (qtd. in Barbosa 255). As further evidence of Faria e Sousa's prestige in the seventeenth century, Luis Jaime Cisneros offers quotes from Gracián, Pérez de Montalbán, Miguel Botelho de Carvalho, and Lope de Vega in his article (6-7).

⁵ Faria e Sousa's first exposure to Lope came through his comedias, which Faria e Sousa read in his youth (Fortuna 136). While we do not know how or when they first met, the paper trail they left clearly suggests a strong friendship between the two men of letters. For a more detailed discussion of their relationship see Marín's "Camoens, Faria y Cervantes," Rodríguez Cepeda's "La relación Camoens, Lope de Vega y Faria y Sousa," and Glaser's "Lope de Vega e Manuel de Faria e Sousa."

⁶ Demosthenes is best-known for his Philipic Orations, in which he urges his people to rise up and defend their country from Philip II of Macedon.

While applauded by many of his literary contemporaries in both Spain and Portugal, Faria e Sousa's works have been, for the most part, far from the critical spotlight ever since. This is due, predominantly, to the fact that history has perpetuated the image of Faria e Sousa as portrayed by his opponents (Glaser, Preface 5). Unfortunately, "for more than a century now it has been fashionable to dismiss Faria e Sousa as a self-seeking eccentric whose critical judgments are of dubious value" (5). Not until the 1970s did scholars begin to reconsider Faria e Sousa's contribution to seventeenth-century literature in general, and more specifically to literary criticism. Glaser, editor of Faria e Sousa's autobiography *Fortuna de Manuel de Faria e Sousa* (1975), encourages critics to restore "Faria e Sousa to the pre-eminent place which rightfully should be his in the history of Iberian culture" (6).⁷ As the leading expert on Faria e Sousa, Glaser beckons readers to "come forth" with new research to support or contradict his own ideas (6). In addition to the autobiography, he dedicates a chapter of his *Estudios Hispano-Portugueses* (1957) to Faria e Sousa's commentary on Garcilaso, not to mention a critical edition of Faria e Sousa's *Cancionero* (1968). While Glaser's scholarship certainly furthered additional study, as of yet no one has exclusively studied the nationalist ideas found in Faria e Sousa's work.⁸

For centuries critics and historians within and beyond Iberia have reduced Faria e Sousa to what they see as a contradiction.⁹ While on the one hand they acknowledge his exaggerated love for Portugal, on the other they reject his patriotism due to his residence

⁷ Until Glaser's 1975 edition, Faria e Sousa's autobiography was previously available only in manuscript.

⁸ For a survey of recent scholarship on Faria e Sousa, see Lemos, Marín, Oliveira e Silva, and Heiple.

⁹ See Javier Núñez C. (275) and Felipe C. R. Maldonado (11).

in Castile and overwhelming literary production in Spanish. Domingo García Péres sees the situation as an obvious case of paradox: “Faria y Souza tuvo la mala suerte de ser sospechoso à la mayor parte de los españoles por ser portugués, y a los portugueses por escribir en castellano, y seguir residiendo en Castilla después de la emancipación” (208-09). Rather than inciting a critical tug-of-war over which literary tradition can claim Faria e Sousa and his crossbred contemporaries—similar to what often occurs with colonial literature—critics, for the most part, have simply discarded these authors and their works. Few, if any, of his contemporaries, not to mention most critics and historians since, have managed to see past Faria e Sousa’s Castilian mask. Rather than overemphasize the Spanish exterior of his works, my reading of Faria e Sousa uncovers the Portuguese identity at the heart of his literary corpus. By this I do not mean to say that by stripping away his Spanish identity one arrives at a true, Portuguese persona, only that the deep structure of his literature reveals the latter as his identity of choice. He wanted to be Portuguese, and as a result he consistently lays claim to this emerging identity in his works. Ultimately, the author defies either/or criticism, embodying, instead, a mix of Iberian identities. It is precisely the fluidity of identity among early modern Portuguese authors that has stifled critics over the centuries. While this has been an obstacle in the past, a number of theoretical movements from the past half-century provide the conceptual framework necessary to understand and appreciate the cross-pollination that so thoroughly characterizes the literary landscape of early modern Iberia.

Traditionally, critics have either obsessed over Faria e Sousa’s connections to Castile or oversimplified his literary contribution. This tends to include some reference to

his lengthy stay in Madrid and/or the fact that he wrote predominantly in Spanish—as if either of these realities say anything about the content of his writings—and some flippant allegation concerning the quality of his work (inaccurate, exaggerated, imitative).¹⁰ I will argue that these frequent indictments merely serve as red herrings, leading the reader to reject Faria e Sousa’s works on account of a perceived disloyalty. These slippery issues, in fact, prove very little concerning the author’s patriotism and even less about the quality of his writing. If Faria e Sousa is to claim his deserved place within Iberian letters, the role of the Portuguese writer during the period of annexation will have to be considered with greater fairness, impartiality, and attention to the text. Unfortunately, relatively little previous inquiry rests on Faria e Sousa’s actual works. Following a brief contextualization of Faria e Sousa’s residence and choice of literary language, my investigation will lead to the author’s literary criticism, historiography, and poetry, thereby allowing the text and the context to work together.

Faria e Sousa’s long-time residence in Castile is one of the most misunderstood aspects of his life and one of the reasons why he does not enjoy greater readership. Many critics and historians move from this biographical fact to a misguided assumption of disloyalty when, in actuality, Faria e Sousa wanted to return to Portugal almost as soon as he had arrived in Madrid (Faria, *Fortuna* 171). This is made abundantly clear in his autobiography, wherein the author repeatedly describes unsuccessful efforts to return to Portugal, making him a sort of anti-hero who cannot complete the journey home. Eugenio Asensio keys in on this trope in his assessment of the autobiography: “Cuando escribe la

¹⁰ Quantity was never an issue for Faria e Sousa, as the author exhausted the various subjects of his works. That he dedicated twenty five years to his critical commentary of *Os Lusíadas* reveals his painstaking approach to writing, especially literary criticism.

Fortuna imagina al panorama de su vida como una aspiración frustrada de regresar a la tierra natal de Entre-Douro-e-Minho donde él y su mujer poseen tierras. De hecho no la vuelve a ver más que durante una fugaz visita en noviembre-diciembre de 1629. Es un Ulises que, con cualquier pretexto, retrasa la vuelta a la tierra soñada” (“La autobiografía” 633). This citation keys in on Faria e Sousa’s duplicity. While he clearly desires to return to Portugal, his pride will not allow him to return a failure. He insists on achieving the success he set out for in the first place: symbolic capital sufficient to hold the respect of his countrymen, and enough actual capital to provide for his wife and children (*Fortuna* 159). It would be wrong, however, to read this duplicity negatively. It is not about the author falling short as either a Portuguese patriot or a converted Castilian, but about how Faria e Sousa navigates his hybridity in such a way that allows him to make a claim to *Portugalidade*.

Faria e Sousa’s self-writing offers much more than unfulfilled desire to return to Portugal. Many other passages shed light on the author’s living situation, clarifying his purposes for leaving his native land on the one hand, and capturing his state of mind while living in Spain on the other. In the following selection, for example, Faria e Sousa juxtaposes his allegiance with that of some of his Castilianized compatriots: “En Castilla entré pero ella nunca pudo entrar en mí; por más y más que después viese en Madrid a muchos portugueses olvidados de su patria y aun de su honra (si honra puede haber en quien se olvida de su patria), que parecía que al pasar los ríos que se pasan de Portugal a Castilla, habían pasado el Leteo” [which, according to Greek mythology, is the river of forgetfulness located in Hades] (*Fortuna* 160-61). Here Faria e Sousa distinguishes

between the physical and the metaphysical. That is, the author would have the reader believe that *where* he was did not change *who* he was. What is both difficult and interesting about Faria e Sousa is that he lives *both* lives, although clearly favoring the one (Portuguese) over the other (Spanish), at least according to his writings. Such was the bottom line of early modern Iberian existence. With the gospel of homogeneity saturating all aspects of peninsular life, individuals had to bring their various identities into line with imperial standards. As Faria e Sousa indicates in the selection above, and often repeats in his writings, the give-and-take of identity never justifies the total desertion of one's native identity.

Upon abandoning Italy and his patron, the Marquis Castel Rodrigo, and returning to Madrid in 1634, Faria e Sousa lost all hope of a Portuguese homecoming. His unexpected appearance in Castile led to suspicions of treason and imprisonment at the hands of the Inquisition (Barbosa 251). Although liberated from this confinement after three months, Faria e Sousa permanently lost the right to leave the capital, thus eliminating any possibility of a return home (Glaser, Preface 74). This captivity reminded him that, while he may have lived in the heart of the Spanish Empire (an *españolado* in every sense of the word), he was still an outsider. That is, regardless of who he became over the years, his life story would always begin with "Once upon a time in the kingdom of Portugal." To complicate matters even more for the Portuguese living in Spain, following the Restoration of 1640 only Portuguese soldiers were permitted to leave Spain to perform military duties, at which time many would desert to England and make their way back to the newly freed homeland (Braga, Teófilo, 303). Even if the excitement of

the Restoration had motivated Faria e Sousa enough to convince him to leave his failures behind and return to Portugal, and supposing that he were able to somehow orchestrate this flight home, the poor health and destitute living conditions facing the ailing author overwhelmed any chances of this happening. It can be said, then, that while many factors kept Faria e Sousa in Castile, disloyalty to his native Portugal is not one of them.

Just as Faria e Sousa's residence in Madrid has assisted critics and historians in both casting his patriotism negatively and marginalizing his works, his choice to write in Spanish has also fueled his detractors over the centuries. More than four hundred years after his birth, Faria e Sousa still maintains the distinction, or for some, the infamy, of having published more in the Spanish language than any other Portuguese author in history. Many question Faria e Sousa's commitment to Portugal, given his decision to write predominantly in the Spanish language. This choice, however, is far too complex to be reduced so easily. A number of different factors motivated Portuguese authors to write in Spanish, including economic opportunism, literary prestige, and a larger reading audience. What is more, writers had to conform to the demands of the market, which at that time favored literature published in Spanish. Faria e Sousa describes this reality in his autobiography: "Todos mis escritos, antes de pasar a Castilla, fueron en portugués, si no eran algunos pocos versos; porque siempre tuve por absurdo el hacerse un portugués castellano en Portugal. Después que pasé a Castilla, fue preciso hacerme castellano, porque como ya escribía para imprimir, no me imprimieran acá lo que escribiese en portugués" (*Fortuna* 156). These words capture the fluidity of identity among Faria e Sousa and many of his contemporaries. Rather than cast aside his Portuguese identity and

become Castilian as market forces required, Faria e Sousa resisted the homogenizing effects of imperial rule by expanding his concept of self to include more hybrid categories (bilingual, multicultural, Iberian). The author never stopped writing in Portuguese, choosing instead to translate his writings from Portuguese to Spanish in order to publish them in Madrid. That is to say, he chose to work from within the imperial system to spread the glories of his native land rather than silencing his pen altogether.

In addition to the publishing standards of the time, writing in Portuguese severely limited the reach of a particular work because the target audience was so small.¹¹ Works authored in Spanish, on the other hand, could circulate throughout the Iberian Peninsula, not to mention many other parts of Europe and the world. Faria e Sousa himself describes the relationship between language and readership in the prologue of his commentary on *Os Lusíadas*: “Valganme los expositores Latinos de textos Griegos; i de textos Latinos me valgan los expositores vulgares en diferentes lenguas” (13). The point here is that Faria e Sousa wants to extend to others the same benefit that he has enjoyed from reading works that would otherwise be inaccessible to his limited linguistic knowledge. We should agree with Asensio, then, that writing in Spanish served as a means to an end: “sirviéndose del castellano como instrumento, [Faria e Sousa] reveló al público de la Península y de más allá la genialidad de Camões y las glorias heroicas de Portugal” (“La autobiografía” 630). Esther de Lemos agrees: “o seu amor pelas coisas portuguesas não fica, porém, em causa: antes pelo contrário, pois tratar delas numa língua então de tão larga audiência, era a melhor forma de lhes assegurar universalidade de expansão” (4).

¹¹ Here, I am not merely thinking of Portugal’s population, which only numbered around two million, but an even smaller group we might refer to as the Portuguese learned elite.

One may scrutinize the effectiveness of Faria e Sousa's strategy, but that it is a legitimate approach to promoting Portugal and a heterogeneous Iberia cannot be denied. Eduardo Lourenço sees the delicate nature of this endeavor: "Faria e Sousa celebra em castelhano as glórias lusitanas, sem ver nisso contradição alguma, e, o que é mais importante, sem que os espanhóis com elas se apoquentem" (27). In this citation Lourenço hints at the risk Faria e Sousa undertakes in his pro-Portuguese writings in the Spanish language. Indeed one might argue that rather than a sign of some kind of disloyalty, writing patriotic works in Spanish was actually the best way to preserve the Portuguese imaginary. This may be what Asensio had in mind when he crowned Faria e Sousa "el más patriota de los portugueses" ("La autobiografía" 635). It can be said, therefore, that while Faria e Sousa dressed the majority of his works in the Spanish language, the substance of his works is overwhelmingly Portuguese. The ever-popular attack on Faria e Sousa's loyalty, based primarily on his choice to write in Spanish, is misguided and cannot, as we will see hereafter, be substantiated by the work itself.

Among the many genres found in Faria e Sousa's canon, no other stands as prominently as literary criticism. This genre would certainly include the introductory sections found at the beginning of each volume of his poetic work *Fuente de Aganipe* (1624); his critical editions of Camões's lyric poetry, *Rimas varias de Luiz de Camoens, Principe de los Poetas heroicos, y Liricos de España* (1685); and his most recognized work, *Lusíadas de Luiz de Camoens, Principe de los Poetas de España* (1639-40)—one of the most patriotic texts published by a Portuguese author during the seventeenth

century.¹² Faria e Sousa completed his five-volume edition of more than two-thousand pages over the course of twenty-five years of intense study, writing, and revision. This includes a 1621 draft in Portuguese, a more extensive version in 1638 (by that time translated to Spanish), and the official publication of 1639 (Askins 220). His all-encompassing look at Camões's masterpiece cross-references at least five-hundred additional authors of world literature, with special emphasis on Virgil. The author describes the painstaking process by which he completed the study:

Empecé a leer a Homero con un cuadernillo blanco en la mesa y la pluma en la mano; como yo tenía en la memoria toda la *Lusíada*, luego [que] se me venía a los ojos cualquier lugar que de ella se parecía a alguno de los que iba leyendo en la *Iliada* o *Ulisea*, éste copiaba en mi cuadernillo apuntando la estancia y el canto de la *Lusíada* con que se respondía, o por imitación o por concurrencia. De este modo me hube con cada uno y algunos a tres, porque de una es imposible cogerlo todo, ni aun de muchas; pero cogí mucho de todos, que por discurso de veinte años pasaron de quinientos libros, y así me hallé a lo menos con quinientos cuadernillos de notas sacadas con este trabajo, que jamás le tomó nadie en el mundo. (151)

This passage captures the patient, all-encompassing effort of Faria e Sousa's critical work, including the initial memorization of Camões's poem, the intertextualization of the epic with the rest of Western literature, and the development of a research archive consisting of at least five hundred notebooks.¹³ The magnitude of this investigation alone is remarkable, to say nothing of its superb erudition. Faria e Sousa did not arrive at such a comprehensive study by accident either, intent, from the moment he decided to undertake

¹³ Faria e Sousa explains that the major difference between his commentary and others is the long, concerted effort he dedicated to the poem: "Hablo con seguridad, i no sin respeto: porque yo no digo que lo obré por mayor entendimiento, ni sutileza, ni estudio, sino por mayor diligencia, i desvelo, i amor al credito de España por el ingenio, que Luís de Camões le perpetuó con el suyo" ("Prologo" 14).

the work, that he would produce an insuperable commentary. There is a consensus among many scholars that Faria e Sousa succeeded in producing such a work.¹⁴

As the citation above suggests, his commentary transcends superficial considerations of Camões's masterpiece, unraveling, instead, its many layers of meaning. Faria e Sousa makes clear his desire to go beyond the surface of *Os Lusíadas* in the prologue of his commentary: "Digo, pues, que el comentó no ha de ser cascarón del comentado: sino que se ha de hazer tan uno aquél con éste, que éste no se pueda desear sin aquél" (5). This way of reading poetry, as Oliveira e Silva points out, depends completely on allegory: "[Faria e Sousa] makes a case for what we today would call allegorical poetics, since it alludes not to the surface or the *visibilia* of the poem, but to the conception that lies behind" (66). With such an in-depth look at the text, Faria e Sousa is able to uncover countless gems within the work, including several references to Portuguese identity. Commenting on the impact of Faria e Sousa's study, Lope explains how the Portuguese critic's work changed public perception of Camões and his work:

No ay duda, que el Poema de Luis de Camoes tuvo siempre estimacion de grandes: pero desde oy la tendra de gradissimo, con los Comentarios de Manuel de Faria i Sousa. ("Elogio" 1)

Todos lo teniamos por mayor en las Rimas varias, i agora fia comparacion es mayor en este Poema, con lo que su Comentador descubre. ("Elogio" 3)

¹⁴ Lope, for one, describes it as "un trabajo invencible," adding that "deste genero de estudios no logra nuestra lengua semejante escrito; ni de las estrañas ay otro que se lo pueda justamente aventajar" ("Elogio al comentador." 2). While Lope gives us an early modern perspective, several scholars maintain the superiority of the commentary to this day. Oliveira e Silva states, "For sheer volume, his discussion of these stanzas (or any stanzas in the work, for that matter) is unequaled, the first stanza alone taking up seven and a half pages of commentary alone. In all, his discussion of these four stanzas entails some seventeen pages of text" (70). Frank Pierce likewise sees Faria e Sousa at the pinnacle of criticism on *Os Lusíadas*: "Faria has not been surpassed in his formidable undertaking to meet squarely and faithfully the critical problems presented by the roving fantasy of the poet" (108); "As it stands, Faria's four-volume work remains the most substantial piece of Camões scholarship. It came out a bare sixty years after the first edition and, apart from being a magnificent tribute, crowns the critical appreciation of a generation that took its poetry very seriously" (100).

It would be difficult to overestimate the impact of Faria e Sousa's study. The change that Lope refers to above affected Camões's place on the literary world stage forever. That Camões's fame rests primarily on his epic and second on his lyrical poetry is a testament to Faria e Sousa's influence. Perhaps for this reason Lope compares the scale of Faria e Sousa's literary undertaking with that of Camões: "como Luis de Camoes es Principe de los Poetas que escribieron en idioma vulgar, lo es Manuel de Faria de los Comentadores en todas lenguas" ("Elogio" 1). The parallels between the Poet and his Commentator extend well beyond Lope's precise observation. The deep structure of each work reveals a similar sense of loyalty to and veneration for Portugal. This likeness is often lost in the many attempts to discredit the theoretical approach and other perceived errors in the commentary.

One can ascertain the value of Faria e Sousa's commentary by the mere fact that it is one of the few early modern Portuguese-authored works in Spanish that survived the centuries. While many critics (including some of his contemporaries) have tried to dismiss the value of this work—basing their criticism primarily on superficial readings and character attacks—the disappearing act they have pulled on most Portuguese annexation literature has not worked in this case. They have succeeded, however, in misrepresenting Faria e Sousa as a Castilianized Portuguese defector. It is clear that he lived many years and eventually died in Madrid, wrote most of his works in Spanish, and was a member of Madrid's Republic of Letters. These factors, however, do not mean that Faria e Sousa's glorification of Portugal was simply an act of self-fashioning in hopes that he might make it into the artistic circus of Spain as some kind of literary freak-show.

There is no textual or historical evidence to support the idea that he was marketing Portuguese exoticism and otherness for his own benefit. Never do his works directly glorify Spain, nor do his praises of Portugal read as an appeal for entry into the lettered elite of the empire. Instead, Faria e Sousa speaks of his native land in terms of differentiation, emphasizing how unique Portugal is in relation to Spain, sometimes expressing this distinctiveness in terms of superiority. Although there are some exceptions, Faria e Sousa and his nationalist contemporaries were not involved in a mud-slinging campaign against Spain so much as a revalorizing movement, a crusade on behalf of the Portuguese nation.

From the outset of his master work, Faria e Sousa makes his allegiance to Portugal very clear.¹⁵ His patriotic agenda begins with the title: *Lusíadas de Luis de Camoens, Príncipe de los Poetas de España*. Whereas the first part of the title quietly passes, what follows thereafter calls for attention. There is an important precedent for using the designation “Prince” in reference to a poet. It appears on the Peninsula as early as 1555 in *Los doze libros de la Eneid de Vergilio, principe de los poetas latinos*. Thereafter, the Renaissance writer Garcilaso de la Vega received the same distinction among Castilian poets. In 1622, for example, Tomás Tamayo de Vargas titled his critical edition *Garcilasso de la Vega, natural de Toledo: Príncipe de los Poetas Castellanos*, only to be echoed four years later in Luis Brizeño’s *Obras de Garcilasso de la Vega, Príncipe de los Poetas Castellanos*. While Virgil was given preeminence among authors who composed in Latin, Garcilaso assumed the same role in Spanish. Rather than name

¹⁵ The same could be said of his critical edition of Camões’s lyrical poetry—*Rimas varias de Luis de Camões. Príncipe de los poetas heroycos, y lyricos de España*.

Camões heir to the same title among Portuguese poets, however, Faria e Sousa surpasses Tamayo de Vargas and Brizeño's scope, increasing Camões's poetic reign to the entire Iberian Peninsula in the title of his commentary: "Camões é caracterizado, pelos seus estudos poéticos, como o espírito de mais alto significado para Espanha e Portugal" (Flasche 15; my emphasis).

Faria e Sousa seems well aware of the audacity surrounding the title of his work, although he considers it modest compared to the title he might have used. In section twenty-four of "Vida del Poeta," one of the introductory sections of the work, he confidently affirms his position on the matter, extending the sphere of Camonian superiority even further: "A los que estuvieron congoxados con el titulo que en la fachada deste volumen dimos al Poeta, de Principe de los de España; no fuera mucho si dixeramos de todos los de Europa (que viene a ser de todo el mundo; pues solamente a ella cupo la suerte de las letras politicas, ingeniosas, i doctas) ya que el Poeta se aventajó a todos" (*Lusíadas* 49-50). As is evident in this passage, Faria e Sousa esteems Camões above all others. "Mi gran Poeta," as he frequently describes Camões, embodies all of the scattered literary talent of the past: "España en solo Luis de Camões vio junta la grandeza de Homero, i Virgilio en lo Heroico: la de Pindaro, i Oracio en lo Lirico: la de Menandro, i Plauto en lo Comico, con igualdad notable; apropiandose a si solo quanto consiguieron en diferentes edades, i sujetos los Griegos, i los Latinos; los Italianos, i los Españoles" (1.47). The divinization of Camões that occurs in this passage establishes him as none other than the Poetic Messiah. Just as the commentator argues that all literature before Camões points to his coming, he sees the best of his Iberian contemporaries as

disciples of the Portuguese poet (Cisneros 2). That Faria e Sousa exaggerates in this description of Camões makes it that much more interesting, echoing his overall tendency to hyperbolize Portuguese greatness in his writings.

Faria e Sousa's title triggers a sense of competition not unfamiliar to the baroque literary mentality. From Luís de Góngora's one-upping of Garcilaso de la Vega in his *carpe diem* sonnet "Mientras por competir con tu cabello" to Sor Juana's challenge of Padre Vieira's theology in *Carta Atenagórica*, the baroque overflows with examples of literary rivalry. In the case of Faria e Sousa's edition of Camões's national epic, the antecedent and rival to his work is clearly Fernando Herrera's commentary on Garcilaso's *Obras* (1580), published in the same year as both Camões's death and the annexation of Portugal. Herrera's critical work establishes Garcilaso as the father of Spanish poetry and initiates the "Príncipe" discussion, although he does not include the designation in the title of his work. Faria e Sousa's editions of Camões's poetry constitute the first legitimate rival to Herrera's work on Garcilaso, and the Portuguese author seems well aware of it. There is, in fact, a certain degree of tension or, to use Harold Bloom's helpful expression, "anxiety of influence" in Faria e Sousa's attitude towards Herrera and Garcilaso: "Faria e Sousa recognizes in Garcilaso his condition as originator of a new poetic school, but at the same time he feels the need to repeat time and time again that his genius does not admit comparison with that of Camões" (Glaser, *Estudios* 11). While Faria e Sousa acknowledges Garcilaso's merit, he only grants the poet a fragment of Camões's greatness. Faria e Sousa's treatment of Herrera, on the other hand, not only withholds praise, but approaches hostility: "Tan afincado está su resentimiento contra

Herrera que inicia sus anotaciones a las *Rimas* de Camões haciendo objeto al andaluz de una furiosa arremetida. No ataca solamente su posición en determinadas cuestiones eruditas, sino que menosprecia la obra entera de su ‘competidor’” (Glaser, *Estudios* 16). Faria e Sousa suggestively asks the reader, “en que se funda el titulo de Divino Herrera?” (*Rimas* 1.6), as if to question his worthiness of such a designation. The harshness of his assessment seems to suggest that Faria e Sousa was not only speaking as a literary critic, but perhaps also as a jealous bystander of the fame Herrera achieved for himself and the glory he brought upon *his* poet.

While the title of his commentary reflects the general literary climate of the Baroque, it also manifests Faria e Sousa’s specific view of the Peninsula and his place therein. Faria e Sousa, after all, was born and lived the majority of his life in a “unified” Iberia. As much as this was a political unification, the artistic continuity between the Spanish and Portuguese was as proximate as it had ever been and, perhaps, ever would be. It makes sense, therefore, for Faria e Sousa to think in these terms. That is, framing his critical commentary in terms of the Iberian Peninsula fits a certain logic unique to annexation mentality. Clearly, an author as well read and metacritical as Faria e Sousa was aware of the differences between Spain and Portugal. Although it would be wrong to read in his appeal to a Peninsular space a distancing from his Portuguese origin, such a conception does suggest that some authors in the period identified themselves with more than one collectivity. Faria e Sousa and many of his Portuguese contemporaries affirm a belonging that links them specifically to Portugal, while at the same time acknowledging their participation in something of a larger scale. The most appropriate locus for the

author and his work may very well be, then, the shared place between the Spanish and the Portuguese, what Ricardo Jorge calls an *interculturalura* (xvi).

While the designation “Príncipe” certainly sets the tone for the entire commentary, the national fervor of the title page extends beyond the title. Gracing the bottom half of the page is the Portuguese coat of arms with its traditional five shields and seven castles. The coat of arms dates back as early as the twelfth century and is a fundamental symbol of Portuguese identity (as I will detail hereafter). Whether the author or the publisher is to be credited for this inclusion remains unknown (that the coat of arms belongs on the title page of this most Portuguese of works cannot be doubted). One of the most consistent threads throughout Faria e Sousa’s commentary is his fervor for Portugal. He weaves a variety of nationalisms into a single discursive fabric that very much echoes the message of the work in question: *Os Lusíadas*. This fabric includes numerous references to history, geography, language, and religion. It is clear throughout the text that Faria e Sousa speaks not as a desperate outsider trying to reenter his beloved Portugal, but as a committed member of the Portuguese community working from beyond the linguistic and national borders of his native land in an effort to spread the glories of Portugal and her poet.

The opening sections of the commentary confirm the teleology set forth on the title page. In the tenth section of “Advertencias para leerse,” for example, Faria e Sousa states the purpose of his work: “por la honra del Poeta i de la patria.” In many other occasions he reiterates this same purpose for writing. It is as if Faria e Sousa is trying to match in his commentary, the same glorification of Portugal that he sees Camões

accomplish in *Os Lusíadas*: “no se hallará en todo este Poema digresión, episodio, ni otro adorno, que no sea, o que no toque acciones gloriosas de la patria” (3.97). While several critics have questioned and criticized Faria e Sousa’s overdependence on allegory in his reading of *Os Lusíadas*, one cannot discount the patriotic harmony between the text and the commentary: “Let us not forget [. . .] that the exaltation of Faith and Empire was, like in Camões’ case, one of the intentions of the commentary” (Flasche 22). In this regard, it can be said that Faria e Sousa masterfully echoes the national pride that underlies Camões’s masterpiece. Rather than competing with Camões, Faria e Sousa builds on his national epic by not only reproducing it in Portuguese, but also by offering a Spanish prose translation, thereby reaching a larger audience with both his annotations and Camões’s original work. Making Camões’s masterpiece accessible to a wider reading public is at the core of Faria e Sousa’s decision to write his commentary in Spanish, at least according to the author: “Con averle comentado en Castellano, i con la traducion literal de las estancias, facilito a todos el entender esta lengua con poco estudio, mas de leer el Poeta, i el comento” (“Prologo” 13). In the sixth section of the “Avertencias para leerse con mas luz este libro” Faria e Sousa makes a similar statement regarding his use of Spanish: “el intento en esta traduccion, assi sea, es para que quien no entiende el Portugues, entiende facil i llanamente lo que contiene cada estrofa.” Aurelia Leyva sees Faria e Sousa’s attention to language as a clear indication of his general grasp of early modern Iberia: “En lo que atañe a Faria y Sousa, no se puede dudar de su pericia y sensibilidad de intérprete de *época* de la obra camoniana, al ofrecer una versión en prosa

del poema, escrupulosamente atento a la traducción literal en castellano, convencido de la necesidad de favorecer la difusión del mismo” (207).

Benedict Anderson’s idea concerning the nation as a simultaneously imagined cultural system is very helpful in describing Faria e Sousa’s Portuguese-minded writings. In chapter two of *Imagined Communities*, Anderson describes the cultural roots from and against which nationalism comes into view (12). Herein he emphasizes the role of simultaneity in the development of the national imaginary, including the emerging voice of the collective self: we, us, our (32). This simultaneous expression of the nation is recurrent in early modern Portuguese literature, although more representative of the learned elite than the masses. It does, however, encompass Portugal in its entirety, not merely the exclusive voice of its cultural centers. Faria e Sousa’s commentary on *Os Lusíadas*, for one, is replete with examples of what Anderson terms a “world of plurals” (32). The frequency of the collective expression *nuestro*, for example, serves to imagine the “representative body” that constitutes the nation (32). While the recurrent theme of simultaneity is certainly fundamental in Portuguese annexation literature, this type of nation-building depends not only on the dissemination of the possessive adjective “our,” but, more importantly, the collective recognition of what that adjective describes. “Our” tells us that “we” are, what follows indicates who/what we are. Faria e Sousa’s works, as well as those of many of his Portuguese contemporaries, consistently make reference to *our* nation, *our* language, *our* sea, *our* loyalty, *our* valor, *our* poet (Camões), *our* religion, *our* history, *our* electness, and *our* preeminence. While the allusion to a broader community alone is a foundational aspect of the movement to which Faria e

Sousa belongs, perhaps more significant is the fact that such authors were imagining Portugal in the same way. These collective expressions are embedded in the writings produced by the Portuguese of the annexation period.

Faria e Sousa repeatedly evokes this Portuguese collectivity in his commentary through expressions such as “nuestra nación” (3.316), “nuestro Reyno” (3.376), and “nación portuguesa” (3.88). These frequent references are key to our understanding of Faria e Sousa’s nationalism in that they reveal the author’s synonymous concept of self- and national identity. Faria e Sousa does not see himself outside of the Portuguese national imaginary he works so deliberately to sustain. Therefore, when he discusses loyalty, bravery, electness, sea-mastery, or any other aspect of Portuguese essentialism, the writer speaks as an heir to this culture and not as an outsider looking in, as some would have it. As a result, Faria e Sousa speaks of the celebrated voyage chronicled in *Os Lusíadas* as if he were part of the fleet (the glory of Vasco da Gama’s enterprise being the timeless inheritance of the Portuguese nation). This sentiment emerges in Faria e Sousa’s response to a line from Canto 7 in which Da Gama speaks of the spreading fame of the Portuguese (7.60):

Por este camino puede tener lugar el aver algunos estraños, envidiosos de la gloria Portuguesa, llamado locura a la acción deste viaje, teniendole por desigual a las fuerças humanas; i a la resolución, i osadia, prudentes: casi diziendo, que se huvieron como niños, dexandose llevar de un sonido que los incitava. I como las tales acciones dellos proceden de la sencillez, puede esta niñeria ser lustre de *nuestra* nación, que como sencilla siempre en obedecer a las voces de la Iglesia Catolica. (3.316; my emphasis)

This selection reflects the commentator’s response to a single verse of the poem that might otherwise pass without interest (“Ouvindo do rumor que lá responde / o

eco” [7.60.8-9]). This simple example epitomizes the patriotic mileage that Faria e Sousa gets out of Camões’s poem. The above passage is full of religious self-posturing and perspectivism. By introducing the dubious and envious voice of the other, Faria e Sousa is able to glorify the acts of his compatriots and elevate *his* nation.

Faria e Sousa begins the passage that follows by claiming Camões for the Portuguese people and then establishing the poet’s words as a truth (better than fiction) in which all of the Portuguese participate: “[*N*]uestro Poeta se resolvió en no escribir mentiras (porque no las hubo menester para hazer raro su Poema con sembrarlo de cosas peregrinas, hallandolas mayores en *nuestras* verdades, de las que en sus fabulas las inventaron Homero, i Virgil.” (2.482; my emphasis; see also 2.519, 5.86). The “truths” Faria e Sousa verifies on behalf of the Portuguese differentiate the actual glories of Portugal from those invented by other nations and their respective poets. The commentator repeats this idea in at least four other occasions (2.450, 2.519, 3.510, 5.86), essentially affirming with each reiteration the superiority of Portuguese history over all other histories, real or imagined. The entire idea rests on the antithetical relationship between truth and fiction, which the author extends to Portugal and all other nations respectively.

Another nationalist trend found within Faria e Sousa’s commentary is the repeated appeal to the primacy and singularity of the Portuguese. It is not enough to speak of Portugal’s greatness. For the zealous commentator, it is all about Portugal’s superiority and uniqueness. Therefore, he is not content to merely mention the impossible deeds of his countrymen, but to elevate them to the status of “mayores imposibles” (3.492). He

highlights Camões's ability to achieve this very effect, praising the poet for eulogizing the Portuguese through the mouth of Adamastor: "Mirad la industria del Poeta, haziendo que al mismo tiempo que el Gigante airado acusa la gente Portuguesa la esté alabando de osada, i valerosa sobre todas las gentes del mundo, en mar, i en tierra, en paz, i en armas, i en todos exercicios heroycos: porque esta estancia, i la mitad de la siguiente, no es sino un elogio ilustrissimo de los Portugueses" (2.521). In another example, Faria e Sousa uses a verse from Canto 4—"Este é o primeiro rei" (48.5)—to launch into a discussion of some firsts that distinguish João I, and by extension, the Portuguese:

No se le podia escapar al Poeta esta advertencia: porque es gran gloria ser primero en alguna cosa: i los Portugueses lo fueron en muchas. El Rey Don Juan fue primero deste nombre en Portugal, i primero en varias acciones, i una dellas, la desta gloria e España, de passar las armas sobre los Moros en la propia Africa, i vencerlos en ella, i tomarle felizmente la Ciudad de Ceuta, plaça importantissima, no solo a la honra Portuguesa, sino a bien comun de la Christiandad. (2.330)

Faria e Sousa accomplishes at least two important things in this quote. On the one hand, he continues to outline the superlative nature of Portugal. On the other, he contextualizes Portuguese achievement within two important, and not unrelated, spaces: Christendom and the Peninsula. The double-edged effectiveness of this passage—allowing Portugal to stand alone and at the same time recognizing the ways in which the Portuguese nation belongs to other collectivities—did not go unnoticed by Faria e Sousa's Spanish contemporaries.¹⁶ Generally speaking, the author makes it point to draw attention to Portugal's singularity and the many "Cosa[s] singular[es] sin duda en la gente Portuguesa" (3.214).

¹⁶ Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *El príncipe constante* (1628) dramatizes Fernando's preservation of Ceuta as a Portuguese colony at the expense of his own life. This and other Portuguese-themed *comedias* are part of the focus of ch.3.

Nowhere does Faria e Sousa celebrate his nation's exceptionality more than when he speaks of their unprecedented mastery of the sea. Given the nature of the poem, the commentator has ample opportunity to speak on this topic. In his introductory notes on the poem, Faria e Sousa has this to say about the sea: "los dueños della son los Portugueses, que con esta de la India enseñaron al mundo el gran navegar, que hasta entonces fue limitadissimo" (109). When Camões speaks of "Mares nunca d'antes navegados" (1.1.3) at the outset of his epic, Faria e Sousa echoes with "los Portugueses son los dueños desta acción" (1.144), adding a brief defense of his poet's assertion as well: "De que lo fuesen no ay noticia, conforme a muchos graves Autores: i los que la quisieren persuadir serán vanamente enemigos del valor Portugues para quien el Autor de todo se sirvió de guardar esta gloria" (1.144). As the poem progresses, Neptune, among other Greek gods of the sea, takes notice of Portugal's maritime successes. The ocean prophet Proteus, for example, tries to warn Neptune that the Portuguese are going to usurp his power over the waters (4.49).¹⁷ Commenting on this section of Canto 4, Faria e Sousa adds, "los Portugueses serán los Gigantes, que despojarán sin reparo a Neptuno de sus Reynos marítimos" (2.332). During the course of the poem Faria e Sousa notes the gradual humanization of the gods and divinization of the Portuguese: "los Dioses vendran a ser humanos, i los Portugueses a ser Dioses" (2.580). The Portuguese gain preeminence over the pagan gods through their metaphorical baptism performed at sea by God himself.

Another aspect of Portuguese national identity that Faria e Sousa promotes in his commentary is what I will refer to as the "David Principle" (taking its name from the

¹⁷ Apparently there are two variations of the final four verses in this stanza. Faria e Sousa looks at both without attempting to resolve the matter (2.332).

well-known personage of the Old Testament). The idea is that an undersized Portugal, similar to David in his clash with Goliath (1 Sam. 17), manages to overcome all odds through God’s divine assistance. Faria e Sousa makes the connection between David and Portugal in his interpretation of Camões’s use of “fraco poder” (7.3.2) to describe the Portuguese. He explains that weakness in this verse is used in the same way that it is used in Canto 3 (stanzas 110-11). Hence, the “David Principle” in literature does not originate with Faria e Sousa’s commentary, but goes back at least as far as *Os Lusíadas*:

Qual o membrudo e bárbaro Gigante,
Do Rei Saul, com causa, tão temido,
Vendo o Pastor inerme estar diante,
Só de pedras e esforço apercebido,
Com palavras soberbas, o arrogante,
Despreza o fraco moço mal vestido,
Que, rodeando a funda, o desengana
Quanto mais pode a Fé que a força humana (3.111)

In concert with stanza 110, in which the poet speaks of the Christian’s power as “fraco e pequeno,” Camões draws a clear parallel between David and the outnumbered Portuguese fleet. At the root of this trope is the dichotomy between quality and quantity. As expected, Portuguese nationalists, facing the reality of meager numbers, are quick to highlight their qualitative value, as we see in these selections from Faria e Sousa’s commentary:

[S]in atender a la *poquedad* de la gente, sino a su natural valor, con que se haze *rara* en parecerse a la palma que con el *mayor* peso se levanta mas. (1.50; my emphasis)

[E]ssa poca gente rara, *poca*, o *pequeña*, en quanto al *numero*, avia *raridad* de valor, en quanto al *animo*. (1.49-50; my emphasis)

Es assi que Portugal, no solo es una *pequeña* parte del mundo, sino de la Christiandad, siendo la parte della en el mundo arto *pequeña*. Pero el Poeta con industria pregona esta *pequeñez* de Portugal, en quanto a la

cantidad, por subir de punto la *calidad* de la Religion, i de su valor (3.214; my emphasis).

In each of these excerpts the commentator highlights the poet's ability to contrast the scarcity of their numbers with the abundance of their virtues, making it clear that quality matters more than quantity. In this there appears to be an implicit reference to other Old Testament stories in which the relative few, through God's help, overcome the multitudinous opponent.¹⁸

Returning to his commentary on the verse from stanza 7 mentioned above, Faria e Sousa transitions from a perceived weakness that Portugal and David share, to a mutual triumph:

David, cuya *flaqueza* envistio con un Gigante, acompañado de un exercito poderoso: i la *flaqueza* de Portugueses ha investido con el mundo todo. Para pintar valientemente estas valentias son confessadas aquellas *flaquezas*. Galano està el termino de que no pesan los Portugueses su poder, para decir que no reparan en ser *pocos* para investir con *muchos* enemigos. (3.215; my emphasis)

This principle depends on a series of binary oppositions in which the right side of the pair would seem the overwhelming favorite (e.g., small/large, few/many), except that the left side has divine help. This rhetorical tug of war plays out time and time again in Faria e Sousa's commentary:

Vos Portugueses que sois *pocos* en numero, pero en valor *inmensos*, i que no meteis en balança, la *pequeñez* de esse número, sino la *grandeza* de essos coraçones: aumentando con el caudal de la vida, la ley divina, i vuestro nombre. (3.215; my emphasis)

Encareció el valor de los Portugueses confessando el *poco* numero se su gente: agora con la misma industria encarece la Christiandad: pues viene a

¹⁸ God's telling reduction of Gideon's army (Judges 6-8) is one example. Whereas the principle is inferred in the previous example, Elisha makes the point explicitly clear to the king of Israel in 2 Kings 6:16.

ser *tanta* en gente tan *poca* no sin misterio la eligió Dios, para cultura de la ley Evangelica, enviandola a partes tan remotas, usando della, como de sus Apostoles, i Discipulos, que siendo *pocos* hizieron *mucho*. (3.216; my emphasis)

Beyond his brilliant use of antithesis in both of these passages, Faria e Sousa introduces another central aspect of the David Principle: providentialism. To establish a similitude between David and Portugal is to highlight the electness of the Portuguese nation. Faria e Sousa wholeheartedly endorses this aspect of Portuguese essentialism, advancing it, as I will analyze later on, throughout his commentary. Additionally, the author establishes the similitude between Portugal and Christ's apostles and disciples. The fact the simile comes on the heels of a statement referring to the fact that the Portuguese were a chosen people sent to evangelize the world, groups them with those whom Christ commissions in the New Testament to take the gospel message throughout the world.

Several other aspects of Portuguese national identity emerge during the course of Faria e Sousa's work. One such feature is the supremacy of Portuguese valor. He states, "los Portugueses nacieron para executar una acción de osadía, que otras naciones temieron imaginar, y Luís de Camões para cantarlos con la mayor turba que hasta agora se vio despues de Homero, i de Virgilio" (1.135). Here Camões, whose impact on the development of Portuguese identity cannot be overestimated, is given credit as the most uniquely gifted individual to recount the glories of the Portuguese. This passage is particularly illuminating as it sets "nacieron" [they were born] and "naciones" [nations] side-by-side, thus implicitly highlighting the etymological link between the two words and juxtaposing Portuguese valor with the fear of other nations. As Faria e Sousa later emphasizes, "entre las naciones del mundo, la Portuguesa no cedió a alguna jamás en el

valor militar” (2.260). He often uses the term *nación* to introduce the virtues of the Portuguese people, thus reflecting the synonymous relationship between *nación* and *gentes* captured in Covarrubias’s dictionary. He affirms, for example, that “Los portugueses son como el mar; muy serenos en el sosiego, en la colera inoportables: ninguna nación es tan suave en la paz; ninguna tan furiosa en la guerra” (2.245). On another occasion he states that humility “resplandece en la nación Portuguesa” (3.78). In reality, Faria e Sousa seems to take advantage of every opportunity available to exalt the land and people of Portugal. Further evidence of this appears in his various comments on Portuguese geography, history, religion, and language.

Explicit and implicit references to Portuguese geography by Camões often trigger a nationalist response from Faria e Sousa. A simple reference to the Iberian Peninsula by the poet (3.17.1), for example, conjures an exacting response from his commentator: “España se aventaja a todas las Provincias de Europa” (2.22). Subsequently Camões designates the Peninsula the head of Europe—a privileged position when considering the New Testament equating of Christ and the head of the body/Church. Faria e Sousa considers this a perfect metaphor, stating that “muchos estranos confiesan la soberania de Portugal, en sitio, hermosura, fertilidad, valor, i Religión” (2.27). The author’s zeal for Portugal leads him to take the metaphor one step further: “Notese la industria, con levantar aqui a España, para despues levantar más a Portugal, que es el fin que lleva [. . .] Exaltando la patria, con hazerla Corona de aquella cabeça (2.22-23). Faria e Sousa is consistent in his privileging of Portugal as he adjusts his geographic scope from the

macro to the micro. A number of concentric circles lead the reader from Europe to Iberia, eventually arriving at the center: Portugal.

Faria e Sousa maintains the same stance towards Portugal that he upholds in his discussion of Iberia, as evidenced in his response to the sixth canto when Camões mentions Porto: “Lá na leal cidade donde teve / Origem (como é fama) o nome eterno / De Portugal” (6.52.1-3). In response to Camões’s immortalization of the Portuguese name, Faria e Sousa states, “Es bonissimo el dezir eterno al nombre de Portugal, que por sus glorias parece inacabable: i por su antiguedad, casi que tiene principio con la restauración del mundo” (3.116). Faria e Sousa’s esteem for his homeland is slightly bridled by “parece” and “casi,” a rare instance of self-control on the part of the commentator. Although he hardly needs a reason to wax patriotic, these verses from *Os Lusíadas* stimulate the previous reflection and the following explanation:

[S]iendo el Poeta docto en las cosas de la patria, no podía dudar desta en que conviene todos los Escritores; componiendose el nombre de Portugal, de *portu*, y *cale*, que todo es uno: porque esta ciudad se llamó primero Cale, quando estaba de la otra parte del rio, en frente del sitio en que agora está; i del nombre de Cale, i de estar situada en aquel puerto, el se llamava Puerto de Cale: i de ai el Reyno de Portugal. (3.116)

In this passage, Faria e Sousa affirms a collective recognition, albeit fabled, of the etymology of Portugal. This is significant because a clear sense of origin is essential in the development of geographic nationalism. That is, in order for a people to take pride in their land (cities, rivers, mountains, etc.), they must share a sense of its history. It should come as no surprise, then, that in addition to commentary on Portugal, Faria e Sousa also traces the etymological evolution of Lusitânia (2.30, 3.376). These descriptions situate

Portugal in a historical present that legitimizes its existence precisely when the same is in danger of absorption by the Spanish empire.

If Portugal is the greatest nation in the world, as Faria e Sousa so often affirms, it would follow that its capital, Lisbon, would also receive preferential treatment. Faria e Sousa comes through with such a description, basing his conclusion on none other than Camões (3.57.1-2):

[L]lama el Poeta a Lisboa Princesa de las Ciudades. Quieren algunos que Constantinopla, sea de las de Europa, la primera; Paris segunda; Lisboa tercera, en sitio, i numero de moradores. Si no se engañan (como yo creo arrimado a buenos testigos) quedará el Principado en Lisboa, que dize el Poeta, atendiendo, no a la grandeza por numero de gente, sino por la calidad della. (2.92)

This excerpt elevates Lisbon above all other cities by highlighting the quality/quantity dichotomy previously discussed. Elsewhere Faria e Sousa confirms the mythological origins of Lisbon, which include, among other fictionalized details, the founding of the city by Homer's Ulysses (3.379). In these descriptions of the Portuguese nation and its capital, Faria e Sousa's nationalist colors are on full display. It is not enough for Lisbon to be a great city; it has to be the greatest. Superlatives, in truth, find their way into almost every discussion of the Portuguese nation, with Faria e Sousa almost unfailingly crowning Portugal and her people the champions of all that is good. Building on the untouchable assertions of his national poet, Faria e Sousa reverts to the past in an effort to reconstruct a present imaginary through which the Portuguese nation can once again take shape and resume its longstanding autonomy.

The sixth paragraph of the "Advertencias" section at the beginning of Faria e Sousa's edition of *Os Lusíadas* presents one of the most significant aspects of

nationalism. Speaking of the difficulty most Spanish-speakers have with Portuguese, Faria e Sousa discusses “la poca razón, o causa con que se les hace difícil *nuestra lengua*” (my emphasis). The topic of language is a fundamental aspect of identity, which would explain why it comes up so frequently in Portuguese annexation literature. The Portuguese historian José Mattoso sees a critical link between language and national identity, at least as it applies to Portugal: “A maioria dos autores que têm tratado da identidade nacional atribui também uma grande importância ao fenómeno da língua” (7). Although writing in Spanish and living in Madrid, Faria e Sousa still considers himself part of a community of Portuguese speakers.¹⁹ “Nuestra lengua Portuguesa” (4.90) offers an important contrast to “their” language (the former Portuguese and the latter Spanish). Emphasizing this difference articulates an important opposition to the threats of linguistic assimilation. In a work of such magnitude, however, a few cursory comments about Portuguese does little to actually alleviate the linguistic threats bearing down on the language. As Ferreira argued the century previous, one honors his or her native tongue by choosing it as a means of expression. For some, the choice by Faria e Sousa and his contemporaries to write in Spanish, regardless of the motivation, overshadows all other attempts by the authors to honor the Portuguese language. I reiterate this fact not as a point of resolution, but in order to problematize, once again, the decision to write in Spanish and, by extension, the essentialism of Portuguese identity. The point is not that Faria e Sousa was or was not “truly” Portuguese, but that the author never relinquished

¹⁹ This may seem contradictory, as many critics argue—Maldonado (11), Asensio (631), and Núñez (268, 275-76)—but this concession was necessary in order to spread the glories of Portugal while living in Spain.

his native claim to Portugal. Emerging from his own blended background is a clear claim of Portuguese solidarity.

Faria e Sousa constructs his linguistic nationalism similar to some of the other nationalisms at work in his commentary. Early in the first Canto, Camões speaks of the similitude between Portuguese and Latin: “E na língua, na qual quando imagina, / Com pouca corrupção crê que é a Latina” (1.33.9-10). Commenting on these verses, Faria e Sousa, in the same way he claims the superiority of the Iberian Peninsula over the rest of Europe, elaborates on the finer points of his native tongue. He begins by explicating Camões’s position: “Dize el Poeta que entre las otras razones porque Venus favorecia a los Portugueses agora, era por la lengua dellos, la qual se le parecia a la Latina con poca diferencia” (1.263). The commentary then turns into a theoretical linguistic discussion not unlike the many taking place in Europe at the time. First, Faria e Sousa establishes the criteria: “las cinco partes (mejor la Portuguesa) que deve tener una lengua para ser perfecta, que son copia, pronunciacion facil, brevedad; escribir lo que habla, i al contrario; propiedad para todos estilos” (1.264). The parenthetical interjection in this excerpt is particularly revealing of the author’s superlative attitude towards the Portuguese language. It can almost be read as a dramatic aside through which the commentator reveals his own perspective in the context of a more technical discussion. Having established the five points of a perfect language, Faria e Sousa concludes with two final statements concerning Portuguese: “en lo que toca a la dulçura, i gravedad, no ay estraño que no confiesse ventaja a la Portuguesa . . . hablar como escribe, ello es cierto, que la [Portuguesa] se aventaja a todas las lenguas” (1.264).

Other references to a national language appear throughout Faria e Sousa's text. For instance, he often provides both Spanish and Portuguese definitions in order to render Camões's text more intelligible for non-native speakers. Such references often sound something like the following: "Alcione es el Ave, que en Portugues *llamamos Maçarico*" (3.157; my emphasis). His consistent use of the first person plural to refer to the Portuguese language aligns the author with his native tongue and establishes his linguistic community of choice. Unlike the previous example, in which Portuguese and Spanish use different words to say the same thing, there are a number of cases in which Faria e Sousa clarifies the divergent meaning of a word the two languages share: "Dizen algunos, que sobra aqui el amorosas, porque estando heridas de amor las Ninfas, luego estarian amorosas. Eso se llama no entender el Poeta. Amorosas estan aqui por blandas, suaves, dulces que el amoroso en *nuestra lengua Portuguesa*, se entiende a esto" (4.90; my emphasis). As in other passages, Faria e Sousa identifies himself with the Portuguese language, affirming, at the same time, the correctness of his reading of the poem.

Aware that his occasional movement between linguistic registers might be a cause for criticism, he explains: "se hallarán otros terminos que pueden parecer Lusitanismos: algunos serán por descuido, llamandome a ellos la naturaleza; i todavia otros son usados cuydadosamente, por parecerme bien el hazerlo assi" ("Advertencias" 4). The most important part of this description—at least for our present discussion—is his use of "naturaleza" to describe the accidental interference of Portuguese in his command of

Spanish. Portuguese is his nature, while Spanish is a learned language and culture.²⁰ One example of a word the commentator purposely leaves in Portuguese appears towards the end of the work. Faria e Sousa offers this in response to his choice to leave *mimoso* (9.83.2) in its original tongue: “Digolo con la palabra Portuguesa: porque pensar dezirlo con otra tan propia, es cosa vana; porque regalo, melindre, ternura, i todo lo semejante, no da por los pies a mismoso” (4.250). A polyglot like Faria e Sousa is certainly entitled to have his linguistic preferences, although he seems to take special pride in the inability of the Spanish language to produce a worthy translation of *mimoso*.

Similar to the religiosity inherent in the “David Principle,” a religious sense of nationhood also permeates Faria e Sousa’s text. At the foundation of this form of nationalism is the belief that the Portuguese are God’s elect, chosen and sent by Him to accomplish countless acts of greatness. In his preface to the commentary, Faria e Sousa establishes Christ as the true founder of Portugal and the Portuguese as his elect people:

Heroes escogidos fueronlo de Christo los Portugueses. (1.108)

[D]el cielo fue enviada la gente Portuguesa para este descubrimiento.
(1.113)

Progenie amada de Dios. El serlo la Portuguesa singularmente, consta no solo de ser el propio Christo fundador de su Reyno [. . .] sino de muchos otros favores continuados. (1.130-31)

Consistent with his use of superlatives to describe other forms of nationalism, Faria e Sousa frequently refers to the Portuguese as the most Catholic people in the world (3.217,

²⁰ While some of his detractors are quick to brand him “hispanizado or “estrangeirado” (Oliveira e Silva 62)—as if to fit him as a turncoat—Covarrubias provides, perhaps, the best term to describe his relationship to Spanish language and culture: “Españolado, el extranjero que ha deprendido la lengua y las costumbres y traje de España” (551).

228). This being the case, Lisbon might be considered, on account of its pure practice of Catholicism, a Latin Church or a New Rome (3.12).

Faria e Sousa unequivocally claims the Portuguese as the “mayor cultura de la ley Evangelica” (1.333), sustaining his position with what he describes as the evangelizing power of the Portuguese fleet: “empleado en redimir el mundo de vicios abominables, extinguiendolos; i de dar premio a las acciones heroycas, para con el despertar los animos postrados a que se empleen en ellas, con el exemplo de nuestros navegantes” (4.80).

Catholicism is such a part of the Portuguese, as the commentator goes on to say in another passage, that it seems to have originated with them (4.91). This echoes a previous comment made in the first volume of his work: “de ninguna cosa son los Portugueses tan propios como della [Religion], ni ella mas propia de otras naciones, que dellos. Creemos, que ninguna nos negara esta gloria, a lo menos con justicia” (1.455). This final passage offers two instances of simultaneity. His reference to “creemos” reflects a sense of Portuguese collectivity on the one hand, while on the other he interjects the indirect object pronoun “nos” with the same basic effect. The inherent “we” essential in these words evokes a national credo that defines the religiosity of Portugal and their elect place among God’s people.²¹ These references to faith not only speak of a present Portuguese identity, but likewise summon a historical legitimacy that reinforces the nation.

Lusíadas de Luis de Camoens, Principe de los Poetas de España is one of the supreme works of early modern Iberian literature. Unfortunately, however, it bears the

²¹ In contrast to Spain’s more than seven-hundred year struggle with the Arabs, Portugal established religious autonomy by the late twelfth century through the papal Manifestis Probatum of 1179 which officially recognized Afonso I as King of Portugal. While conflicts certainly continued thereafter, Portugal was a named kingdom comprising, from the late thirteenth century onward, nearly the exact same geographic area it maintains today.

distinction of a work frequently mentioned but seldom consulted (Pierce 99; Hart 31).

With the bending of national and linguistic borders that occurs therein, the commentary is truly a work of its day and a text with much to say about our time. In my analysis I have tried to establish a clear nationalist posture on the part of Faria e Sousa that will force scholars to rethink their approach to the Portuguese patriot and annexation literature in general. As a result, I hope to bring the critical spotlight to a place in-between the Spanish and Portuguese literary canons that deserves our attention. Rather than ignore the fact that Faria e Sousa and many of his contemporaries exude a mix of Spanish and Portuguese in virtually all that they do—upholding an existence layered with identities—I have embraced these details as further evidence of their commitment to Portugal. By leaving his beloved Portugal and writing in the language of the empire, Faria e Sousa put himself in a position to promote Portuguese identity in a way that many of his compatriots could not accomplish by remaining at home and limiting their publications in Spanish. Faria e Sousa offers the twenty-first-century reader a sense of what it means to claim an identity within a complex national imaginary. What emerges from his critical edition of Camões's national epic—to a degree that few other early modern texts achieve—is the weaving together of linguistic, national, and literary identities.

While his critical work on Camões was the crowning achievement of his literary life and one of the clearest expressions of nationhood at the time, Faria e Sousa was also an active historiographer. The balance of his literary corpus, in actuality, tilts in favor of history. His knowledge of and interest in Portugal's past are made evident in his annotations on *Os Lusíadas*. What is more, both of his autobiographies—one in prose, the

other in verse—capture the author’s fascination with personal history. One could say that the author’s historiography drifts between two primary subjects: (1) the past, present, and future of the Portuguese nation, and (2) his own personal legacy. History, as a genre, was particularly suited for projecting the names, places, and events associated with Portugal’s glorious past onto the European landscape. John Stevens, the late seventeenth-century English translator of Faria e Sousa’s historiography, does not consider the historian’s Lusocentrism a problem: “Being a Portuguese, I cannot affirm him to be altogether impartial, for there is no Man whom the love of his Native Country does not a little sway, yet his can be no exception against him, because, if such, all History would be lyable to the same censure” (Preface). Vázquez Cuesta takes things one step further, identifying history not merely as a place where nationalist sentiment inevitably appears, but as a preferred locus of patriotic expression: “El género preferido para servir de cauce al sentir patriótico que subterráneamente informaba buena parte de la literatura portuguesa de la época filipina es la Historia” (646). What was it about history that made it such an effective vehicle of nationalist expression? For one, the cloak of authenticity that often accompanies the genre motivated many writers to aim high in their “official” rendering of the nation.

Overall, nation-minded historians cultivate a unique sense of the past. Their concept of history typically leads to the promotion of certain aspects of their national heritage and the silencing of others (both of which contribute to the creation of a foundational narrative). This ebb and flow of historical identity changes and develops according to the perspective of those in power. In the hands of nationalists, then,

historical texts not only multiply but change. While the subjectivity of such efforts may be more readily apparent than other “pure” or “objective” histories, as Hayden White brilliantly outlines in his essay “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” from *Tropics of Discourse* (1978), historiography cannot escape its literariness. The proximity of literature and history as systems of discourse was particularly close during the early modern period, when a single author tended to practice a variety of genres. In a point not too different from White’s, Benedict Anderson describes the imaginative writings of historico-national movements as a magic-act in which the historian turns chance into destiny (12). This occurs, as he later explains, because “nationalism thinks in terms of historical destinies” (149). Few, if any, words have enveloped the Portuguese imaginary over the centuries more than destiny in its various forms (*fado, destino, fortuna, sorte, providência*). That Portuguese authors would continue to invoke the language of destiny during the annexation speaks to the longing they felt for an independent Portugal. Rather than change the historical frame to include the entire Peninsula as one might expect, Portuguese historians of the annexation maintained a Lusocentric reading of the past.

To whatever degree we can speak of the collective inventiveness of history in general, we can certainly identify the specific creativity of nationalist historians to a much larger measure. The first author to look closely at Portuguese history from the perspective of a post-1580 Portugal was Fernão de Oliveira (1507-82). Previously, the author had published *Grammatica da linguagem portugueza* (1536), widely recognized as the first study to deal with Portuguese grammar. Many of the nationalist ideas about language that circulate among Portuguese authors during the early modern period

hearken back to this text. With this early work, Oliveira established himself as a prominent figure of sixteenth-century Portuguese literature. While *Grammatica* remains the work most commonly associated with Oliveira, *História de Portugal* (1580) may very well be just as significant as his earlier study on language. Both works are foundational within their respective genres. Francisco Contente Domingues explains why Oliveira's historiographical work stands out: "é a primeira História de Portugal escrita depois de 1580, justificativa do direito do país a permanecer livre e independente – acusando portanto um discurso marcadamente anti-castelhano" (10). According to Domingues, Oliveira was not only the first Portuguese historian to consider Portuguese history in light of the Spanish annexation of Portugal, but also to oppose it.²²

Oliveira's conception of the past is directly informed by the political events surrounding the Iberian Unification. Hence, the author insists on Portugal's antiquity, its primacy and superiority above all other Peninsular kingdoms, and its right to autonomy (Franco 17). José Eduardo Franco describes *História* as a work whose fiery commitment to the reconstruction of Portugal's remote past is made possible by the political climate in which the aged author was writing (17). Unlike his younger compatriots or those later born into the occupation, Oliveira had nothing to lose by coming forward with critical views of the annexation. The mythification of Portugal at the hands of the historian ennobles his homeland with a sacred past and a promising future. He creates a nation providentially destined to fulfill a divine mission (Franco 17-18). According to the author's characterization of Lusitânia, the annexation of Portugal places Spain in direct

²² Oliveira's antagonistic feelings towards Castile are also manifest in his historiographical work *Viagem de Fernão de Magalhães*, wherein he emphasizes Magalhães's Portuguese roots in an apparent effort to distance the famed navigator from his ties to Spain.

opposition to God's plan for Portugal. Oliveira exemplifies, therefore, the potential of historiography to operate as a vehicle for nationalist sentiment, "ao serviço de uma ideia, de uma posição e de um fim que é, em última análise, político-ideológico" (Franco 18). The nationalization of history in Oliveira's work anticipated Portuguese annexation authors who would similarly make use of historiography to imagine an exalted past for their homeland and an autonomous future.

While Benedict Anderson's theories concentrate on the modern era, the association of history with nationalism extends at least as far back as the early modern period. The nationalizing of history, in fact, is one of the most frequent brands of nationalism practiced by early modern Portuguese historiographers in the decades leading up to and following the annexation. As we will see, Faria e Sousa transgresses the myth/history dichotomy Mattoso traces in the following passage:

Até a um passado mais ou menos recente, conforme o grau de instrução dos sujeitos em causa, a memória colectiva apoiava-se frequentemente em mitos, alguns deles criados justamente para servirem de suporte da crença na perpetuidade, ou mesmo na sacralidade da Pátria. Tal foi a crença no milagre de Ourique, surgida no fim do século XIV ou princípio do seguinte e cuidadosamente cultivado pelas elites nacionalistas até meados do século XIX. (103)

Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcelos, Teófilo Braga, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, and others accuse Faria e Sousa, for example, of authoring inaccurate history, not realizing that his aim is not historical accuracy per se, but rather the glorification of Portugal, the nationalizing of history. This necessitates omissions on the one hand, and embellishments on the other. Cidade explains it in this way: "o sentimento da autonomia, com verdades apoiadas de mentiras, ia preparando a atmosfera, que o levaria a dinamizar-se no

movimento revolucionário que no restituiu a independência” (105). In Cidade’s eyes, both truth and lies—history and fiction—contributed to the dynamic atmosphere that would once again render Portugal a sovereign nation. That is not to say that all criticism related to Faria e Sousa’s historiography is unsubstantiated, nor that his work lacks historical merit. It would likewise be false to claim absolute self-awareness on the part of the author. Faria e Sousa’s approach to historiography reflects both his background in literature and an unyielding commitment to his native Portugal. Hernani Cidade explains it this way: “Assim a historiografia era género literário que confinava com a agiografia e com a epopeia. Não excluía a intervenção do sobrenatural—premissa que se esableceria como probabilíssima hipótese para toda a acção de certa transcendência política, social ou religiosa” (82). In the able hands of Faria e Sousa, Portuguese history becomes a story of providentialism, collective action and being, and hyperbolic accomplishment. Using his comprehensive knowledge of the Bible, the author portrays Portugal as an early modern equivalent of ancient Israel. While the author is certainly not a prophet by biblical standards, Faria e Sousa’s storytelling and mythmaking certainly qualify him as a preacher of Portuguese nationalism.

Faria e Sousa’s historical output takes on the history of Portugal to an unprecedented degree.²³ This includes, among other works, *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (1628), *Imperio de la China* (1642), and the posthumously-published series *Asia Portuguesa* (1666), *Europa Portuguesa* (1678), and *Africa Portuguesa* (1681), edited by his son Pedro de Faria e Sousa. It is difficult to surmise to what extent, if at all,

²³ The clearest and most admired (by the author) predecessor of Faria e Sousa’s work was João de Barros. Diogo do Couto, Fernão Lopes de Castanheda, Gaspar Correia, and Damião de Goes deserve mention.

perceptions of Faria e Sousa might differ had he lived long enough to see his final historiographical work through to its completion. Had he realized the fourth volume—*América portuguesa*—the author would have, at the very least, written himself into the colonial Brazilian canon, providing thereby a valuable antecedent to Sebastião Rocha Pita's *Historia da America Portuguesa* (1730).²⁴ A general consideration of Faria e Sousa's historiography reveals a body of works unlike his other writings. For one, most of these texts were written in Portuguese. While the only extant copies of *Epítome* are in Spanish, the widely-read work was originally composed by the author in Portuguese octaves and titled *Vida dos Reis Portugueses*. What is more, his three-volume tribute to the worldwide expansion and dominance of Portugal was also written in Portuguese. It is not clear whether the author eventually intended to translate these works into Spanish—as he had done with almost all of his previous writings—or if they were written to be published in Portuguese. Faria e Sousa's son Pedro published the series in the years leading up to and following Spain's official acknowledgment of Portuguese sovereignty (1668), at which time the factors motivating the Portuguese to write in Spanish had changed significantly.

Epítome de las historias portuguesas is Faria e Sousa's most recognized historical contribution. This work reveals the author's nationalized view of history and served as the source for at least two—Tirso de Molina's *Las Quinas de Portugal* and Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *El príncipe constante*—of the many Portuguese-themed Spanish

²⁴ Unfortunately, Manuel de Faria e Sousa died before he could complete *América portuguesa*, which would have covered the years between Portugal's discovery of Brazil and the Restoration of 1640. Rocha Pita's widely published and celebrated work could be considered the completion of the four-part series. As a peninsular living much of his life in Brazil, Rocha Pita's work maintains a more informed view of what would eventually become Brazil than Faria e Sousa could have ever hoped to achieve having never visited the country.

comedias published during the seventeenth century. There is evidence to suggest that Tirso and Calderón not only reproduced the historical facts laid out in *Epítome*, but also captured the nationalist fictions (spirit) of the work. While scholars have made a case for the former, they have not yet identified the ways in which the two *comedias* reflect the national consciousness abounding in Faria e Sousa's work. His influence on Calderón and Tirso only hints at the potential effect he had as a writer in his day. In *Corre manuscrito*, Fernando Bouza creates a picture of early modern Iberian texts that expands previously limited views of the written word. In the tireless writer Faria e Sousa (27), who would often spend his days and nights writing, Bouza finds an individual whose reach, although great in its own right, extended far beyond his known published works: "En suma su amplia trayectoria como autor descansaba tanto sobre impresos como sobre manuscritos" (29). Overall, it is impossible to calculate the reach of *Epítome* or any other published work, to say nothing of his equally, if not more abundant production of manuscripts.

Epítome de las historias portuguesas is exactly what it claims to be in its title: the embodiment of Portuguese history. This work comprises Faria e Sousa's attempt at a representative approach to Portugal's glorious past. Thus, *Epítome* is in part what his four-corner's work was to be in whole.²⁵ That his abstract is still hundreds of pages long is telling of the author's high regard for his homeland and its indispensable past. What would seem to be a fairly straightforward, albeit patriotic, work, however, was examined with caution by the inquisition, appearing on the *Index of Prohibited Books* by 1632 as a

²⁵ It is fitting that the author never completed the larger historiographical project. According to Faria e Sousa, a comprehensive look at Portuguese history is impossible; the project will always outlive the author, the former being too great for the latter to capture in any number of lifetimes.

work requiring expurgation (Asensio, “La autobiografía” 631). What was it about the text that alarmed the inquisitors? Whereas Faria e Sousa’s Portuguese rivals tried to get his commentary on *Os Lusíadas* banned for what they deemed heretical content, that was not the case with *Epítome*, at least not in the religious sense.²⁶ While a definitive answer may not be possible given our limited knowledge of the situation, I would like to suggest that the work may have been targeted for its nationalist zeal, particularly the way in which it portrays past conflicts between Portugal and Castile. After all, any writing that destabilized the Empire, questioned the legitimacy of Spanish rule, or usurped the king’s power also fell under the inquisition’s responsibility and could be dealt with accordingly. The anti-imperial nationalism evident in *Epítome* may have triggered the process that would eventually lead to the book’s inclusion on the *Index*.

Two ideas seem to inform Faria e Sousa’s approach to *Epítome*. On the one hand, he believes that no amount of paper is sufficient to capture Portuguese greatness in its entirety, and yet on the other, even a succinct consideration of the topic must be thorough enough so as to not diminish his homeland.²⁷ That is not to say that the author measured success solely by pages written—although there is some indication that he derived much self-worth from this very thing (see *Fortuna*). While the amount of Portuguese deeds was innumerable in the author’s eyes, it was the quality of their heroics that exalted Portugal above all other nations. In other words, the point of *Epítome* is not to say everything, but to say enough so as to convince the reader of his implicit thesis: that no history can

²⁶ Faria e Sousa’s response to the allegation appears in Información en favor de Manoel de Faria, y Sousa Cavallero de la Orden de Christo e de la Casa Real. The Portuguese author was exonerated of all charges.

²⁷ A similar conception defines his approach to his commentary on *Os Lusíadas*. That he dedicated twenty-five years of his life to the composition of this work served as a fitting tribute, at least in the author’s mind, to the unmatched worth of Camões’s national epic.

compare with that of Portugal. The challenge of his task, then, was to maintain a certain degree of brevity without diminishing Portuguese accomplishments.²⁸ In a number of instances the author reflects on the incomprehensibility of Portuguese history, a perception that does not make his task any easier. As he states, “Si se detiene un rato el pensamiento a ponderarlo, antes parece sueño que discurso” (115). While difficult to capture dreams in writing, Faria e Sousa does not offer this comparison as an apology, but rather to provide an explanation as to why Portuguese history seems imaginary. He cloaks Portuguese history with an air of mystery and intrigue as if it were heavenly or beyond this world.

While his fairy-tale approach to Portugal’s past may seem to distance Faria e Sousa from the “unadulterated” practice of historiography, the author insists that, despite its fantastic nature, the Portuguese history that he writes is not fictional. He contends that no individual can imagine anything greater than that which the Portuguese actually accomplished: “Menos hay que creer en las fábulas de los libros vanos que en las verdades de los hechos y de los sujetos portugueses” (113). In the specific case of Manuel I (1469-1521), he emphasizes the limitlessness of the deeds accomplished during his reign: “Alcanzó triunfos gloriosos. [. . .] El grande Imperio del Abexin, en la Etiopía. El reino de Ormuz y Malaca, el más celebre emporio de todo el Oriente. Otros reinos, otros señoríos, otras y otras naciones, tierras y climas, *para cuya historia todo el papel es poco*” (100-01; my emphasis). This passage captures the baroque spirit of Faria e Sousa’s *Epítome* specifically, and his entire historical corpus in general. Overall, *Epítome* stands

²⁸ One example of Faria e Sousa’s concern with the extent of his work occurs in his analysis of Alonso’s reign: “En seis horas que duró el conflicto hizo Alonso tales suerte que el abreviarlas fuera osadía y el escribirlas salir de nuestra brevedad” (27).

as a testament of the author's nationalist tendency to hyperbolize the past, divinize all things Portuguese, and create a collective sense of national identity.

In an attempt to validate his position regarding Portugal's past while maintaining some semblance of brevity, Faria e Sousa often uses overstatement, superlative, and exaggeration. A clear example of this appears in the first line of his section on John II: "En el *más* ilustre lugar de Europa (Lisboa), en el *más* hermoso mes del año (4 de mayo), nació uno de los *más* excelentes príncipes que se vio la gente y el tiempo, Don Juan, hijo tercero y último de sus reyes Don Alonso y Doña Isabel" (85; my emphasis). The scope of this specific passage transcends the life of John II, providing the author with an occasion to exalt Lisbon and extend the importance of this event both temporally and geographically. While he structures his work according to the various Portuguese monarchs, Faria e Sousa's aim is not regal history per se, but Portugal altogether. During the course of the work, he actually uses royal lines to characterize the nation, always moving from the individual to the collective. Speaking of John I's conquest of Ceuta, the author weaves Afonso I and his son Sancho I into the history, ultimately extending the success and providentialism of this single victory to all Portuguese endeavors: "Que por divina dispensación él [Afonso] y su hijo Don Sancho habían socorrido a sus [John I] vasallos en aquel conflicto. No lo dude nadie, que las victorias de los portugueses *todas* son estupendas, *todas* imagen del poder de Dios" (36; my emphasis). As he often does throughout *Epítome*, Faria e Sousa synecdochically moves from part to whole in this passage in order to expand his praise to the Portuguese nation and not merely its royal power. What is more, he equates Portuguese history with divine will, thereby making his

assertions irrefutable. In the following passage Faria e Sousa echoes the spirit of the previous citation, however in this case he uses an augmentative to accentuate the disparity in number between Castile and Portugal:

Ibanse llegando los dos campos, desigualísimos en número; salió del de Castilla un hermano de Nunálvarez a tentarle que se pasase de su parte; mas viendo su constancia, Diego Fernández Mariscal, castellano dijo: Al fin sois los más honrados del mundo, o seais vencedores o seais vencidos, porque si vencéis siendo tan pocos y si os vencemos siendo tantos, toda la gloria y toda la fama es vuestra. (47)

Several details stand out in this reference. While there is room to speak of Portuguese essentialism and the strategic placing of praise in the mouth of a Castilian, I would instead draw the reader's attention to Faria e Sousa's measured view of the Portuguese. The primary focus of this excerpt is quantity, which he introduces with the augmentative "desigualísimos en número." Numbers are an essential aspect of the Portuguese self-concept, with Portugal always making up for their quantitative deficit with their qualitative surplus. Faria e Sousa's historiographical works key in on this fundamental aspect of Portuguese identity.

As in other works written by Faria e Sousa, the triumph of the Portuguese despite their "underdog" status is a constant theme within *Epítome*. From Afonso I to Manuel I, Portugal always seems to defy the odds. Early on in the work, for example, he cites a speech given by Afonso before one of Portugal's many battles with the Arabs, wherein the prince calls attention to their sparse numbers and abundant value:

¿Teméis por veros pocos? Pues yo os aseguro que de lo propio tiembla toda esa morisma; porque de la pequeñez del ejército infiere la grandeza de la gente. La diferencia no penséis que es poca: yo traigo compañeros, no vasallos. A vosotros os mueve el amor; la fuerza, a ellos. Ellos, más numerosos que justificados; nosotros, más justicia que multitud, y es

invencible tormenta la justicia. Si son las armas vuestras, de Cristo es la causa. (24)

Faria e Sousa skillfully uses the figure of antithesis to structure this passage. In effect, a series of binary pairs characterizes the entire speech: us/them, few/many, love/obligation, right/wrong. At the root of each contrasting set is the basic division of quality and quantity. According to Faria e Sousa, the outstanding worth of the Portuguese comes from their Christian faith. Accordingly, the heavens open and Christ appears to the Portuguese soldiers right before the battle begins (26). Casting the Portuguese in this way allows the author to spin a potential negative (size) into a definite positive (value).

Another example of this occurs under the leadership of Duarte Pacheco Pereira (c. 1445-1533), one of the great heroes of Portuguese history. In the following excerpt, Faria e Sousa recalls, in both certain and ambiguous terms, the improbability of Portugal's five-month defense of Kochi (India) in particular, not to mention Pacheco's other successes:

Duarte Pacheco, que, sin pérdida de un *solo* portugués, desbarató *muchas* veces *muchas* gentes, y con *ochenta* embistió todo el poder del zamorí, que conduciendo un campo de *sesenta mil* combatientes escandalizaba al reino de Cochín, y les hizo que con pérdida de *muchos* se retirasen vencidos en diferentes batallas navales y terrestres, con admiración de *todo* el Asia. (110; my emphasis)

Whether it is the lack of fatality on the Portuguese side, or the abundance of decadence on the other, Faria e Sousa emphasizes, and perhaps exaggerates, the quantitative details of Pacheco's military campaigns. In the specific case of Kochi, the author contrasts the relatively few Portuguese who miraculously prevailed against their numerous foes. Not only were many of their enemies defeated in this legendary encounter, but the Portuguese won the admiration of all of Asia in the meantime.

In an effort to explain Portuguese successes in spite of their relatively small population, Faria e Sousa often evokes—sometimes implicitly, other times explicitly—passages from the Bible. One obvious example from the Old Testament often used in conjunction with Portugal in Faria e Sousa’s works is the story of David and Goliath (1 Sam. 16-17). The “David Principle,” as discussed earlier, is most relevant here. The biblical story illustrates, among other things, how David’s intrinsic qualities—faith, courage, trust—allow him to overcome seemingly impossible odds—differences in age, size, weaponry, armor, and experience. This is precisely the type of parallel Faria e Sousa draws between David and Portugal: always outnumbered but never overpowered. According to the author, then, the Portuguese are God’s chosen people, and, consequently, the odds are always in their favor (the very lesson illustrated in Judges 6-7). Overall, the biblical intertext that perhaps best reflects the author’s view of the Portuguese nation appears in 2 Kings when the prophet Elisha offers direction to the king of Israel concerning the impending threats posed by Syria. His reassuring words to the king seem to inform Faria e Sousa’s concept of Portuguese history: “Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them” (6.16). Not only does this verse reverse the disproportionateness of the situation, but also reinforces the distinction between *us* and *them*, one nation and another. Faria e Sousa borrows from this perspective in his *a posteriori* explanation of Portuguese success.

In a very revealing passage found in his discussion of Manuel’s reign (1469-1521), Faria e Sousa situates Portugal’s achievements within the broader context of the global landscape. Within his scope, however, he includes historical and fictitious

figures, thereby demonstrating the supremacy of Portuguese among people both real and imagined:

Todos con poca gente desbaratando infinita, feroz, armada y belicosa, haciendo estipendiarios a sus reyes, muchos reinos, muchas provincias y aun la misma fortuna. Vana memoria es la que hacemos de los argonautas y de todas las osadías de los antiguos, más dichosos que grandes, para encarecer las presentes. Vana la de Hércules, la de Alcides, la de Teseo en las hazañas de la guerra; vanas las de Numa y de todas las togas en la paz. (113)

Here Faria e Sousa blurs the difference between the fictional and the historical so as to support his assertion that Portugal even surpasses the stuff of legends. The consistent use of *todos(as)* maintains the author's hyperbolic style, as does the contrastive use of *poca* and *infinita*. Another aspect of this passage that merits attention is the repetition of *vana*. The author would have the reader believe that any attempt to match Portuguese greatness is futile. He then upstages the three groups mentioned above—(1) Argonauts (mariners), (2) Hercules, Alcides, and Teseo (warriors), and (3) Numa (kings)—by placing the Portuguese at the head of each category:

Para los *primeros* son mayores los portugueses; que en las aguas antes que hombres, fueron peces. Para los *segundos*, un Viriato, un D. Alonso Enríquez, un Don Juan I y un Alonso V, un D. Nunálvarez, un Alonso de Albuquerque, un Duarte Pacheco, un D. Francisco y un D. Lorenzo de Almeida, un D. Juan de Castro, un Nuño de Acuña, un D. Pedro y un D. Duarte y un D. Juan de Meneses, un Lope Vaz de Sampayo, un Nuño Fernández, un Lope Barriga y unos infinitos son los verdaderos Hércules, Theseos y Anteos en uno y otro hemisferio, en uno y en otro elemento. Para los *terceros*, un Don Sancho I, un D. Dionis, un D. Pedro, un D. Cristóbal de Moura, un Lorenzo Pirez de Tavora, la multitud me los confunde y me empobrece. (113-14; my emphasis)

Again, Faria e Sousa not only makes his point, but takes his argument to the extreme. It is not enough, for example, for the Portuguese to be superior at sea. Instead the author calls

them fish, as if the ocean were their natural habitat. Upon completing an excessive list of seventeen Portuguese war heroes, Faria e Sousa boldly asserts that such figures continue *ad infinitum*, and that, unlike Hercules, Theseos, and Anteos, they are real and not imagined. Finally, he trumps the noble résumé of one Numa by presenting a number of Portuguese sovereigns, the multitude of which confounds his apt mind and capable hand.

While certainly a general digression from the topic at hand, the above citations echo the tone of Faria e Sousa's section on Manuel I. The author deifies the king to such a degree that his words become incapable of expressing Manuel's grandeur. To emphasize the king's godliness, Faria e Sousa mythologizes him as if he were actually Zeus, ruling over all other gods:

Pronosticóle también la propiedad, y con tanta entró reinando, que parecía haber arrebatado de las manos de los dioses todos (permítase que lo digamos ahora así) el cetro de su gobierno: al de las aguas, al de los vientos, al de la guerra. Antes pareció que entraba a reinar sobre los elementos que sobre la gente, y antes que sobre la suya, sobre todas las extrañas. (100)

As his brief interjection suggests, Faria e Sousa's intent in this selection is not to promote pagan gods. It could be argued, rather, that the author sets up his argument in this way so as to emphasize the incomparable reach of Manuel's reign. It is the symbolic value of this paganism, therefore, that the author draws from as a means to an end. In other words, it is alright to make heretical references if it serves a Christian purpose. Manuel, God's chosen king, not only ruled over people but also controlled the elements (his kingdom comprised both land and sea, things at home and things abroad):

Príncipe fue de toda España, jurado en Toledo; emperador de todo el Oriente y de todos los mares, y, al fin, después de haber sucedido sólo a todas las venturosas de los más venturosos monarcas, sucedió al Apóstol

Santo Tomé, porque, haciendo volar las banderas cruzadas por todo el Asia, enseñó la ley evangélica y plantó la firme en los corazones de las gentes y en los confines de la tierra. Alcanzó triunfos gloriosos. [. . .] El grande Imperio del Abexin, en la Etiopía. El reino de Ormuz y Malaca, el más celebre emporio de todo el Oriente. Otros reinos, otros señoríos, otras y otras naciones, tierras y climas, para cuya historia todo el papel es poco. (100-01)

Here Faria e Sousa gradually intensifies his praise of Manuel. The extent of his rule moves progressively from the Iberian Peninsula to the Orient to all of the oceans. He succeeds the rest of the Portuguese monarchs and, at the same time, picks up where St. Thomas left off in the holy apostleship, carrying the gospel across the globe, as Jesus had asked of his chosen servants (Matt. 28.19-20; Mark 16.15). Essentially, all the paper in the world is not sufficient to contain Manuel's accomplishments, another idea with a biblical counterpart: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written" (John 21.25).

The divinization of Portuguese history is one of the foundational aspects of Faria e Sousa's *Epítome* and a central feature of his literary corpus. As Javier Núñez explains, "el nacionalismo de su obra [. . .] revela su convicción en el destino mesiánico de Portugal" (261-62). In order to lift his nation to a more heavenly sphere and solidify its place in world history, the author aligns the main figures and events of Portugal's past with God's will. As a point of reference we might mention Faria e Sousa's contention that Christ himself founded the kingdom of Portugal (132). With this in place it is easy to situate every other Portuguese accomplishment within the frame of providentialism. What results is the history of God's chosen people authored by God himself. As much as the

author wanted recognition for his writings, Faria e Sousa's real purpose was to write in such a way so as to saturate the text with the presence of heaven.

Faria e Sousa's vision of the Portuguese nation, therefore, must include a people worthy of the divine favoritism he describes. This is evident in his depiction of the Egas Muniz (1080-1146). Faria e Sousa portrays this legendary figure as representative of all his fellow Portuguese: loyal, devout, obedient, self-sacrificing. The author showcases his ability to move from the micro (Egas) to the macro (Portugal) in the following selection:

Era su ayo Egas Muniz, excelente portugués que, afligido con tal defecto en una criatura que en o restante de su proporción y forma era bellísima, solicitó devoto con Dios el ejercicio de los pies que la Naturaleza le negaba. Aparecióle la Virgen María, Señora nuestra [. . .]. De esta manera, pues, va dando ya nuestro reino sus primeros pasos con pies de dios. (22)

The full version of the passage includes the 'actual' words the Virgin spoke to Egas, including the instructions he would have to follow to bring healing to the handicapped feet of the infant Afonso. Thereafter Faria e Sousa moves metonymically from the feet of the prince to the divine inception of Portugal. The faith of Egas Muniz made the miracle possible not only because he loyally carried out the directions given by the Virgin, but because he was righteous enough to receive such a visitation in the first place. This mythical example lays bare the nationalized consciousness of Faria e Sousa's historiographical work.

The theme of Portuguese electness appears frequently throughout *Epítome*, often serving as the author's rationale for his nation's success. A certain confidence underlines all Portuguese endeavors because, in Faria e Sousa's view, they had heavenly assistance. It is not uncommon, for example, to find passages like the following: ¿Quién duda en la

victoria que busca nuestra gente, si la hace el Cielo electora de un rey y pelean con él ante sus ojos? (26). Clearly Faria e Sousa is not fishing for an answer to this question. Of all instances worthy of mention for their divinizing character, however, the most significant has to be the author's account of Aljubarrota. This was the site of the well-known conflict between Portugal and Castile in 1385, which assured Portuguese independence and survived as a symbol of national pride. Among the Castilians, however, the memory was not so endearing.

This legendary clash did not intimidate Faria e Sousa as it had many of his contemporaries, who often skipped over this episode in their histories. While a seemingly sensitive matter requiring careful treatment, Faria e Sousa was not shy about expressing what 'really' happened. Portugal's victory, he argues, cannot be attributed to the sun getting in the eyes of the Castilians or some other poor excuse, as some historians have suggested (48-49). The part of Faria e Sousa's account that I would like to emphasize is the aftermath:

Admirando el rey de Castilla la ruina prodigiosa de sus confianzas, en tanta multitud con razón fundadas, si el cielo con David desnudo tantos años antes no hubiera asegurado que es suyo el vencer, puesto en huída presurosa no paró hasta la villa de Santarem, de donde entrado en un navío, diligente se puso en Sevilla, bien como otro Pompeyo llegado roto a Larisa, y desde allí por mar a Lesbos, huyendo las armas vencedoras de César en los campos de Farsalia. No halló el rey en muchos tiempos consuelo equivalente a su tristeza, descubriendo su corazón en lo exterior de un luto que trajo siete años: *No por ser vencido* (decía él), *antes por serlo de quien no lo esperaba.* (49)

Of all possible vantage points, Faria e Sousa's chooses to discuss Portugal's miraculous victory from the perspective of the Castilian king. One would expect the above report from the Portuguese side, so the fact that it not only comes from a Castilian, but the most

powerful of all Castilians, demonstrates Faria e Sousa's ability to depict Portuguese history in the most favorable way possible. The king is awe-struck at the ruination of his armies given the circumstances that weighted so heavily in his favor. He marvels even more at what this loss could mean: that God favors Portugal, not Castile. As the significance of these realities sinks in, the king and what is left of his army run off with their tails between their legs. While the defeat was tremendous by any standards, it was the way that Castile fell that prompted the king's seven years of mourning. He was not prepared to cope with a defeat that rendered him and his kingdom a fallen Goliath.

In the same way that he weaves Portuguese electness and the "David Principle" into his historical writings, Faria e Sousa also reinforces the national collectivity by speaking on behalf of the nation. In the selection that follows, he frames everything within a collective *nuestro* that not only elevates the Portuguese nation as a whole, but also celebrates the specific region of Portugal where he was born and raised:

Llórese la falta de la memoria de cuántas hazañas serían obradas por los *nuestros* en el asedio y escala del más ilustre propugnáculo de España. Pues si Enrique la ganó con el rey, su suegro, con sus vasallos solos dio muchas batallas grandes, con que adquirió varios lugares de entre Duero y Miño, provincia a quien *nuestro* reino debe sus glorias, porque en ella está la ciudad de Oporto, que le dio nombre; en ella, la villa de Guimaraens, que le dio rey; en ella, la gente que le dio coronas; en ella, edificios nobles de *nuestros* primeros príncipes. (17-18)

If the communal voice marks the boundaries of the frame, the repeated use of "en ella" certainly situates Douro e Minho at the center of the picture. While Faria e Sousa's primary objective is the glorification of Portuguese history, he still takes advantage of the opportunity to emphasize the contributions of his native region to the greater identity of the nation. Considered in its entirety, it is clear from reading *Epítome* that that the author

identifies himself with Portugal. There is no attempt at an objectivity that would leave the author absent from the text. He is proudly there with the rest of his compatriots, even if their collective presence is only imagined within the text. Of course, no matter how much the author has to say in favor of Portuguese history, the reader is acutely aware that Faria e Sousa remains divided between an impossible, autonomous Portuguese identity, and the blended Iberian existence underlying early modernity.

One curious feature of the national imaginary that Faria e Sousa develops throughout the course of his work is that it is not merely a place of privilege for the rich, noble, and/or learned. In the Portugal that he imagines, everyone has a voice (provided that they are Christian):

Mas reconociéndolo todo, el ánimo lusitano estuvo un poco dudoso; pero deshecha la suspensión con la señal de acometer, dijo un sacerdote al mismo punto: *Verbum caro*. Preguntaron unos rústicos qué era lo que había dicho, y respondióles otro: *Que les había de costar caro*. *Sea* (replicaron) *enhorabuena*. y arrojándose al peligro, hallando valerosa resistencia en los contrarios, casi suspendieron la corriente de la victoria. (48)

This citation is crucial, in that it highlights the courage of the commoner and gives him a voice in the discourse of the nation. These rural soldiers do not live outside of the national imaginary, but are active participants in its construction. Portuguese valor emerges from this passage as it does in many others from *Epítome* (e.g., 61 and 117), with the important difference that the commoners provide the case study. My emphasis on Faria e Sousa's socio-economic openness to the nation should not be confused with a general open-door policy to the Portuguese. In his picture of what it means to be Portuguese, the author focuses more on affirming Portuguese essentialism than

attempting to specify those who do not fit the profile. Hence, instead of directly telling Protestants or Muslims that they do not belong in Portugal—a view the author may or may not have espoused—he makes Catholicism a central feature of Portuguese nationness.

Faria e Sousa's nationalist vision of Portuguese history is consistent up to the death of King Sebastian. The king's tragic disappearance on the field of battle in Africa was followed by a crisis of succession that led to the annexation of Portugal by Philip II in 1580. Faria e Sousa's treatment of these two royal lines is markedly different from his otherwise cohesive view of Portugal's glorious past. These two figures were very much a part of his present life, thus he could not speak about them with the same openness and confidence that he might have displayed with more temporally distant characters of Portuguese history (a technique often employed by early modern dramatists). Faria e Sousa appears trapped between two conflicting conceptions of the nation. His nationalism keeps him from abandoning his exalted view of Portuguese destiny altogether, while his realism fuels a present sadness that cannot help but see a nation in irreversible decline. While the former feeling prevails for most of the text, the latter imposes its will on Faria e Sousa's vision of Sebastian's death and Philip's claim to the throne.

In speaking of the young king's passing he states the following: "podremos decir, no sin dolor, que con la vida del rey más dichoso se acabaron todas las verdaderas dichas y glorias lusitanas" (102). In this passage, Faria e Sousa figuratively speaks on behalf of the entire nation, which not only mourns the death of the king, but also the end of an era. The author is committed to the idea that something was lost with the king that will never

be recovered. That does not mean that Faria e Sousa was ready to accept a provincial place on the Peninsula forevermore, only that as a historian and a native of Portugal he acknowledges the significance of this moment in Portuguese history. Even more revealing of his perspective of Sebastian's death is a passage towards the end of the book:

[F]uimos *vencidos* en 4 de agosto, *infausto* día a Portugal, que en él dejó teñida la arena africana en *sangre* de tantas vidas y la patria anegada en *llanto* de tantas *muertes*, lastimosas *exequias* del reino *muerto* en tierra ajena. Allí *acabaron* los triunfos lusitanos. *Murió* el orgullo y el brío, la pompa y la fuerza, la riqueza y esperanza, sirviéndoles *fatalmente* de *sepulcro* la vida y honra ganada en el discurso de tantos centenares de años. (135; my emphasis)

Faria e Sousa packs these lines with decadent language. In his view, the battle at Alcazar-Quibir (1578) marks the low point of Portuguese history. Hundreds of pages covering hundreds of years of history cannot overshadow the loss the author feels in describing this event. The subjectivity of this passage suggests a living affinity between Faria e Sousa and his native Portugal. Writing a little more than half a century after Sebastian's death, the event is still too recent for Portugal's wounded self-concept to heal, yet distant enough for the author to frame the domino effect it has left on the national imaginary. What made Sebastian's death so significant and the birth of Sebastianism thereafter so prevalent was what each symbolized for those who adapted either of the two stances. A lifeless king denoted a fallen empire, whereas an immortal king meant that Portugal could still realize its historical destiny.

In the same way that Faria e Sousa carefully avoids any reference to Sebastianism in *Epítome*, he also bites his tongue when it comes to discussing the Iberian Unification. Some critics want to impose on the text a favorable view of the annexation on the part of

the author. They contend that he articulates a clear, pro-Philip agenda. Ciriaco Bustamante, for example, cannot reconcile what he sees as a patriotic view of the past and a sympathetic view of the present in the text (5). To begin to unpack this issue we must first recognize that “Faria e Sousa’s attitude towards Philip II and his successors [. . .] does not differ markedly from that of the majority of his compatriots” (Glaser, Preface 12-13). The similitude between Faria e Sousa and his contemporaries discounts this issue as a legitimate marker of difference in their loyalty to Portugal. I use my words carefully because looking at *Epítome*, to say nothing of the sum of Faria e Sousa’s works, blurs this very issue. *Epítome* offers a cursory view of Philip II’s right to the Portuguese throne and his subsequent rise to power. He concludes his inquiry into the various claims to the throne by saying “Nunca lo sabrá nadie decir cómo él [Philip II] lo supo ejecutar” (147). In context, the tenor of this phrase is hardly one of undying allegiance and support. Faria e Sousa was impressed by the king’s ability to orchestrate the annexation without any armed conflict, and consistently portrays him in a positive light. Did Faria e Sousa tell the story of the Hapsburgs favorably out of preference or self-preservation? Although interesting, the answer to this question is in many ways inconsequential. Faria e Sousa’s life and works debunk the either/or categorizations to which critical commentaries have reduced most Portuguese writers of the seventeenth century. He could have supported Hapsburg rule *and* wanted Portuguese autonomy. An individual of mixed polity can legitimately claim more than one identity. Faria e Sousa lived out the heterogeneous existence that he inherited from the time and place in which he lived. While Faria e Sousa’s hybridity deserves more critical attention, we must never

forget that *Epítome*, similar to his other writings, makes it clear that the balance of his love and loyalty consistently tips in favor of his native Portugal.

The rest of Faria e Sousa's writings, especially his poetry, reflect the same commitment to Portugal he projects in his criticism and historiography. Manuel de Faria e Sousa's poetic work par excellence is *Fuente de Aganipe* (1624). The seven volumes composing the work include more than eight hundred poems in more than fifteen poetic forms, including the sonnet, eclogue, and an autobiographical poem, not to mention a lengthy critical introduction on poetic theory and history. Faria e Sousa dedicates the entire first volume of *Fuente de Aganipe* to the sonnet, dividing the text linguistically and thematically: the first four hundred are written in Spanish and the last two in Portuguese. The poet includes amorous, moral, sacred, sad, and mournful sonnets in both languages. A survey of the six hundred poems reveals the work of someone well aware of the poetic movements of his day and demonstrates a profound knowledge of the genre's history. The relatively few critics that have entered the literary canon of Faria e Sousa generally narrow their interest to his critical works or his autobiography. Lope, however, in *Laurel de Apolo*, focuses his attention on Faria e Sousa's history and poetry: "entre muchos científicos supuestos / eligen a Faría, / que en historia y poesía / saben que no pudiera / darle mayor la lusitana esfera" (3.155-59). As noted by José Maria da Costa e Silva, between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, literary critics and historians unjustly ignored Faria e Sousa's poetic works: "As composições poéticas de Manuel Faria y Sousa, a pesar dos seus defeitos de stylo, me parecem superiores as da maior parte dos poetas, que floresceram naquelle tempo tanto em Portugal, como em Castilla, e tenho

para mim que merecem ser mais conhecidas” (45-46). Close to nothing has been done with Faria e Sousa’s poetry since Costa e Silva made this statement over one hundred fifty years ago. Consequently, I have selected a number of representative sonnets to introduce the reader to the author’s familiarity with and imitation of the predominant poetic themes of the time. While the general trajectory of his poetry does not depart markedly from his Peninsular contemporaries—although in many ways of a higher quality, as stated above—what stands out in his poetry, as in the other genres he practiced, is the pro-Portuguese sentiment he so often endorses in his writings.

In the following amorous sonnet, the author constructs a place for himself within the scaffolding of poetic history:

A Amarilis Maron; Naso a Corina;
a Cintia; a Lesbia; a Lia; a Clori cante
Propercio; i dos, que forman consonante;
i a quel a quien fue llama nieve Alpina.

Petrarca al gran Laurel, Casa a Quirina;
a Selvagia, a Beatriz, el Cino, El Dante;
Lasso a Isabel; Camoens a Violante;
Ausias a Teresa; Bembo a Urbina.

A Diana, Silvia, i a Lucinda Bellas:
Jorge, Berndarez, Lope; pero dellos
Todos, Albania, ese tuyo el canto dellas

Denme los Astros, que te dieron, bellos,
para abrasarme luz de todas ellas;
para cantarte voz de todos ellos. (1.1.4)

In this sonnet, Faria e Sousa presents his muse, Albania, at the end of a long list of well-known poets and their corresponding muses. In this way the poet not only exalts *his* muse, but, perhaps more importantly, puts *himself* in the company of the greatest poets in

history. Whether one agrees with his presumption or not is not as important as the poet's ability to masterfully capture Western poetic tradition. In his commentary on Camões's *Rimas varias*, Faria e Sousa gives the reader a sense of his grasp of Western literature: "puedo juzgar de los estilos de más de quatrocientos Poetas que he leído, Griegos, Latinos, Italianos, Franceses, y Españoles: pues no los leí assi como quiera al buelo, sino repetidas vezes, con mucha ponderación del modo de proceder cada uno" (4.134). As Flasche points out, it is extraordinary to find someone with a 'global' perspective of literature at this time: "Muito significativo é o reconhecimento de que, já neste comentador do século XVII, se revela uma consciência da Literatura Universal" (42). Despite his painstaking approach to criticism, Faria e Sousa was hardly a mere seventeenth-century bibliophile. His criticism and his original compositions reflect grand erudition and a lifelong commitment to literature.

Although the Portuguese poet employed many of the same themes that his Spanish contemporaries did, in many cases we find Faria e Sousa transcending convention and planting new possibilities. In the quatrain that follows, for example, the poet imitates Petrarch's conventional dismemberment of the female body, but with a provocative twist at the end:

Las trencas de oro fino, el rayo ardiente
de vuestros bellos ojos, el suave
hablar, que a un mismo tiempo alegre, i grave
explica el gran pensar de vuestra Mente (1.2.95)

While the golden hair and eyes of fire of the first two verses do not really stand out, Faria e Sousa's praise of her tongue in relation to her mental capacity ("gran pensar") is worth noting. These verses promote an appreciation of the woman beyond her corporeal value

(the possibility of considering intellect in our conception of femininity). He does not continue with the feminine mind in this next sonnet, but Faria e Sousa manages a brilliant variation of the same topic:

No es de cristal tu frente, Albania hermosa;
ni tus cabellos lazos de oro fino
ni tus dos luces de esplendor divino
tienen del Sol la llama caudalosa.

No admite del rubí la vergonzosa
color el labio, a quien el alma inclino;
ni es muro de diamantes peregrino
la hiera de tus dientes luminosa.

No es nieve tu candor, si el suyo eximes
de igualar esas manos, que comprenden
poderes con que al mismo Amor oprimes.

Que los Astros, en ti formar pretenden
un compuesto de objetos tan sublimes
que si bien dejan verse, mal se entienden. (1.1.23)

Here the Petrarchan theme is present, but the poet rejects the conventional description of Albania in order to affirm, in the final tercet, the incomprehensibility of her beauty. That is, similar to other baroque sonnets—the quatrains from “Mientras por competir con tu cabello” by Góngora, for example—Faria e Sousa wants his description of Albania to surpass those crafted by any other poet in favor of his or her muse. Although it does not appear as explicitly as the previous reference to female intellect, the poet praises her inestimable worth.

In addition to the major poetic currents of the time, Faria e Sousa’s poetry also reflects the socio-political context in which he lived. While some verses, for example, overflow with nationalist sentiment, others simply reflect his Portuguese roots. In the

preface of *Asia Portuguesa*, published fifteen years after his death, Faria e Sousa's son Pedro conducts a defense of his father's patriotism based, primarily, on his poetry. Overall Pedro reads his father's life and works as an unapologetic declaration of Portuguese loyalty.²⁹ He demonstrates his own critical skills by supporting this assertion with a number of poems from *Fuente de Aganipe*. He begins with the following selection, which, in Pedro's view, reflects his father's desire to see Portugal freed from foreign occupation:

Quando será que o grão Motor eterno
Livre a nossa Siam a que quiz tanto
Do que a oprime tiranico governo?
O quanto gôzo sentiremos! quanto!

Naquelle alegre, e desejado dia
Que o jugo nos soltar da Tirania

Entam com claros, e melosos metros
Nos ham de ouvir dizer tôdas as Gentes:
Já o gram Dador de Báculos e Cetros
Que entre todos nos fez mais excelentes,
Dando satisfação ao prometido
O nosso Trono reparou luzido (qtd. in Faria e Sousa, Pedro, 21)

There are two predominant and, if we read it according to Pedro's frame, *opposing* powers in these verses: the Spanish Empire ("tiranico governo," "Tirania") and God ("o grão Motor eterno," "o gram Dador de Báculos e Cetros"). Hanging in the balance of these two forces is Portugal ("a nossa Siam," "o nosso Trono," and the collectivity inherent in *sentiremos*, *nos soltar*, *nos ham*, and *nos fez*). The poet laments the fact that his nation has fallen into the hands of a tyrannical ruler, remembering, at the same time,

²⁹ It is important to remember the father/son connection while reading Pedro's letter to the reader. This is not merely literary criticism. This is personal. While the desired outcome is the revaluation of his father's name, the improvement of his own conditions is an unavoidable byproduct as well.

what it was like to be under providential care and hoping that such heavenly favor will once again fall upon Portugal. In these lines the poet casts the present in opposition to the past and future. According to Faria e Sousa, there is no room to doubt God's great love for Portugal in the past ("a que quiz tanto," "entre todos nos fez mais excelentes"), nor does Faria e Sousa allow for any question concerning its future: "gôzo sentiremos," "naquelle alegre e desejado dia," "o jugo nos soltar," and "nos ham de ouvir dizer." As the many references favoring the future suggest, the focus of the poem rests on the eventuality of Portuguese sovereignty and not merely some kind of collective *ubi sunt*. Pedro puts these verses forward as proof that his father hoped for a restoration (21).

In an effort to clarify his relationship to João IV, the Portuguese king following the Restoration (1640), and his view of Portugal's newly recovered sovereignty, Pedro cites a series of sonnets that were added to the 1646 edition of *Fuente de Aganipe*:

Se excelso sangue he digno de tesouro,
Digno de Imperio; Tu de tudo és digno:
A Ti se incline o Tejo cristalino;
A Ti se incline o cristalino Douro.

Se por valor se alcança o verde Louro
Que o soberano Apolo fêz divino,
Nunca o vio o Teatro Tiberino
Noutra frente melhor orlado e ouro.

Se Diadema se dá por peito justo
Em Ti esperamos ver claro Diadema,
O sucessor do Cetro mais Augusto.

Toda ousadia, só de verte trema,
Que se do mao o bom he mayor susto,
Em fazerte melhor o Ceo se estrema.

In Pedro's view, this sonnet expresses Faria e Sousa's vision of the Duke of Bragança not only as a worthy heir to the Portuguese crown, but as the legitimate successor (21). Throughout the poem, especially in the first quatrain, the poet emphasizes John IV's worthiness through the repetition of *digno* and the deified capitalization of *Ti* and *Tu*. What adds to the effectiveness of these verses is the personification of the Tejo and Douro rivers—rivers also claimed by the Spanish—each of which recognizes the dignity of the new Portuguese king. Most importantly, however, is the divine approbation described in the final verse. Faria e Sousa aligns the Restoration with God's will. This being the case, the Spanish have no chance of reclaiming the Portuguese nation.

Pedro continues his poetic analysis by looking at the deep structure of several other sonnets, each of which reflects Faria e Sousa's allegiance to the newly crowned Portuguese king. Whereas sonnet 66 disguises John IV's name in a divine anagram (*Anjo* as another way of saying Joan), sonnet 67 uncovers the poet's intentions altogether:

Ó tu, por nome, amado da Criatura
Que tudo enfim creou, toma o Governo
Que declinado já, será superno,
Pois Iove, crucifixo, o assegura.

A redea, que até agora foy tam dura,
Modera brando, e te farás eterno:
Do bem que guardas lá no peito interno
Sublime exterior nos assegura.

Tu serás acalamado por divino
Sucessor do pacífico Terceiro,
Que te espera no assento cristalino.

Farás com passear o Imperio inteiro,
De loureiros crescer um bosque dino,
Que a cada passo teu, brota hum Loureiro.

As Pedro explains, this sonnet contains several references to the new Portuguese king (22-23). The first verse, for example, makes reference to Christ's beloved apostle, John. In this case, however, the poet is not really speaking of the New Testament author, but alluding to him as a way of calling upon John IV. In yet another telling instance from this sonnet, Faria e Sousa invokes the Portuguese king by referring to him as the "Sucessor do pacífico Terceiro." Intermingled with these references is an important message: aided by the heavens the Portuguese Empire will be made to flourish once again.

In the eyes of his son, Faria e Sousa's poetic work demonstrates a favorable attitude towards the House of Bragança: "[D]e todos os seus escritos consta que teve sempre enraizado no seu peito êste insaciável desejo de renovação e engrandecimento da Sereníssima Casa de Bragança, porque, tôdas as vezes em que o tempo lhe deu ocasião de falar dela, se desfez em contínuos louvores" (24). Pedro goes on to say that the king reciprocated his father's goodwill, showing him favors in Madrid and doing all in his power to provide him a safe return to Portugal following the Restoration (24-25). Pedro does not go so far as to say that his father served as an informant for John IV as others have suggested, but the Portuguese captain leaves no room for doubt concerning his father's allegiance.³⁰ While it is clear that we cannot divorce Pedro's literary criticism from his personal circumstances, it is just as obvious that we cannot ignore the thread of patriotism he illuminates in his father's poetry. It is likewise important to note the absence of commentary related to his father's relationship to Spain. His letter to the reader at the beginning of *Asia Portuguesa* is clearly aimed at revaluing his father's place

³⁰ In his biography *Retrato de Manuel de Faria y Sousa* (1650), Francisco Moreno Porcel claims that Faria e Sousa served as a spy for John IV in Madrid, an assertion considered improbable by most critics.

in Portuguese letters (his legacy had been compromised by a perceived disloyalty first posited by some of his contemporaries, and one that has survived until the present day). Why Pedro's voice has also been silenced over the centuries is somewhat of a mystery. To my knowledge, no scholar has taken on Pedro's assertions regarding his father's poetry. If his letter to the reader came in *Europa Portuguesa* or *Africa Portuguesa* this would be more understandable, as no modern edition of those works has been published. *Asia Portuguesa*, however, was reedited and published less than a hundred years ago. Manuel de Faria e Sousa has much to offer scholars of early modern Iberian poetry. While he reflects the literary themes and trends of the time, he also engages the socio-political landscape, revealing a clear preference for his native Portugal.

In his poetic works, as in his literary criticism and historiography, Manuel de Faria e Sousa lays claim to his Portuguese roots, articulating a nationalism that at once confirms and rejects the continuity of early modern Iberian identity. What is lost in the process of translating his *Portugalidade* into Spanish is the identity of the author himself. Thus, although his works do not prove what he was, they do make a case for what he wanted to be: Portuguese. That he even felt a need to make this claim dispels any doubt as to the duality of his *persona*. Faria e Sousa represents a generation of authors who sacrificed their individuality for the sake of the national collective. While his self-image reflects many of the complexities associated with early modern Iberia, the beginning and end of his existence, indeed the love of his life, was Portugal. He maintained a complicated relationship with his homeland throughout his life, ever-praising her in his writings, never claiming her again as home. The intricacies of this association stand out

most prominently when considered together with the disproportionate praise he received in comparison to that which was given:

Como historiador y crítico hizo conocer al mundo, más que ningún otro, la gloria literaria de su país, los hechos famosos y aventuras prodigiosas de sus naturales. A él, por escribir en castellano, más que a Camoens, Barros y Couto, debe quizá Portugal el ser conocido en el extranjero; servicio que no solamente no reconoció, sino que pagó con ingratitud. (García Pés 208)

His erudition, writing ability, and work ethic promised a place among his literary heroes, but the Portuguese author could not overcome the time in which he lived—a heterogeneous world determined to establish and enforce homogeneous categories. His religious “purity” assured a place for him on the Iberian Peninsula, but was not sufficient to keep his political and linguistic “impurity” from having a marginalizing effect on his place within Iberian letters. What has served for so long as justification for his decentralized status, however, needs to be revisited. In the wake of recent theoretical trends, scholars may finally be prepared to see beyond the surface of Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish and appreciate the complex navigation of identity, language, and literature often found therein. By so doing, they will not only enrich the Spanish and Portuguese literary canons by reincorporating a large body of excellent works therein, but may also, in the process, acknowledge the value of what Ricardo Jorge appropriately called the “intercultural de Portugal e Espanha” almost one hundred years ago.

CHAPTER IV

STAGING THE NATION: CORDEIRO, AZEVEDO, AND THE PORTUGUESE *COMEDIA*

In the prologue of his first published play, the fifteen-year-old Portuguese dramatist Jacinto Cordeiro (1606-46) makes his purpose for writing clear: “tenho de eternizar grandezas de minha patria” (*La entrada*). At the root of his drama lies a commitment to immortalize Portugal. The young playwright maintained this position during the course of his literary career, dedicating many of his more than twenty *comedias* to the praise of the Portuguese nation. Cordeiro, however, was not alone among his contemporaries. While not all Portuguese playwrights employed their literary genius in favor of Portugal, many of them situated their works within their native borders and made frequent reference to Portuguese-related themes and history in their plays. Within the latter category, for example, we discover one of Cordeiro’s female contemporaries, Ângela de Azevedo (1600?-60?), whose three *comedias* reflect a similar place-based approach to theater. In the works of Azevedo and Cordeiro, one reads a consistent effort to stage the nation, affirming, through their works, the past, present, and future worth of their native Portugal, and the important contribution of Portuguese dramatists to the *comedia* tradition.

Considered within their context, it is not surprising to find early modern dramatists paying tribute to their respective nations. Such patriotic imaginings, in fact, were frequent among the most well-known authors of the era, not to mention their

sixteenth-century predecessors (see chapter two). Early modern Iberian theater is particularly inviting for those reading the period and the genre with an eye on national consciousness. Two main waves define sixteenth- and seventeenth-century dramatizations of Spain and Portugal. The first—which I addressed, in part, in chapter two—includes Gil Vicente and the school of playwrights that preceded the annexation. It is difficult to overestimate Vicente’s influence on Golden Age theater in general, and the outpouring of early seventeenth-century interest in Portuguese-themed drama in particular. The second wave—what we might appropriately call a tidal wave—consists of Lope de Vega and the *comedia nueva*. The role of Portugal and the Portuguese in this second group, a topic traditionally overlooked, is the focus of the present chapter. Lope and the new school that he founded produced numerous nationally motivated *comedias*, many of which are specifically related to Portugal. Spanish and Portuguese dramatists had looked to Portugal for artistic inspiration in the past, but during the second half of the annexation, the Portuguese nation had become a legitimate dramatic impetus, feeding the frenzy that was Spanish Golden Age theater. Despite the relatively scarce attention their works have received, Portuguese playwrights rode the popular wave of the *comedia nueva* with their Spanish contemporaries, taking advantage of the medium to affirm their own national identity at a time when the Spanish empire had culturally subsumed Portugal. The *comedias* of Cordeiro and Azevedo move freely across linguistic, literary, and cultural boundaries, manifesting their connections to Spain at the same moment that they affirm their *Portugalidade*.

Literary historians often consider the seventeenth century a decadent period of Portuguese letters. They point to the cultural Castilianization of Portugal—intensified, but not caused, by the 1580 annexation—as the major cause for this collapse. Perhaps most astonishing, especially when considered in comparison to their Spanish contemporaries, is the decline of the theater. After all, Portugal boasts one of the greatest Iberian dramatists of the sixteenth century in Gil Vicente, not to mention Luís de Camões and António Ferreira’s dramatic contributions. Critics often point to Francisco Manuel de Melo’s *Auto do fidalgo aprendiz* (1665) as one of only a few bright spots in seventeenth-century Portuguese drama. The farce builds on both Portuguese and Spanish dramatic technique—Vicente’s frequent use of satire, social critique, and the *redondilha*, on the one hand, and the division of the work in three *jornadas*, cloak and dagger scenes, and stock characters, on the other. The mother-daughter relationship within the play, however, departs from standard *comedia nueva* practice. The *comedia* generally lacks mothers altogether, to say nothing of the self-determined, power-driven Isabel of Melo’s play. The brevity (1065 lines) of the work, among other aspects, keeps it from completely measuring up to *comedia* standards. It might be best, therefore, to think of *O fidalgo aprendiz* as a mix of Vicente and Lope; a hybrid that reflects the century-and-a-half of Peninsular theater preceding its composition. The play deserves the praise and recognition that literary critics and historians have bestowed upon it, but not to the exclusion of Portuguese-authored drama in Spanish. Taking into consideration the vast body of Portuguese *comedias* written in Spanish—which may number as high as three

hundred¹—drastically alters the perception of the literary, and more specifically, the dramatic production of Portuguese authors during the seventeenth century, leading to the inevitable conclusion that there *is* such a thing as a Portuguese *comedia*.

In addition to the three primary motifs—religion, love, honor (Wilson, *Spanish* 42)—critics have spent decades establishing and defining categories for organizing the thousands of *comedias* written during the Golden Age. There are, of course, familiar designations such as cloak and dagger, wife-murder, honor, and historical. David Castillejo's *Guía de ochocientas comedias del Siglo de Oro* goes even further, dividing Lope's *comedias*, for example, into sixty-seven different groupings (96-110). One body of works that represents an important *comedia* sub-genre, yet goes beyond the aforementioned categories, includes the various Portuguese-themed works, which may number anywhere from the twenties (modest estimate) up to the fifties. While Castillejo offers the category "*La historia de España*" in his section on Lope, no further clarifications are made (i.e., works related to Portugal, the New World, or other related spaces). A similar trend runs through *comedia* criticism in general. Often overlooked, and certainly understudied, are the many Portuguese-themed *comedias* authored by both Spanish and Portuguese dramatists.

Just as Portuguese playwrights of the seventeenth century had a clear predecessor in Gil Vicente and his nation-minded theater, Spanish dramatists writing about Portugal during the Golden Age could look to Bartolomé Torres Naharro for inspiration. Torres Naharro, in fact, may have been the first Spanish dramatist to take up Portuguese themes

¹ The best approximation of the total number of *comedias* penned by the Portuguese can be found in García Pères's 1890 bibliography, which names two hundred sixty-six works by sixty-eight playwrights (Cruz-Ortiz).

in his plays. He penned at least two works that speak to the developing sense of national consciousness in Iberia at the time, especially as it pertains to the Portuguese. His polyglot play *Tinelaria* (1517), for example, not only incorporates Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, French, and Italian characters, but also has them speak their respective languages and embody, with a certain degree of essentialism, their respective nationalities. Most of the play takes place during a meal at the servants' eating quarters of some great palace. The setting and dialogue are very picaresque. For the most part, the work revolves around the conversation taking place between the various characters at mealtimes. One of the more entertaining exchanges in the play occurs between Francisco (Castilian), Mathía (Sevillian), and an unnamed Portuguese:

FRANCISCO. ¡Gran Castilla!
Que si saca su cuadrilla
no hay, par Dios, quien se le acueste.
MATHIA. Que solamente Sevilla
puede sacar una hueste.
PORTUGUES. Eu vos fundo
e vos concedo o segundo,
que Sevela he muyto boa;
mais Sevela e tudo o mundo
he merda para Lisboa. (1.60-69)

While the conversation begins with talk of the military strength of various Peninsular regions, the Portuguese servant takes advantage of the moment to make a general comment about Lisbon's superiority above all other cities in the world. Some of the other characters add their voice to the discussion, but none of them challenge what the Portuguese has said nor make such an audacious claim of their own. That said, his comment about Lisbon pales in comparison to what he later says about the relationship between God and Portugal: "Naun zumbés, / que Judas foi cordovés / e muyto ben se vos

prova; / e Deus foi português / de meu da Rua Nova” (2.110-14). God, according to the Portuguese, is so Portuguese that one can trace his roots to Lisbon’s early modern equivalent to Main Street—*Rua Nova*—the heart of Lisbon, and, by extension, the Portuguese nation.² In these verses, Torres Naharro captures Portugal’s elevated self-concept; an attitude he may have picked up from his Peninsular contemporary, Gil Vicente. The influence of his Portuguese contemporary is particularly evident in Torres Naharro’s *Comedia Trofea*, a likely spinoff of Vicente’s *Auto da fama* (Figueiredo 37). Such references in the work of Torres Naharro become commonplace by the seventeenth century among other Peninsular dramatists who attempt to characterize Portugal and the Portuguese.

Vicente, Torres Naharro, and other sixteenth-century Iberian authors influenced Lope and the new school of theater that he founded during the first decades of the annexation, especially in terms of the historico-national dramas that they would produce. By the time he published the *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* (1609), his treatise on the basic characteristics of the *comedia nueva*, Lope had polished his dramatic technique significantly (483 plays written up to that point, by his count). His Spanish and Portuguese contemporaries were soon to follow, as the public theater quickly became a popular Peninsular pastime for all members of society. As they did with other literary genres, Portuguese authors took advantage of their proficiency in Spanish to participate in the widespread popularity of the *comedia*. Whereas a work in Spanish had audiences throughout Iberia, plays in Portuguese could only be staged for limited audiences in

² *Rua Nova* appears frequently in the literature of the time, including Gil Vicente’s theater, Camões’s *El-rei Seleuco*, Tirso’s description of Lisbon in *El burlador de Sevilla*, Francisco Manuel de Melo’s *Apólogos Dialogais*, and António Vieira’s *Cartas* (Davies).

Portugal. That they had to be written in Spanish, however, did not mean that they had to be written about Spain. In fact, for some Portuguese dramatists, the opposite was true. The *comedias* of Ângela de Azevedo and Jacinto Cordeiro, for example, reveal a deliberate attempt to stage the Portuguese nation. They perform national identity by invoking Portuguese history, language, geography, and other key features. While many Spanish playwrights also dedicated entire works to Portugal, Azevedo and Cordeiro depart from their Peninsular contemporaries by rooting their works in the glorification and immortalization of Lusitânia.

Although the Portuguese were writing in Spanish and actively participating in the same *comedia* trends as their contemporaries in Spain, and the Spanish were busily writing dozens of Portuguese-themed plays, the two groups are not one in the same. Not unlike the point Jorge Luís Borges makes in “Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*,” there is a qualitative difference between Spanish and Portuguese playwrights saying/doing virtually the same thing (in this case, dramatizing the Portuguese nation). The layers of signification in the work of the Portuguese differ from that of their Spanish contemporaries, if not for any other reason than because the Portuguese write from within a category of belonging that does not pertain to the Spanish. They highlight this claim in a variety of ways, the most obvious being the repeated use of *we* and *our*. Traditionally, the Portuguese are left out of critical conversations related to the *comedia*. Separating them from the Spanish allows me to examine their general participation in Golden Age theater as well as their unique contribution to nationally conscious theater. I speak of nationality fully aware that the Iberian Unification (1580-1640) held Portugal under

provincial status for most of the first half of the seventeenth century. Thus, I am not necessarily speaking of nationality in terms of political autonomy, but rather a native claim to place, culture, and history. That is to say, anyone can praise Portugal, but not anyone can state from the outset that his purpose is to immortalize the greatness of his *patria* (Cordeiro, *La entrada*).

When Portuguese authors write about Portugal, they cast a collectivity to which they claim affiliation, whereas the Spanish remain distant from their subject matter when it relates to Portugal. Even when Spanish playwrights focus on their own national identity (e.g., *Fuenteovejuna*, *Numancia*, *Las mocedades del Cid*), it is not presented with the same cohesiveness as works focused on Portugal. This is due, in large part, to the relative stability of the Portuguese imaginary at this time, particularly when one considers, as a point of contrast, the emerging, yet disjointed concept of Spanish identity.³ While some may argue with this effort to distinguish the two dominant Iberian personalities, what is beyond question is the increased emphasis Spanish and Portuguese dramatists of the seventeenth century placed on the nation. From the early nationalist template established by Gil Vicente, to the numerous nation-themed *comedias* of the Golden Age appearing throughout the Peninsula, the nation frequently dominates early modern Iberian theater. While Portugal may have dropped off in many ways during the decades of the annexation, its presence on the stage was never more widespread nor important than at this time. My purpose is not to list every dramatist and work related to the nation, but to

³ This point is too rich and complex to treat at length at present. While there is much to say about the difference between Spanish and Portuguese concepts of nationhood and how they are represented on the stage, such a rich topic requires more attention than this study affords. Such a work would take as its basic premise the static nature of dramatizations depicting the Portuguese nation in comparison to the dynamic views of Spain; the former much more stable than the latter.

trace the general development of this topic in Peninsular drama during the late sixteenth, early seventeenth centuries, with special emphasis given to the representations of Lusitânia found in the works of Cordeiro and Azevedo. Of all the literary genres that Portuguese authors took advantage of in order to spread the glories of their homeland, theater was the most common and effective means of communicating their sense of *Portugalidade*.

A wave of *comedias* dealing with Portuguese history and themes appeared throughout the Peninsula during the Golden Age. Portugal was en vogue, acting as a muse for virtually every major playwright of the day. Many scholars have studied this phenomenon as it relates to specific authors such as Lope, Tirso, and Calderón.⁴ These studies suggest that many of the *comedias* dealing with Portugal were written specifically for a Portuguese audience. In general, interest in Portugal can be attributed to the increased cross-cultural exchange between Spain and Portugal ushered in by the annexation, not to mention the influential work of sixteenth-century authors such as Vicente. It is worth noting that from 1580 to 1610 few Spanish authors took interest in their longtime Peninsular neighbor. The final decades of the annexation, however, saw both an outpouring of Portuguese-themed *comedias* and an increased interest in Lisbon as a destination for theater companies from Madrid (Rennert 194; Vázquez Cuesta 634). The concentration of Portuguese-themed works during the second half of the annexation

⁴ For a general survey of this trend, see Ares Montes's "Portugal en el teatro español del siglo XVII." For studies specifically related to Lope, see Edward Glaser's "El lustanismo de Lope de Vega," Fidelino de Figueiredo's "Lope de Vega: alguns elementos portugueses na sua obra," and Hipólito Raposo's chapter "O sentimento português em Lope de Vega" from his critical work *Aula régia*. For a look at this same phenomenon in Tirso's canon, see Alonso Zamora Vicente's "Portugal en el teatro de Tirso de Molina," Manoel de Sousa Pinto's *Portugal e as portuguesas em Tirso de Molina*, and Edwin Morby's "Portugal and Galicia in the Plays of Tirso de Molina."

coincides with both the rise in popularity of the *comedia* in general, as well as the active participation of the Portuguese in Peninsular culture. Many Portuguese authors, in fact, stimulated interest in their native land by publishing works that celebrate Portuguese history and culture. The influence of Portuguese authors writing in Spanish, therefore, is incalculable. It not only includes those who directly read, heard, or participated in their writings in some other way, but also those who went on to produce poetry, plays, history, and other texts inspired by what they read from the Portuguese.

Within Manuel de Faria e Sousa's immense body of historiography, we find *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (1628). As discussed in the previous chapter, the relationship between history and nation-building is on full display in this work. *Epítome* echoes many of the nationalized themes that Faria and other Portuguese authors bring to bear in their writings. Furthermore, the work captures the direct influence Portuguese writers were having on the production of Portuguese-themed *comedias* among Spanish playwrights. *Epítome*, for instance, served as the source for at least two *comedias* written during the Golden Age—Tirso's *Las Quinas de Portugal* and Calderón's *El príncipe constante*.⁵ These and numerous other Spanish *comedias* include Portuguese characters, take place partially or entirely in Portugal, are related to Portuguese history, and contain other references to Portugal. Among Lope's works alone, we find *La tragedia del Rey D. Sebastián*, *El duque de Viseo*, *El más galán portugués*, and *El Brasil restituido*, among others. Cidade describes this early seventeenth century phenomenon as follows: "Los

⁵ A.E. Sloman locates Calderón's work at the end of 1628, while Tirso scholars have not been able to situate *Las Quinas* any earlier than the decade following the publication of Faria's *Epítome*. At the end of the *Quinas* manuscript, Tirso specifically identifies *Epítome* as one of the primary sources of his play. Margaret Wilson's "The Last Play of Tirso de Molina" offers a close look at Faria e Sousa's contribution to *Las Quinas*.

comediógrafos españoles hallaron una importante fuente de inspiración dramática en diversos temas de la tradición y de la historia lusitana; sea el trágico amor de Inés de Castro o la lucha contra los holandeses en Brasil” (viii-ix). In some instances, a single figure from Portuguese history inspired a series of dramatic works. This was certainly the case with Inés de Castro and King Sebastian. As Ares Montes observes, what these works lack in historical fidelity, they make up for in theatricality: “No importa que la fidelidad histórica se disluya en la inventiva poética; la historia de Portugal está ahí, vista con admiración y cantada con entusiasmo, así como elogiado en extremo la belleza de las portuguesas y el valor, generosidad y fidelidad de los portugueses” (“Portugal” 15). With very few exceptions, critics call attention to the goodwill demonstrated by Spanish dramatists towards the Portuguese in their *comedias*.⁶ This is partially due to the fact that they were writing for Portuguese audiences, but there is more to it. Portugal’s rich folkloric tradition and high output of works about Portugal in Spanish made it an easy source from which early modern dramatists could draw. Portuguese history and themes offered a degree of familiarity and novelty that both playwrights and audiences from across the Peninsula could appreciate. That a Lusocentric playwright like Cordeiro was praised throughout the Peninsula, is proof enough that Portuguese-themed plays were not merely intended for Portuguese audiences. Based on his success, in fact, one may ascertain that the Spanish did not feel threatened by such pro-Portuguese texts.

No Spanish playwright got more dramatic mileage out of Portugal than Tirso de Molina. From the well-known description of Lisbon in *El burlador de Sevilla* to his

⁶ Morby, for example, speaks of Tirso’s “extremely flattering conception” of Portugal (269).

treatment of the mythical founding of Portugal in *Las Quinas de Portugal* to the entertaining switches between Spanish and Portuguese in *El amor médico*, Tirso had an in-depth knowledge of the very features of the Portuguese nation so frequently cited by authors during the annexation. Overall, he penned at least seven predominantly Portuguese *comedias*⁷ and another eight with Portuguese characters and frequent references to Portugal (Ares, “Portugal” 16). As Morby points out, “the peak of enthusiasm” among Tirso’s Portuguese-themed works has to be *Quinas*, the author’s last *comedia*. The play recounts the legendary feats of Afonso Henriques and the founding of Portugal. What is more, it imagines the same national identity cast by Tirso’s Portuguese contemporaries: invincibility (478, 675), valor and fidelity (528, 755-57, 1125-26, 1569, 2042, 2404), the “David Principle” (723-30, 854, 890, 1083-97), and providentialism (1743-49, 1840-41, 1890-1985, 2030-33). While Faria e Sousa’s historiographical work ensured the survival of such foundational myths, it was in the pages of the *comedias* written by Tirso de Molina and his contemporaries and on the stages their works were performed, that such conceptions of the Portuguese nation took root and produced fruit throughout the Peninsula.

Although *Quinas* is based on Faria e Sousa’s *Epítome*, there is at least one important difference between the way in which each author speaks of the events surrounding Portugal’s famed beginning. For Tirso, speaking of the *quinas* is a matter of description, whereas for Faria e Sousa it is, in a collective sense, self-description. The distinction is subtle, yet significant. It is a “we” instead of a “they,” an “our” rather than a

⁷ *El vergonzoso en palacio*, *Averígüelo Vargas*, *Doña Beatriz de Silva*, *El amor médico*, *Escarmientos para el cuerdo*, *Siempre ayuda la verdad* y *Las Quinas de Portugal*

“their.” Understanding this difference is particularly important when it comes to reading the variety of Portuguese-themed *comedias* written by both Spanish and Portuguese dramatists during the Golden Age. Portugal is typically at the heart of such works. Together, they invoke the rhetoric of *Portugalidade* and lead readers through a tour of Portuguese history and geography. Among many Portuguese playwrights, however, there seems to be more at stake. The way they speak of the Portuguese nation is a difference of degree, not kind. Their plays both exalt and pledge allegiance to Lusitânia. They are at once art and ideology. Sustaining such a pro-Portuguese agenda during the Iberian Unification constituted a speech-act of real import. Beginning with the early work of Simão Machado, and then moving on to Jacinto Cordeiro and Ângela de Azevedo, I hope to trace the rhetoric of the nation within the Portuguese *comedia*, including the various times at which they articulate a native claim to their homeland and subscribe to a national collectivity.

Simão Machado (1570-1640) was one of the first Portuguese playwrights to experiment with the dramatic innovations coming out of the late sixteenth century from a nation-based perspective. Having lived during the dawn of the annexation, the turn of the century, and well into the 1700s, Machado provides a meaningful bridge between Vicente, Torres Naharro, Camões, and other sixteenth-century dramatists, and the many seventeenth-century Spanish and Portuguese playwrights writing with the nation in mind. *Comédia do Cerco de Dio* and *Comédia da Pastora Alfea* were likely written during the 1590s, although not originally published until 1601 (Ares, “Portugal” 13). Another edition of his plays, bearing the same title as the 1601 version but with the addition of

several *entremeses* attributed to Lope and Francisco de Quevedo, was published in Lisbon in 1631 with the name *Comedias portuguesas. Feitas Pello Excelente Poeta, Simão Machado*. Similar to some of the sixteenth-century dramatists discussed in chapter two, as well as Torres Naharro, Machado consistently alternates between Portuguese and Spanish throughout his two *comedias*. Machado's *Comédia do Cerco de Dio* bears the mark of a Portuguese apologist who, at the occasional expense of his Castilian neighbors, uses his polyglot works to exalt Portugal. The two verses found in the third to last stanza of *Cerco de Dio* capture the spirit of Machado's literary devotion to his homeland: "Louvay sempre os Portugueses, / Pois são vossos naturais" (fol. 56).

Similar to many of his Iberian predecessors, Machado uses language as a mode of characterization in *Cerco de Dio*, suggestively assigning Spanish to the lowliest characters in the work. In response to his alternating and subversive use of the two languages, Vázquez Cuesta asks, "¿será demasiada suspicacia atribuir a encubierta mala fe nacionalista el hecho de que ponga el autor hablando castellano precisamente a aquellos personajes que constituyen en la pieza los enemigos de los protagonistas portugueses: moros e indios?" (635). It is not out of the question to think that Machado would play with language in this way, especially in light of Vicente and Camões's previous efforts to characterize the Spanish accordingly. From beginning to end, Machado's *Cerco de Dio* answers Vázquez Cuesta's question. The two lines of stage directions that anticipate the initial verses of the play set things in motion: "Entrão Mouros e Christãos, pelejando, e dizem os Mouros: Arma, mueran estos locos, / Mueran soberbios Christianos" (1.1-2). The switch from Portuguese to Spanish, from the

Christian playwright Simão Machado to the Moorish enemies, is significant. This characterization identifies the Moors with the Spanish through a linguistic common ground (a potentially subversive insinuation). After all, this play was written only a hundred years after Granada fell and the centuries-old Spanish *Reconquista* came to an end. In the late sixteenth, and well into the seventeenth century, struggles against Islam persisted on the Peninsula. Thus, by grouping the Moors and the Spanish under one linguistic banner, Machado casts an unseemly insult. Spanish remains the means of communication for all Moors throughout the play. Nevertheless, several others, including the king, speak Spanish. Does the fact that the king speaks Spanish ennoble the Moors, disgrace the king, or neither of the two? The Portuguese, after all, took great pride in their loyalty. It would seem out of character, then, for Machado to in some way dethrone the king. Interpreting the function of language switches in Machado's plays, therefore, may seem fairly straightforward as it pertains to the Moors, but highly inconclusive in the case of the king.

During the time of the Portuguese annexation, one would expect to find patriotic statements in favor of an autonomous Portugal. While many would expect Portuguese to be the *lingua franca* for such manifestations, Machado and many of his contemporaries appropriated Spanish as a means of dissemination. An example of this appears at the beginning of *Cerco de Dio*, when a Moorish soldier reflects on the puzzling military success of the Portuguese given their relative smallness as a nation: "es posible que tan pocos / resistan a tantas manos" (1.4-5). Traditionally, the Portuguese take great pride in being able to defend their sovereignty despite being outnumbered by the opposition (e.g.,

Aljubarrota). Manuel de Faria e Sousa describes the phenomenon as follows: “Vos Portugueses que sois pocos en numero, pero en valor inmensos, i que no meteis en balança, la pequeñez de esse número, sino la grandeza de essos coraçones: aumentando con el caudal de la vida, la ley divina, i vuestro nombre” (3.215). In this passage, Faria e Sousa contrasts Portugal’s scant numbers with their overwhelming quality. The biblical intertext—favoring the internal over the external, the heart over the body (see 1 Sam. 16.7)—is on full display in this and similar statements from the time period. A parallel passage appears later in the play, as Rao, a Moor and main character in Machado’s work, makes specific mention of the military prowess of Portugal, “nunca vencida en la guerra” (fol. 16). While it may seem ironic for Machado to include such statements in his text while Portugal remains annexed, this reference to the glorious past could also be read as an attempt to inspire his fellow Portuguese to action. This seems very possible, considering Claude-Henri Frèches’s contention that Machado likely participated in the intellectual movement of resistance to Spanish dominance (21). Just as Machado, many of these intellectuals published works that collectively remember Portugal as she once was and as she might once again be.

It is evident that Machado felt uneasy about the cultural Castilianization (and other foreign influences) taking over the Peninsula, particularly in his native Portugal. In *Comedia da Pastora Alfea*—a work not as overtly Portuguese as *Cerco de Dio*—the author reflects on the changes occurring on Portugal’s literary landscape as a result of the annexation and other related factors. It contains, for example, many explicit and implicit references to the socio-historical climate in which Machado composed his works. To

some extent, one could say that *Pastora Alfea* predicts the complete shift in Portuguese theater from the Portuguese and polyglot texts of the sixteenth century, to the near saturation of the national theater by the Spanish language in the seventeenth. The work reads as a haphazard mix of characters, eleven of which speak in Portuguese, eight in Spanish, and two in Italian. Between the first and second parts of the play, Machado inserts an intriguing *dicho*⁸ on the state of Portuguese culture and society, decrying the assimilation of foreign (especially Castilian) influences at the expense of Portugal's own identity. It relates the story of an artist who is commissioned to paint the nations of the world, distinguishing each one by his dress. While the Castilian, French, and Italian all wear their customary attire, the Portuguese is depicted with fabric in hand. Asked why the Portuguese figure appears this way, the artist complains of the difficulty of portraying Portugal since one never knows what to expect one day to the next from the ever-changing Portuguese:

Velos eis disse a Francesa,
Despois disse a Castelhana,
Oje andão a Valoneza,
A amanhã a Sevilhana,
E ja nunca a Portuguesa. (fol. 78)

The artist goes on to say that the choice to represent the Portuguese with material in hand was better than the alternative: painting him with thirty different outfits (the suggestion here being that Portuguese vanity is boundless).

Having drawn a clear picture of the problem, the satirical *dicho* moves away from the painting proper to a much larger stage: the condition of the arts in Portugal at the turn

⁸ According to Covarrubias, it is “el papel que ha decorado el farsante para recitar en la comedia” (470). *Dicho* is probably the best word to describe this selection, although its playfulness recalls the *entremés* and its moralization hearkens to the *loa*.

of the century. The work complains that the Portuguese public has become constant in their shiftiness and incessant in bad-mouthing (79). Two verses from the antepenultimate stanza capture the spirit of lament akin to this liminal text: “e do vosso natural / Nada vos parece bem” (79). It is not difficult to sense the anxiety of the artist in these verses. The text unequivocally states that an author committed to the cultivation of Portuguese language and aesthetics will not survive among his own people, which, given the limited readership for works in Portuguese, is his only audience. The message is not unlike the longstanding proverb of biblical origin: *In patria natus non est propheta vocatus*.⁹ The closing verses of the *dicho* emphasize the point even further, criticizing the fact that Portuguese authors have to write in Spanish in order to gain favor in their own country:

Vendo quão mal aceitais,
As obras dos naturais,
Fiz esta em lingua estrangeira,
Por ver se desta maneira
Como a elles nos tratais.

Fiome no Castelhana,
Fiome em ser novidade,
Se nua e noutra me engano,
Vos Portugal eu o pano,
Cortay a vossa vontade. (fol. 79)

The last two verses complete the dramatic scene that Machado paints from the outset. Rather than the painter being analogous to the early modern Portuguese artist, Machado associates the painter with the Portuguese public (presumably the reading public [cultural consumers]). Accordingly, the artist is the fabric, fashioned according to popular demand. This, of course, turns previous criticism upside down, as most literary critics and cultural

⁹ “Never a prophet was valued in his native country” (see Matt. 13.57, Mark 6.4, Luke 4.24, John 4.44).

historians primarily hold the artists accountable for the Castilianization of Portuguese letters.

Machado's plays present a fascinating blend of past and present, native and foreign, Portuguese and Spanish, problematizing both sides by bringing them together on the same stage. *Cerco de Dio* fits in well with the current of nationally-determined drama of the sixteenth century. *Pastora Alfea* focuses on the nation in a different way, predicting the complete saturation of the Portuguese stage by Spanish language and dramatic technique. Rather than reading both works as a contradiction or a problem to be solved—the one praising, the other criticizing the nation—I see them as forming a bridge between sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Iberian theater. While he looks at early modern Iberia from a Portuguese perspective, his preoccupations, his influences, and his audience are Peninsular. There are times, however, when the dramatist reminds the reader that he is indeed Portuguese, and that at different times, his works are keenly directed to his compatriots. Machado believes that Portugal merits praise in general, but is particularly insistent that the Portuguese esteem that which is Portuguese once again: “Louvay sempre os Portugueses, / Pois são vossos naturais” (*Cerco* 56).

Despite the bleak picture of Portuguese letters painted in *Pastora Alfea* and António Ferreira's earlier warnings and threats against those who would abandon their native tongue and cultivate another (see chapter two), seventeenth-century Portuguese theater became precisely what many sixteenth-century Portuguese authors had feared: an extension of Castilian culture. It is erroneous, however, to argue that by virtue of the fact that it was mostly written in Spanish, that the plays are somehow less Portuguese. Such a

perspective would be a modern imposition that does not fairly consider the nuances of language and identity at the time. In effect, many playwrights utilized their Spanish proficiency to celebrate Portuguese identity both before and after the Restoration of 1640. They accepted their context for what it was, and wrote in praise of Portugal anyway. In other words, they did the best with what they had. Annexation literature was peripheral to and strongly influenced by the Castilian center, but that should not keep us from acknowledging its valuable contribution to early modern Iberian letters. Rather than blame Portuguese playwrights for the Castilianization of the national theater, García Pères points to the unique impact of the annexation on the stage: “Lástima que Machado y otros ingenios portugueses careciesen de un teatro público en que pudiesen, como los dramáticos castellanos, lucir las galas de su ingenio. A ésta, y no á otra circunstancia, se debe el que nuestra literatura dramática no corresponda en importancia á su hermana la castellana” (339). García Pères is right to suggest that the conditions in Portugal kept artists from achieving the success that their literary ability promised. He overstates the point, however, in claiming that were it not for the absence of a public theater, the Portuguese would rival the accomplishments of their Spanish contemporaries. One would be hard-pressed to find any national theater tradition to match what Spanish playwrights achieved during the Golden Age. The way García Pères constructs his argument, positioning the Portuguese against the Spanish, is refreshing, even if a bit misguided. It is encouraging to find someone trying to make sense of the general lack of dramatic works in the Portuguese language during the seventeenth century, but he oversimplifies the issue when he attributes the disparity between Spanish and Portuguese artistic production on

the annexation, not only because the matter is much more complex, but also because the categories “Spanish” and “Portuguese,” at least in literature, are not nearly as stable as he makes them out to be.

Many Portuguese dramatists of the annexation period continued along the same patriotic lines that Vicente established during the first half of the sixteenth century, and Machado carried into the seventeenth. As Machado’s works describe, the stakes of literature, language, and politics had changed as a result of the annexation. A close reading of Ângela de Azevedo and Jacinto Cordeiro’s *comedias* reveals the uniqueness and variety of Portuguese-authored attempts to stage the nation in the seventeenth century. Both authors dramatize Portugal’s rich folkloric tradition, incorporate Portuguese history, and weave other national themes into their plays (e.g., Lisbon’s grandeur, *saudade*, qualitative supremacy). While Cordeiro reads much more overtly Portuguese than Azevedo, the female dramatist is also upfront about her affection for Portugal. Cordeiro takes broad, unmistakable strokes, announcing, before the work even begins, that the reader can expect a glorified rendering of the fatherland. Azevedo, on the other hand, exerts her *Portugalidade* in subtle ways, inserting herself between the lines, brilliantly locked in the tropes she employs. Cordeiro was one of the most successful Portuguese dramatists of the Golden Age. Azevedo’s works, if staged at all, were performed for small, most likely female, audiences. Ultimately, both playwrights embody the Portuguese nation in distinct, yet complementary ways.

From an early age, Jacinto Cordeiro had a clear sense of what he wanted to accomplish as a dramatist. In the prologue to his first *comedia*, *La entrada del rey en*

Portugal (1621), published when he was only fifteen years old, the budding playwright reveals the teleology of not only this particular work, but his entire literary corpus. A typographical error on the cover page, however, reveals the patriotic underpinnings of the work before Cordeiro can even announce his stated purpose. While almost certainly accidental, the Lisbon publication reads *La entrada del rey em Portugal*. Leaving the preposition “em” in Portuguese serves as the first gesture of a symbolic striptease that will eventually leave the true Portuguese character of the work completely exposed to its readers. Turning a few pages, the prologue reveals Cordeiro’s inspiration for writing: “tenho de eternizar grandezas de minha Patria.” At least two things stand out from this statement. First is the author’s choice to write the prologue in his native tongue rather than in Spanish, the language of the *comedia*. This is important in that it demonstrates a prevailing commitment to Portugal. Spanish was not only the language of prestige on the Peninsula at this time, but, on top of that, Portuguese dramatists had no hope of staging works in their native tongue. Where Cordeiro does have a choice—the prologue—he revealingly opts for Portuguese. What is also significant about his stated purpose is that it distinguishes *his* motivations from the many Spanish dramatists who also took up Portuguese history and themes in their works. That is not to say that Lope, Tirso, Vélez de Guevara, Calderón, and others did not care for Portugal, only that their intentions were not as Lusocentric, nor as personal, as Cordeiro’s (“*minha Patria*”).

Hence, from the beginning of his literary career, Cordeiro seems to have had a sense of what he wanted to accomplish in his works. That they would be staged throughout Iberia, only adds an exclamation point to his nationalist intentions. The

significance of the aforementioned title goes far beyond the apparent editing mistake previously mentioned. Philip III's visit to Portugal in 1619 inspired an outpouring of literary works, including Soror Violante do Céu's *Comedia de S. Engracia*, which had the honor of being performed for the visiting king. A number of other works, including Cordeiro's *comedia*, specifically discuss, at least in the title, the king's celebrated visit to Portugal. This includes, most notably, Francisco Rodrigues Lobo's *La jornada que la Magestad Catholica del Rey Felipe III hizo al reino de Portugal, y el triunfo y pompa con que le recibió la insigne ciudad de Lisboa* (1623). Similar to other works commemorating this event, with the exception of Cordeiro's *comedia*, this text pays poetic tribute to the king. While the title of Cordeiro's play may suggest that the author also intends to praise Philip III like his contemporaries, the king is only peripherally situated on the stage, a side note to the real protagonist: Portugal.

One of the first overt attempts to glorify Portugal is the author's consideration of Lisbon, "una Ciudad tan gallarda, / donde tantas alegrías, / tantas fiestas, tantas danças, / tantos fuegos, tantas luzes, / tantas invenciones varias, / tan graves actos de amor/ se hazen" (fol. 3). This hyperbolic description of Lisbon was a common practice among nationally inclined writers of the time—not to mention many Spanish authors ("Poetas" 16)—and continues throughout Cordeiro's play (fol. 4, 14). While Ares Montes's contention that authors glorified Lisbon with hopes of persuading the king to make it the capital of the dual monarchy seems reasonable, it would be inaccurate to reduce the outpouring of praise to this single motive. Much of the Portuguese elite that supported the annexation in the first place felt that the Hapsburg capital would eventually move from

Madrid to Lisbon. This kind of zeal, however, faded over the decades. By 1619, Portugal was beginning to pull away from the empire. It seems more likely—not to mention more in line with the the actual *comedia*—to read the title of Cordeiro’s work satirically, since it has little to do with Philip III. Rather than give voice to the minority elite, it seems much more probable that Cordeiro’s praise of Lisbon follows after Camões’s tastes. In *Os Lusíadas*, for example, Camões offers this description of Lisbon: “E tu, nobre Lisboa, que no mundo / facilmente das outras és princesa” (3.57.1-2). This apostrophe complements another well-known selection from the sixth Canto in which Camões describes Bacchus’s anger over the divine favoring of the Portuguese and their esteemed capital: “Via estar todo o Céu determinado / De fazer de Lisboa nova Roma; / Não no pode estorvar, que destinado / Está doutro Poder que tudo doma” (6.7.1-4). The providentialism of this passage and the overall praise of Lisbon in this and other works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries extends the meaning of Cordeiro’s characterization of Lisbon well beyond the self-fashioning that Ares Montes suggests.

The staging of the Portuguese nation in Cordeiro’s play, however, includes more than singing the glories of the capital city. The work attempts to define the Portuguese identity by stressing a number of essential characteristics. This includes “la lealtad Lusitana” (fol. 3, 6), “el amor Portugues” (fol. 3, 6), the David versus Goliath self-conception (fol. 4), “gran valor” (fol. 6), and their unyielding obedience (fol. 14), just to name a few. Cordeiro also consistently suggests that Portugal is the envy of the world (fol. 3, 10) and “sin igual” (fol. 10, 11). In fact, in comparison to other great civilizations, he states that “la Lusitana grandeza, / [. . .] ha dexado atras a quantos / se hizieron en

Roma ò Grecia” (fol. 14). Perhaps the most significant comparison comes, however, towards the end of the play when one of his characters, upon discovering improprieties between a Castilian and his sister, contrasts moral conduct in Portugal with that of Castile: “En Portugal / no tratan essa baxeza / que *alla* llaneza llamais” (fol. 38; my emphasis). Here Cordeiro not only reflects the competitive spirit of early modern Iberian literature, but intensifies it furthermore by bringing in national loyalties.

As if these references were not enough to reveal the Portuguese character of his *comedia*, Cordeiro stages a competition among three of the male characters of the play in which each tries to out-perform the others in his poetic rendering of Portuguese history, drawing inspiration from a number of arches inscribed with Portugal’s past deeds. What is particularly surprising about this contest is the fact that it comprises more than eight hundred verses, which ends up covering most of the second act. This excess—another trademark of the time—does not enhance the work artistically, but accomplishes a great deal ideologically. While his work only flirts with the aesthetic potential of the *comedia nueva*, it is fully engaged with the nationalist agenda put forward in the prologue. As the reader might expect, Cordeiro concludes the work by echoing the “thesis statement” of the prologue in the final verses: “Y aqui senado se acaban / los triumphos de Portugal, / y el dichoso en las desdichas / nuestras faltas perdonad” (fol. 39). The Portuguese playwright once again underlines the fact that this work is not about Philip III nor the Spanish empire, but an opportunity to stage the glories of Portugal.

La entrada del rey serves as the perfect gateway into Cordeiro’s literary corpus. The prologues of *Seis Comedias famosas* (1630) and *Segunda parte de las Comedias*

(1634), for example, announce a similar teleology to that put forward in his first *comedia*, and likewise appear in Portuguese. Whether by direct praise or by the fame generated from the artistic merit of his plays, Cordeiro's purpose remains centered on the eternal glory of Portugal. The fact that his basic purpose for writing remains unaltered throughout his career reveals a certain degree of substance to the prologue from his first play, which Ares Montes superficially groups with other opportunistic texts from the time. By this I do not mean to suggest that the fifteen-year-old had everything mapped out at such a young age. Clearly there was more to his work than the dramatist states from the outset. Within a decade, however, Cordeiro was back saying essentially the same thing. In the prologue to the *Segunda parte*, he justifies his nationalist focus by stating that Portuguese deeds "excedem o credito humano, [. . .] excedem a todas as monarquias do mundo." This passage, as many others like it from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, underlines the preeminence of Portugal. Camões and his many seventeenth-century disciples, including Cordeiro, offer a clear and consistent answer to the question posed in *Os Lusíadas* concerning the worth of Portugal in relation to the rest of the world: "E julgareis qual he mais excelente, / Se ser do mundo Rey, se de tal gente?" (1.10.7-8).

Cordeiro's *Los doze de Inglaterra* stresses national identity in ways similar to *La entrada del Rey*, but also includes a number of creative innovations. This *comedia* relates a well-known story of Portuguese folklore also celebrated in *Os Lusíadas*, the truth of which is inconsequential to the desire to create history that coincides with his idea of *Portugalidade*. Benedict Anderson describes this creative historiography as a magic-act

in which chance turns into destiny (12). As he explains, this occurs because “nationalism thinks in terms of historical destinies” (149). In the first scene of Act 1, Cordeiro sets up the frame of the traditional story: twelve Portuguese knights are obliged by their honor to travel to England to challenge the twelve infamous English knights whose disrespect for women demands a noble response, which England is apparently unable to provide. While eleven travel by sea, one of the twelve goes by land, rescuing the Almirante de Francia on his way.

In a passage similar to the hyperbolic description of Lisbon from *La entrada del Rey en Portugal*, Cordeiro describes the worth of these twelve Portuguese knights: “cavalleros tan supremos, / tan valientes, y arrogantes, / tan esforçados, tan buenos” (fol. 61). Cordeiro doubles the rhetorical value of this statement by later heaping his praise on Don Alvaro Vaz de Almada, the one knight who travels by land. That is to say, in the same way that Don Alvaro represents in part what the twelve are as a whole, so do the twelve reflect in part what the Portuguese embody as a people. Towards the end of his opening monologue, he explains that “sólo un Portugués” is enough to accomplish almost anything (fol. 61). Later he surpasses this original position with an even more audacious suggestion: “Que es conmigo loco Ingles, / por los Evangelios Santos, / que basta para otros tantos / la mitad de un Portugués” (fol. 63). Here Cordeiro exaggerates the strength of the constantly outnumbered Portuguese, claiming that half of one Portuguese knight is enough to take on several others. The constant references to just one or half of a Portuguese knight are important in that they synecdochically reflect all of Portugal, a strategy that remains in force through the end of the *comedia*. By the end of Act 1, “Los

Leones Portugueses” have defeated the English, restored honor to the women, and begun their return home (fol. 64).

At the beginning of the second act, Costa, the well-named *gracioso* of the play, appears with his master Don Alvaro and one of the other twelve Portuguese knights who has joined them for the journey to Portugal. This includes a promised visit to the Almirante, whom he had previously rescued from a near-death situation. Following Don Alvaro’s statement that little can be known by one who does not read, Costa nostalgically remembers a *donato* who once invited him to his bookstore, which, fortunately for the illiterate lackey, ended up being a *bodega*. To end his comic story, Costa makes use of Portuguese: “E falando em conclusão / em nossa lingua verdades, / inda tenho saudades / do vinho, do frade não” (fol. 65). This brilliant moment of metatheater highlights Cordeiro’s symbolic invoking of the collective self—“nossa lingua”—not to mention a reference to the nationally meaningful and uniquely Portuguese word *saudade* (see chapter one). In the first instance, Cordeiro paints the “world of plurals” that reinforces the national imaginary (Anderson 32). References to *us*, *our*, and *we* are an important step in the simultaneous conception of the national self. *Saudade* is particularly relevant in this call to the collective because it is not merely a word in Portuguese like the rest of the passage—although this shift from Spanish to Portuguese is significant—but an untranslatable Portuguese word. *Saudade* was no stranger to annexation literature, appearing in the works of virtually every Portuguese author of the time, including each of the major writers included in this study.

The rest of *Los doze de Inglaterra* reads like many other *comedias de enredos*. There are letters, balconies, tokens, love interests, jealousy, cases of honor, a near duel, and most of the other ingredients Lope outlines in the *Arte nuevo*. Cordeiro, however, continues to mix occasional references to his native Portugal with the rest of the work, always finding some way to exalt his homeland. In comparison to *La entrada del Rey*, this *comedia* is a much better reflection of Cordeiro's artistic talent. The storyline, characterization, *enredos*, and resolution are carefully crafted in a way that complements the nationalist undertones of the work. Thus, while *La entrada del Rey en Portugal* is more of an attempt at the *comedia* by a young Portuguese nationalist trying to find his way, *Los doze de Inglaterra* represents the work of a seasoned dramatist who has successfully married his art with his ideology. Cordeiro's ability to raise the quality of his dramaturgy without compromising his nationalist message not only brought him success throughout the Peninsula, but also the favor of his countrymen following the Restoration of 1640. In fact, the Chamber of Commerce of Coimbra actually commissioned the performance of one of Jacinto Cordeiro's plays in celebration of this historical moment (Ares, "Portugal" 13). It seems clear, then, that the nationalism apparent in Cordeiro's *comedias* now, was similarly received by audiences then. Why else would his works have been staged in celebration of the return of Portuguese sovereignty, unless the Portuguese likewise saw in the dramatist the very nationalist imprint I have been describing? Indeed, Cordeiro's dramatizations of the Portuguese nation may have been more effective at promoting *Portugalidade* than any other seventeenth-century Portuguese author.

Given the widespread acclaim his works received, how is it that Cordeiro remains in obscurity? As is the case with Portuguese annexation literature in general, Cordeiro does not deserve the critical cold shoulder he has faced during the past centuries. Vázquez Cuesta captures the problem perfectly: “sólo por el hecho de ser portugués de nacimiento y de corazón se explica la poca atención que Jacinto Cordeiro—autor que por su opción lingüística no puede ser incluido en las historias de la literatura portuguesa” (637). I agree with her assessment of Cordeiro’s Portuguese heart, but I do not believe that we have to continue recycling the false idea that national canons have to maintain linguistic purity at all times. If language is not one of the determining characteristics of nationhood, as modern nation theories widely agree, why do scholars continue to defend their respective canons on the basis of linguistic purism? Being Portuguese does not, in my view, justify the relegation of annexation literature to the periphery of Spanish letters, just as the choice to write in Spanish should not keep Portuguese readers from reading and appreciating these authors and their important role in Peninsular culture.

As much as Cordeiro stands out as a prominent fixture of seventeenth-century Iberian theater, he was not the only Portuguese dramatist having success throughout the Peninsula. Others such as Soror Violante do Céu, Manuel Galhegos, and Pedro Salgado also come to mind. The most widely published Portuguese playwright of the era, however, was Juan Matos Fragoso (1610-89), who published dozens of works individually and in collaboration with many of the most prominent Spanish dramatists of the period, including Juan Pérez de Montalván, Agustín Moreto, and Luís Vélez de

Guevara. If seventeenth-century Portuguese drama were a coin, Matos Fragoso would represent one side and Cordeiro the other, with the former taking advantage of his Spanish proficiency for self-promotion and personal achievement, and the latter using it primarily to exalt Portugal. That is not to say that it can only be one way or the other, only that the two authors generally fall into those two categories.

Although not as recognized as the other Portuguese authors of this study, Ângela de Azevedo demonstrates a commitment to Portugal in her plays not unlike Cordeiro's unyielding love for his homeland. Her background is largely unknown, with only three surviving *comedias* constituting her literary corpus: *El muerto disimulado*, *La margarita del Tajo que dió nombre á Santarén*, and *Dicha y desdicha del juego y devoción de la Virgen*. The biographical information available, celebrates Azevedo for her discretion and talent, recognizing her relationship with Isabel de Borbón, to whom she was a lady-in-waiting (García Péres 7). The general absence of information on the playwright limits our understanding of Azevedo, at least in comparison to her more well-known Spanish and Portuguese contemporaries. Her writings, nonetheless, paint a clearer picture of the dramatist than critics have previously acknowledged.

Since Teresa Soufas's publication of Azevedo's *comedias* in *Women's Acts: Plays by Women Dramatists of Spain's Golden Age* (1997), most critical studies related to the author have concentrated on the construction and performance of gender within her plays. Christopher Gascón's observation that "Azevedo's female characters are anything but one-dimensional," however, could just as easily be used to describe the dramatist herself (125). Of the multiple layers that define Azevedo and her works, her native connection to

Portugal is certainly one of the most prominent, although her nationality has received relatively little critical attention.¹⁰ Soufas's text, in fact, blurs this very issue by lumping Azevedo together with her Spanish contemporaries under the banner of *Spain's* Golden Age (an issue to which I will return at the end of the chapter). While it is clear that Azevedo and many of her Portuguese contemporaries contributed to the Spanish Golden Age in meaningful ways, it is a mistake to ignore the fascinating markers of identity and origin that many Portuguese-authored works—especially *comedias*—contain. As in the case of Cordeiro, Azevedo writes her *Portugalidade* in between the lines of her plays.

The fact that Azevedo, Cordeiro, and their Portuguese contemporaries wrote *comedias* in Spanish does not diminish the importance of their native claim to Lusitânia. If anything, writing in the language of the dominant culture highlights the complexities of early modern identity by problematizing emerging categories of nationhood. Azevedo, as many other Portuguese annexation authors, affirms her *Portugalidade* at the very moment she evidences her Spanishness. Rather than see this as grounds to ignore her works (as many have reasoned when it comes to Portuguese annexation literature), or even as a problem to be solved, I embrace the complexities surrounding the dramatist and her works, arguing that while the author clearly transmits her love for and loyalty to Portugal—staging the nation much like her Portuguese predecessors—she is more than a Portuguese playwright. Similar to the cross-dressing of Lisarda and Clarindo in *El muerto disimulado*, and the self-determination of Irene in *La margarita del Tajo*, Azevedo's

¹⁰ Maroto Camino, Doménech, and Mujica give some attention to the fact that the dramatist was Portuguese. For a more complete treatment of the subject, see my article "Patriotism and Revolt: Uncovering the Portuguese in Ângela de Azevedo."

crossings between Spain and Portugal, Spanish and Portuguese, underscore the heterogeneity of Iberian culture at this time, highlighting the dramatist's multiculturalism.

From geography to language to religion, Azevedo's *comedias* have a strong Portuguese presence, giving the author a stage upon which to celebrate Lusitânia. Each of Azevedo's plays, for example, takes place in a specific part of Portugal, namely Porto (*Dicha y Desdicha*), Lisbon (*El muerto disimulado*), and Santarém (*La margarita del Tajo*). This is particularly significant considering the common *comedia* practice of situating all or part of a work in a foreign land. This often occurs in historical *comedias* such as Lope's *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* and *El Brasil restituído*, Zárate's *La conquista de México*, Tirso's *Las Quinas de Portugal*, and Vélez de Guevara's *Reinar después de morir*. This practice was not limited to historical works, however. Lope situates *El castigo sin venganza* in Italy, Tirso sets a number of his works in Portugal (e.g., *Averígüelo Vargas* and *El vergonzoso en palacio*), and, in perhaps the most well-known case, Calderón places *La vida es sueño* in Poland. Azevedo builds on this same convention (sending her characters abroad), but instead of situating her piece in some unknown foreign destination, she elects the heart and soul of her native soil. After all, Porto and Lisbon represent the centers, past and present, of Portugal and its cultural development. If the author was not in a position to return to Portugal, she might as well send her characters there. The choice of Porto is especially significant since Portugal derives its own name from this ancient city (Mattoso 59). As Bárbara Mujica observes, "El hecho de que situara sus tres obras existentes en Portugal a pesar de vivir muchos años en la corte española es un testimonio del cariño que siempre sintió por su país

natal” (232). Azevedo’s zeal for her homeland, however, only begins with the cities in which they take place. In her *comedias* she also evokes Portugal’s maritime tradition, shipwreck motif, religious folklore, language, and many other characteristics of her native land. All of these elements combine to advance one cohesive message: “*eu sou portuguesa.*”

Azevedo’s *comedias* are clearly encoded with her affinity for Portugal. One of the best examples of this occurs in *El muerto disimulado*. In the opening scene, Jacinta tells her servant, Dorotea, of the extreme sorrow she feels as a result of the passing of her lover, Clarindo. Shortly thereafter, Lisarda, Clarindo’s sister, appears in Lisbon dressed as a man and ready to avenge her brother’s death. Lisarda’s slapstick sidekick, Papagayo, immediately speaks of his affection for Lisbon upon entering the city:

PAPAGAYO. Ya en Lisboa estás y este
el tercero es de Palacio,
tropiezo hermoso de Thetis,
rica adoración del Tajo.

LISARDA. ¡Gallarda plaza por cierto!

PAPAGAYO. Todo en Lisboa es gallardo,
pues no ha visto cosa boa,
según lo afirma el adagio,
el que no ha visto Lisboa. (1.545-54)

Azevedo introduces these two characters to the play with these lines of praise for Lisbon. While positive references to Lisbon were also prevalent among Spanish authors (e.g., Torres Naharro’s *Tinellaria*), it signifies differently when coming from a Portuguese author. Anyone could potentially make use of this same aphorism, but not every dramatist has seen nor esteems Lisbon to the same degree as Azevedo apparently does. She highlights her native claim to Lisbon by alternating between Spanish and Portuguese—

boa, or good, being the Portuguese equivalent of the Spanish *buena*—a linguistic move that has a doubling effect on Lisbon’s (*Lisboa*’s) goodness. Given that the Portuguese prided themselves so much on their capital city, this patriotic gesture should come as no surprise to readers. Azevedo’s other plays also contain references to the geography of her homeland, including a number of cities, rivers, and other significant places.

Dicha y desdicha takes place in Porto (1.1026, 1160), the location of Portugal’s most important waterway (the Douro). The play, in fact, develops around a number of themes related to the ocean. Towards the end of the first act, Tijera and Don Fadrique appear for the first time, having returned to Portugal after ten years of commercial success in India. Their joyous return, however, went awry, as a storm nearly cost them their lives. Between India, where they were, and Porto, where they are now, Azevedo succeeds in situating her work within Portuguese spaces. What is more, she links one of the most important issues of the play—economic status—to the sea. *Os Lusíadas* establishes the maritime spirit of the Portuguese and their deep connection to the ocean, to say nothing of the seemingly endless literary references to the Portuguese and their connection to the sea.¹¹ In contrast to analogous situations in other Spanish *comedias*, the two characters are returning from colonies in India, originally founded by the Portuguese, not the Spanish colonies in the West Indies. The shipwreck theme flourished in Portuguese literature during the early modern period, inspiring a subgenre that would find its greatest expression in *A história trágico-marítima* (1735-36) (Williams 48). Azevedo

¹¹ Regarding their maritime past, one scholar notes “Portugal foi a primeira nação a aproveitar-se totalmente da tecnologia, melhorando ou aperfeiçoando alguns aspectos, inventando outros e colocando o todo na prática numa escala global enorme, até então desconhecida” (Williams 40). Camões’s work chronicles Vasco da Gama’s famous journey to India. Through his pen Camões immortalizes the famous voyage, which created an unprecedented passage to the Orient and inspired Portugal’s greatest season of economic prosperity.

attributes the possession of wealth among the two *galanes*, Don Fadrique and Felisardo, to their respective maritime ventures. Like so many of his countrymen, both real and fictitious, Don Fadrique has made his fortunes at sea, although Azevedo omits the details of his adventures abroad. His trip to the East Indies, together with Don Felisardo's failure to reach the Portuguese colony, set up one of the primary conflicts of the play.

The initial exchange between the Tijera and Fadrique sets the fearful *gracioso* in opposition to the fearless *galán*. In Tijera's opinion, man belongs on land, not at sea, to which Fadrique retorts that both land and sea present a variety of dangers. Tijera, however, is not convinced:

Pues si en la tierra hay desgracias,
¿qué será en la mar, señor,
donde hay corsarios, piratas,
sustos, naufragios, zozobras;
y si acaso de bonanza
un día un cristiano tiene,
al punto se le preparan
a millares las tormentas,
a montones las borrascas,
y a veces un huracán
cuando menos de la casta
del que nos iba poniendo
en la postrera jornada;
en términos de no vernos
ésta de la Lusitania
bella ciudad, dulce fin,
que es del Duero y nuestra patria? (1.941-57)

In this passage, Tijera doubts that the advantages of being at sea outweigh the threats, especially when the land left behind is *Lusitania* (fittingly rhymed with *patria*). By referring to Portugal in this way, Azevedo is able to evoke her native land's antiquity.

There is much more at play in these lines, however, than the mere response of a *gracioso*

to his master. Fadrique, in fact, epitomizes the maritime spirit of the Portuguese—the same courage that led them to initially take on the dangers that Tijera describes, and tame the waves of the sea for their benefit and glory. While, for Tijera, Portugal ends where the ocean begins, for Fadrique the land and the sea are one (“ya sea por mar o por tierra” [1.940]). In the end, Fadrique credits the Virgin Mary with their successes (1.992). Tijera echoes his praise, explaining that she calmed the sea in their behalf. This entire conversation hearkens to a number of national discourses already established within Portuguese literature. Later in the play, in fact Azevedo attributes Portuguese successes on the sea to Mary, stating “es María del mar luciente estrella” (2.1514). That is, the Virgin is the guiding light of the Portuguese. This verse echoes Azevedo’s many literary compatriots who likewise viewed Portuguese triumphs abroad in terms of providentialism. Between the divine favor they receive, the importance of the sea, and the invocation of *Lusitania*, Azevedo saturates this scene with *Portugalidade*.

While *Dicha y desdicha* borrows primarily from historical and literary themes in its depiction of Portugal, *La margarita del Tajo* takes a slightly different approach. As Soufas explains, this work captures Azevedo’s connection to Portugal’s rich folkloric tradition through the dramatization of Saint Irene, a well-known figure within Portuguese hagiography and balladry (2). In *Europa Portuguesa* (1679), for example, Manuel de Faria e Sousa dedicates several pages to the telling of Irene’s legendary story (1.3.19.351-54). Because Faria e Sousa’s work was likely published after Azevedo’s death, his text could not have served as a direct source for Azevedo’s play. The *comedia*, nonetheless, echoes Faria e Sousa’s description quite thoroughly, incorporating nearly

every geographical reference mentioned in the legend: Nabantia (Tomar) where Saint Irene was born, the Nabão River in which her body was discarded, the Tagus River in which her body was discovered, and the city Scalabis (now Santarém), where the Nabão and the Tagus meet.¹² Reference to the Tagus, especially in the title of the play, stands out because both Spain and Portugal share and esteem the river. Making a Portuguese saint the *margarita*, or pearl, of the Tagus consecrates the river for Portugal, not Spain, even though the river begins and finds its greatest extension in Spain. Faria e Sousa hints at these very ideas in his discussion of Irene: “Assi tiene esta Santa en Portugal el mas illustre, el más pomposo Entierro del Mundo: pues uno de los mayores Rios es su Tumulo: una de las mayores Villas su Epitafio. Una de las más principales aguas la esconde; una de la más ilustres Poblaciones la publica” (1.3.19.354). Whether claiming the river for Saint Irene, extending Portugal’s dominion to the sea, or exalting Lisbon, Azevedo finds many different ways to publish (“publica”) the supremacy of Portugal.

Whereas most annexation authors typically express the nationalist aim of their works—in the case that there is one—at the beginning of the text, Azevedo, whose *comedias* do not include the standard introductory sections, closes *La margarita del Tajo* by laying out, in no uncertain terms, the purpose of her writing. As previously mentioned, *La margarita del Tajo* dramatizes the legendary story of Saint Irene and her martyrdom. Rather than ending the play with the conventional request that her “audience” forgive the flaws in her work, Azevedo states that it does not matter what they think, because it was not written for them:

¹² While the overlap between Faria e Sousa’s account and Azevedo’s play is interesting, perhaps even more fascinating are the points of contrast, which may result from the sources themselves or from the dramatist’s artistic license.

Así el poeta la acaba,
y advierte que para ella,
ni pide perdón ni Víctor,
sea mala o sea buena;
pues no la escribió, Senado,
en gracia o lisonja vuestra,
sino por la devoción
de la santa portuguesa. (3.4185-92)

The explicit claim in these verses is devotion to the *Portuguese* saint. Both the hagiographic figure and her Portuguese identity are meaningful, although my present interest rests upon the latter. The way she ends her play is revealing as to the character of this and other works by the playwright. All of the religious, linguistic, and geographic connections to her country make Azevedo's play a celebration of Portugal. What is more, her disregard for her audience is in open defiance of Lope and his insistence in the *Arte nuevo* that the bottom line of dramaturgy is to please the audience. Some might argue that Azevedo exhibits little concern for her audience because she had none—that is, her works, if staged at all, would have been performed on a very small scale—but that does not take away from the national consciousness of these final verses, not the defiant spirit they exhibit. The author draws a line between the Spanish audience and the Portuguese saint, making it clear where she sides on the matter. While she does not express the teleology of her other *comedias* as explicitly, there are clear indications in each of her works that one of the playwright's principal objectives is to celebrate Portugal—the land that she left, but which apparently never left her.

One of the most fascinating elements of *Portugalidade* that Azevedo incorporates into her plays is the occasional use of the Portuguese language. Compared to some of Tirso's *comedias* (e.g., *El amor médico*), Azevedo's use of Portuguese in her plays is

quite minimal. Decoding Azevedo's alternation between Spanish and Portuguese, however, reveals a conscious attempt to elevate her native tongue and, by extension, her native land. The playwright wastes no time introducing Portuguese in *La margarita del Tajo*. Etcétera, Britaldo's cleverly named *gracioso*, switches to Portuguese to emphasize that he has heard enough of his master's "letanías, / digresiones y progresos, / hipérboles, elogios / y otros encarecimientos" (1.429-32). With rhetorical flourish, he asks, "¿Posible es que para un hombre / decir que se siente preso / de amor, sean menester / circunstancias ni rodeos / si no decir claramente / con un portugués despejo / "Querolhe bem, acabouse?" (1.445-51). The way the Portuguese enters the dialogue—with that native air ("portugués despejo")—may indicate that the character did not feel that Spanish could express what he needed. These lines may also reflect what communication was like for the Portuguese who lived in a predominantly Spanish-speaking world (something to the effect of "where I come from we say"). For the *gracioso*, Portuguese possesses a clarity ("claramente") and simplicity that, for whatever reason, surpasses what he might have said in Spanish. Azevedo makes no effort to explain how it is that Etcétera knows Portuguese, making it that much easier to associate the lines with the author herself.

Not unlike Faria e Sousa, Azevedo introduces untranslatable Portuguese words and expressions into her works. The finest example of this appears in Act 1 of *El muerto disimulado*, where Azevedo introduces *saudade* to her Spanish-speaking audience.¹³

Although Spanish language dictionaries have, for centuries, recognized the importance of this word in Portuguese and the absence of an equivalent in Spanish, the word has never

¹³ Audience may not be the right word to use in conjunction with Azevedo, whose *comedias*, if staged at all, would have been performed for very small audiences at Court, where she served as a lady-in-waiting for Isabel of Borbón.

been adopted, although a number of Spanish American authors have incorporated it in their works.¹⁴ While numerous writers have offered their definition of *saudade* over the centuries (see Botelho), including a number of Portuguese authors preceding Azevedo (see chapter one), perhaps the most relevant definition comes from Azevedo's contemporary Francisco Manuel de Melo. In *Epanáforas Amorasas*, Melo describes the unparalleled nature of *saudade*:

[L]hes toca mais aos Portugueses, que a outra nação do mundo, o darlhe conta desta generosa paixão, a quem sòmente nós sabemos o nome, chamando-lhe: *Saudade*; quero eu agora tomar sòbre mim esta notícia. Florece entre os Portuguezes a saudade, por duas causas, mais certas em nós, que em outra gente do mundo; porque de ambas essas causas, tem seu princípio. Amor e ausência, são os pais da saudade; e como nosso natural, é entre as mais nações, conhecido por amoroso, e nossas dilatadas viagens ocasionam as maiores ausências; de aí vem, que donde se acha muito amor e ausência larga, as saudades sejam mais certas. (224-25)

In this passage, Melo establishes a collective sense of Portuguese identity through his repeated use of the subject pronoun “nós” and the possessive adjective “nosso.” He describes *saudade* as a sensation felt by many different nations yet articulated exclusively by the Portuguese. The word is charged with identity and history. Melo goes on to link *saudade* to love and absence, contending that the two conditions culminate among the Portuguese (which would explain why they have a word to describe the feeling resulting from an intense combination of the two). The idea that *saudade* communicates something that most of humanity feels, but only the Portuguese can express, repeats itself

¹⁴ Pablo Neruda affirms the untranslatability of the word in his poem “Saudade,” found in the collection “Los crepúsculos de Maruri” from *Crepusculario* (1921-23). The opening line admits, “Saudade —¿qué será?... yo no sé” (136). There is a widespread, yet undocumented, poem in Portuguese titled “Saudade” attributed to Neruda as well; it is not, however, a translation of the Spanish poem from *Crepusculario*. In *Tala* (1938), Gabriela Mistral titles the sixth section of her collection “Saudade,” which consists of five poems and a brief explanation of the title.

throughout Portuguese literary history. Consequently, the use of the word in literature should not be overlooked nor underestimated. It is one of the easiest and most effective ways to evoke *Portugalidade*.

In *El muerto disimulado* Azevedo makes no attempt to replace *saudade* with an inadequate Spanish equivalent, but instead proudly drops the word right in the middle of the text. Similar to Lisarda and Papagayo in the earlier example, Azevedo does not let the first scene go by without characterizing Jacinta in some uniquely Portuguese way.

Speaking of the deep sense of loss she feels in the absence of her lover, Jacinta makes repeated mention of *saudade*, multiplying its presence through the use of polyptoton¹⁵:

Con esto nos despedimos
si él saudoso, yo más saudosa;
que es cierto, que a quien se queda,
más las saudades ahogan. (1.353-56)

The appearance of this term is highlighted by Azevedo's own self-referential explanation of its unintelligibility for her Spanish-speaking audiences:

No repares en la frase,
que de ausencia este síntoma
solamente se declara,
cuando en Portugués se nombra. (1.357-60)

Echoing the previous passage from Melo, Azevedo defines *saudade* as a symptom of absence. As Maroto Camino explains, "Azevedo, recalling her own geographical and linguistic displacement, emphasizes that only the word *saudade* can describe accurately the feelings of the protagonist" (316). However, Jacinta should not need to explain the meaning of *saudade* to Dorotea, a fellow native of Portugal. Therefore, one can only

¹⁵ Polyptoton = "Repetition of words from the same root but with different endings" (Lanham 117).

assume that she is speaking to her Spanish audience. This metafictional scene underscores Azevedo's consciousness of the untranslatability of *saudade* and her own identification with Portugal. The reader cannot help but step back and read *saudade* beyond its immediate function in the work. *Saudade*, in other words, is not merely the symptom of two separated lovers (Jacinta and Clarindo), but also the byproduct of a people (the Portuguese) and the devotion they feel for their homeland (Portugal). Azevedo and her compatriots are distanced from the self-actualized Portugal of yesteryear, leaving them in a condition that can only ("solamente") find proper expression in Portuguese.

Despite the examples previously cited, reading Azevedo's *Portugalidade* is not without its challenges. Azevedo's audience, for example, was much different than, say, Cordeiro's. If her works were ever staged, it would have likely been for small audiences (probably female). It is unclear what her motivations were for writing in the first place. In *La margarita del Tajo*, Azevedo explains that she writes in praise of the Portuguese saint, but it is not clear whether she was purely self-driven in her writing or whether she was commissioned by another (presumably Isabel) to do so. If she was commissioned, did Azevedo choose the content of her works, or was she specifically asked to write about her homeland. That is to say, the greater market forces that impacted Faria e Sousa, Cordeiro, and others, probably did not have a direct influence on Azevedo. The dramatist, nonetheless, may have been well aware of the strong current of Portuguese-themed *comedias* being written during the first decades of the seventeenth century. Not having to meet the expectations of a large and diverse audience, it could be said that Azevedo's

comedias are more organic than those of her contemporaries, since she did not have to meet the expectations of a large and diverse audience. Whatever else critics are able to uncover will surely complement the Portuguese reading of Azevedo's plays that I have, in part, conducted in this chapter. As so many other Portuguese expatriates writing during the annexation, Azevedo did not leave Portugal behind, but, instead, praised her homeland by staging the nation.

While there is certainly nothing wrong with the Spanish rendering, Ángela de Acevedo, the dramatist and her works remain incomplete until we acknowledge the Portuguese-born Ângela de Azevedo. Orthographically and critically it may appear to be but a small detail, yet it shifts the way we read the dramatist and her *comedias*. One of the most fundamental aspects of her three plays is Portugal, which the dramatist consistently emphasizes in her works, even though none of them are as overtly Portuguese as Cordeiro's *comedias* or perhaps even Lope's *El más galán portugués* or Tirso's *Quinas*. Azevedo's stagings of the Portuguese nation are more subtle, and, perhaps, more natural. That is, the dramatist did not have to turn to historiographical works or other source materials because Portugal was an organic part of her persona (her life was her source material). The framing of her *comedias* relies heavily on Portuguese culture. Her plays show a preference for Portuguese themes and an insistence on remembering and honoring the identity of her homeland. Her approach to staging the nation hearkens back to many of her Portuguese predecessors and links the dramatist with the current of Portuguese annexation writers who also made Portugal the focus of their writings in Spanish. Fortunately for Azevedo and the field of Golden Age Theater, her works were

rediscovered in the 1990s and integrated thereafter into the *comedia* tradition. In this process of incorporation and celebration of another female dramatist, however, it would be a mistake to overlook Azevedo's native claim to Portugal; a reality that enlightens our understanding of the dramatist, her works, and the time in which she was writing.

Seventeenth-century Portuguese literature is clearly not the "wasteland" that some have made it out to be (Haberly 50). The decadence of this time is in the eye of the beholder, who, in the past, has often failed to give them more than a superficial consideration. That they remain, for the most part, on the periphery of the Spanish and Portuguese literary canons does not reflect poorly on them, but on us, the gatekeepers. That Ângela de Azevedo's *comedias* have been recovered is a great start, and hopefully a prologue of things to come in the field. Jacinto Cordeiro, for one, merits much more critical attention. That he was considered one of the best of his time should be enough to lead critics to at least look at his works now (Vázquez 637). His Portuguese origin and nationalism do not justify his neglect by *comedia* scholars, nor should his widespread use of Spanish marginalize him in the Portuguese literary canon. The two masterfully dramatize *Portugalidade* in their *comedias*. They call attention to the significance of *saudade*, hearken to their national poet (Camões), and invoke Portuguese history and folklore. They also pay tribute to their homeland in less conspicuous ways: situating their works in Portugal, reinforcing Portuguese essentialism, and occasionally introducing words or verses in their native tongue. All of these gestures combine to form an intelligible rhetoric of nationhood. While they are not saying exactly the same things about Portugal, their voices harmonize in singing the glories of their homeland. That is

the magic of Portuguese annexation literature: that so many writers at this time could produce a coherent national discourse.

Clearly not all Portuguese theater of the seventeenth century is of high artistic and ideological value. Just as obvious is the fact that there are treasures among Portuguese dramatists waiting to be discovered. Not only will they enhance our overall understanding of and admiration for early modern theater in general, as well as the development of nationally conscious theater in particular, but will also correct a mistake that Hispanists and Lusists have perpetuated for centuries. Not only, then, *can* we speak of Portuguese theater during the seventeenth century, but we *must* if we are to appreciate the contribution of these playwrights to the *comedia* tradition and their unique efforts to stage the Portuguese nation during the annexation. In the very least, studying these works can expand our understanding of Portuguese-themed *comedias* by the Spanish. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Spanish and Portuguese dramatists assured that Portugal would occupy a permanent place on the Iberian stage. Gil Vicente made an art-form out of staging the nation, providing his fellow Peninsularists with a pattern for dramatizing nationally relevant themes. The performance of Portuguese identity on the early modern stage helped preserve and promote Portugal before, during, and after the period of annexation. While it remains to be said whether Cordeiro and his Portuguese contemporaries successfully immortalized the greatness of Portugal or not, four centuries later we are still finding reasons to read their works and understand what they uniquely contribute to our understanding of language, literature, identity, and politics, both then and now.

CONCLUSION

ANTICIPATING AND REMEMBERING THE RESTORATION: VIOLANTE DO CÉU, MELO, AND SOUSA DE MACEDO

While Portugal regained sovereignty in 1640, it would be nearly three decades before Portuguese annexation literature would come to end. Ultimately, Spain did not recognize Portuguese autonomy until 1668. The rhetoric of nationhood filling the pages of Portuguese literature from 1580 to 1640, appeared with renewed vigor during the intense period that followed. Many of the authors that published important works leading up to the Restoration played a decisive role in the preservation of Portuguese sovereignty thereafter: “Parece não haver dúvida de que a ideia de nacionalidade esteve por trás da restauração da independência plena de Portugal após sessenta anos de monarquia dualista. Cinco séculos de governo próprio haviam evidentemente forjado uma nação, fortalecendo-a até ao ponto de rejeitar qualquer espécie de união com o país vizinho” (Oliveira Marques 436). The literature written during the post-Restoration period, still largely in Spanish, echoes the nationalist sentiment originating with Portugal’s sixteenth century literary giants and proudly carried forward by authors of the annexation. Some continued writing as they had before, celebrating *Portugalidade* in all its past, present, and future glory. Others penned works specifically commemorating the Restoration. Still others, as Vázquez Cuesta points out, employed their literary skills in defense of Portuguese independence, which was by no means secured: “Una abundante literatura político-jurídica se encarga de difundir dentro y fuera del país las razones que

justificaban la existencia del Portugal Restaurado a fin de conseguir su transformación de régimen de hecho en régimen de derecho y propiciar su reconocimiento por otros países” (670).

Just as sixteenth-century authors such as Gil Vicente and Luís de Camões constitute one bookend of this study (see chapter two), the post-Restoration literary movement consisting of Francisco Manuel de Melo, Violante do Céu (1607-93), António de Sousa de Macedo, and others, represents the other. Melo may very well be the greatest Portuguese writer of the baroque, excelling in poetry, drama, literary criticism, philosophy, and history, not to mention the author of a large number of letters. The poet-dramatist Violante do Céu, stands out as Portugal’s first prolific female writer. Sousa de Macedo, one of the most active defenders of Portuguese independence following the Restoration, carries the distinction of being Portugal’s first journalist and one of its most important ambassadors from 1640 to 1668. These authors could easily fill volumes of literary history and criticism on their own, let alone the few concluding pages of this study. I offer a brief analysis of three different works—a sonnet (Violante), a history (Melo), and a treatise (Sousa de Macedo)—as an afterword to what I have previously described. Their works sustain the rhetoric of nationhood crafted so masterfully by their predecessors, invoking many of the same tropes and figures that characterize their works.

Violante do Céu’s well-known poem “A el-Rei D. João IV” expresses a theme common in Portuguese literature after the Restoration: the relationship between God’s will and the Portuguese Restoration. In the same way that the Portuguese had read divine favor into all of their previous achievements, God, according to much post-Restoration

literature, was once again at the helm of Portugal's fortune. This providential view of 1640 reignited the story of Portugal's divine destiny. Justifications of the Restoration appeared in a range of Portuguese texts, from legal defenses like Sousa de Macedo's *Lusitania liberata ab injusto Castellorum dominio* (1641), to dramatic representations such as Manuel de Araujo de Castro's *La mayor hazaña de Portugal* (1645). As Frederick Williams observes, "Violante do Céu witnessed and applauded the separation of Portugal from Spain after their sixty-year union" (161). Evidence of this can be seen in the poet's aforementioned sonnet:

Que logras Portugal? Um rei perfeito.
Quem o constituo? Sacra piedade.
Que alcançaste como ele? A liberdade.
Que liberdade tens? Ser-lhe sujeito.

Que tens na sujeição? Honra e proveito.
Que é o novo rei? Quase deidade.
Que ostenta nas acções? Felicidade.
E que tem de feliz? Ser por Deos feito.

Que eras antes dele? Um labirinto.
Que te julgas agora? Um firmamento.
Temes alguém? Não temo a mesma Parca.

Sentes alguma pena? Uma só sinto.
Qual é? Não ser um mundo, ou não ser cento
Para ser mais capaz de tal Monarca. (162)

In order to communicate her Restorationist message, Céu makes use of the figure of *hypophora*, "asking questions and immediately answering them" (Lanham 87). Through this series of questions and answers, Céu elevates the king ("Um rei perfeito") by attributing the Restoration to deity ("Sacra piedade"). The second quatrain essentially restates the ideas put forward in the first. The freedom gained is happily surrendered to a

king divinely constituted. Spanish efforts to reappropriate Portugal, therefore, stand in contrast to God, himself, who orchestrated Portugal's liberation in the first place ("Ser por Deos feito"). Portugal's confused state ("um labirinto") under Hapsburg rule, has given way to the heavenly influence of a Portuguese king ("um firmamento").

Accordingly, divine order has been restored. The use of *hypophora* intensifies the nationalist ideas that Céu spells out in her sonnet. The generation of Portuguese authors writing predominantly after 1640 are generally more explicit about their post-Restoration loyalties.

Given the opportunity to choose only one of Melo's many noteworthy texts in an effort to capture the essence of his nationalism, my choice unmistakably leads to his *Historia de los movimientos y separación y guerra de Cataluña* (1645), one of the few works of Portuguese authorship to be included in the canon of early modern Spanish literature. From basically the time of Portugal's liberation to his death nearly twenty years later, Melo diligently advanced the national cause through his writings, often fueling resistance to Spain by emphasizing the empire's decadence. Overall, his works help preserve Portugal's independence during the volatile years following the Restoration by maintaining the nationalist discourse established during the annexation. In *Historia*, Melo undermines Spanish credibility by repeatedly describing the various failures and weaknesses of the Spanish forces in their battles against Catalonia. The content of the book was controversial enough that Melo originally published it under the pseudonym Clemente Libertino (Melo, *Hospital* 90). In one of his later publications, he explains the significance of this fictitious name:

Clemente Libertino, porque, a não ter o nome que tenho, esse houvera de ser o meu nome, sendo *Clemente* o santo titular do meu nascimento, o qual estimo pelo mais estimado horóscopo a ascendente; *Libertino*, porque já sabeis que era entre os romanos o nome dos filhos dos escravos libertos. Assim, acudindo à liberdade que já gozava minha pátria, fiz dele brasão e apelido. (*Hospital* 93)

Melo chooses his pen name not simply for the sake of anonymity, but to reinforce his personal identity and the character of his homeland, celebrating their recent liberation. As he explains, Melo had originally been appointed by the Spanish Court to write an account of all the war-related events, “manifestando-o assim como ele fora, e não como o ódio ou o amor, que são dous grandes pintores” (92). Here Melo affirms the objective nature of his account, contending that his emotions did not distort the representation of events found therein. In *Hospital das letras* (1657), Melo refers to *Historia* as “um livro tão verdadeiro” (90), echoing the disciplinary insistence of truth claims that so often accompanied the writing of history (e.g., Bernal Díaz’s *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España*), and which Cervantes brilliantly parodies in *Don Quijote de la Mancha*.

In his account, Melo criticizes the empire “no tanto con lo que dice,” as Joan Estruch Tobella explains, “sino más bien con lo que calla o sugiere” (23). In other words, he lets the events of the war speak for themselves. In the third book, for instance, he reports on the success ratio of the Spanish army, adding some sharp adjectives to ensure a subversive tone: “Castilla, soberbia y miserable, no logra un *pequeño* triunfo sin *largas* opresiones” (201). It is interesting to note how Melo inverts the categories that Portuguese authors of the annexation so often used to exalt Portugal. What was a qualitative advantage in the face of a quantitative disadvantage with the Portuguese,

becomes a quantitative advantage and a qualitative disadvantage with the Spanish. In other words, no empire, no matter how great in size, can prosper against God's will. He emphasizes this at the end of the first book, offering a cutting view of Spain's attempts to colonize and Castilianize:

Éstos son aquellos hombres (caso digno de gran ponderación) que fueron tan famosos y temidos en el mundo, los que avasallaron príncipes, los que dominaron naciones, los que conquistaron provincias, los que dieron leyes a la mayor parte de Europa, los que reconoció por señores todo el Nuevo Mundo. Éstos son los mismos castellanos, hijos, herederos y decendientes de estotros, y éstos son aquellos que por oculta providencia de Dios son agora tratados de tal suerte dentro de su mesma patria, por manos de hombres viles, en cuya memoria puede tomar ejemplo la nación más soberbia triunfante. Y nosotros, viéndoles en tal estado, podremos advertir que *el cielo, ofendido de sus excesos, ordenó* que ellos mismos diesen ocasión a su castigo convirtiéndose con facilidad el escándalo de escarmiento. (1.104.126)

This significant passage divides into two main parts: (1) Spain then (late fifteenth to late sixteenth century), including several of their past accomplishments, and (2) Spain now (late sixteenth to mid-seventeenth century). He begins by characterizing Spain in terms of fame and fear. Due to their immense successes and power, Spain intimidated the rest of Europe. One after another, Melo lists Spain's glorious accomplishments of the past, emphasizing each one with the repetition of "los que," "aquellos," and "éstos." Their ascension culminates with "hijos, herederos y decendientes de estotros." *Estotros* literally means "these others," referring to Spain as the Others rather than the superior self the throne considered itself to be.

All of this, however, comes crashing down, triggered by a revolutionary "agora." Melo sets them up only to violently pull them down (although, as he suggests in the passage quoted above, Spain is responsible for its own fall). In comparison to Spain

before, Melo now portrays them in terms of mockery, divine punishment, and a fallen Empire. In other words, Melo calls upon the familiar medieval motif *ubi sunt*, challenging readers to find the all-powerful Spanish. As Melo explains, Spain is nothing more than a memory, powerless to change the course of its descent. He closes his criticism by contending that their downfall was divinely mandated: “el cielo, ofendido de sus excesos, ordenó.” Nothing could be more subversive than to propose that God has withdrawn his support of Spain, especially considering the Count-Duke of Olivares’s claim that “God is Spanish” (Brown 190). This observation derives not only from Melo’s own eyes, but from the collective sight of all (“nosotros”).

Melo maintains this degenerating view of the Spanish Empire throughout *Historia*, ending in very much the same way that he began: “se abre y cierra con episodios que ejemplifican la derrota y humillación del poderío español” (Estruch 37). As Melo explains, it all fell apart on the battlefield of Monjuic: “había llegado ya aquella última hora que la divina Providencia decretara para castigo, no sólo del ejército, más de toda la monarquía de España, cuyas ruinas allí se declararon” (5.134.381). Just as his text ends, so does the Spanish empire. As Melo explains, it was not just an unlucky day of war, but God himself was now against the Spanish. Their losses at Majuic reflected their other previous failures—namely Portugal’s return to independence—and would also serve to foreshadow greater Spanish losses in the future. Melo would continue to write throughout his life, essentially reaffirming Portugal’s individuality and autonomy and Spain’s decadence with each subsequent publication.

Most of the authors who actively wrote during this new era, had given signs of their literary potential leading up to 1640. António de Sousa de Macedo's *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (1631), for example, may very well be the culminating expression of Portuguese annexation literature dedicated to the praise of Lusitânia. Within its pages are found references to every aspect of *Portugalidade* that I have highlighted in previous chapters, not to mention the many others found therein. What the twenty-two year old accomplished in this work is nothing short of a perfect arrangement of Portuguese excellences, hand-picked by the author himself. The work enlists all of the best Portuguese writers from the early modern period in a single cause: the glorification of Portugal. *Excelencias de Portugal*, as Francisco Manuel de Melo calls the work in a sonnet he dedicates to Sousa de Macedo, is often mentioned but scarcely analyzed with any degree of critical depth. As one might expect, Sousa de Macedo's treatise receives significant attention from Cidade in *A literatura autonomista sob os Filipes*. As the Portuguese critic points out, "Jamais se escreveu livro assim tímido de desmedido orgulho nacionalista, sobretudo em condições mais contra-indicadas" (130). Pilar Vázquez Cuesta, in her account of early modern Portuguese literature, describes the work as follows: "bate el récord en atribuir a su patria méritos y prioridades, tantos materiales como espirituales, que la colocan no ya por encima de los demás reinos de la Península sino del mundo" (646). The critic appears keenly aware of the work's acquaintance with hyperbole and acknowledges Sousa de Macedo's attempt to establish Portugal as the pinnacle of all that is good.

As convention required, Sousa de Macedo begins by presenting his work to the king. He justifies his outright exaltation of Portugal by cleverly proposing that any praise of Portugal only serves to glorify Spain, since Portugal is merely one of the empire's many adornments or flowers. This rationale, however, is somewhat disingenuous. Beyond his words to the king, there is no textual evidence to support the idea that Sousa de Macedo is, in actuality, elevating Spain in his praise of Portugal. Essentially the author dangles the possibility of synecdoche before the king, only to discard the trope once the work begins.¹ The subsequent introductory section—his dedication to the Kingdom of Portugal—presents the author's true object of fancy. The section heading reads, "Al Reyno de Portugal, muy alto, y poderosissimo reyno, soberana Monarchia." It is easy to overlook Sousa de Macedo's claim of sovereignty, as it comes on the heels of his praise of Portugal's exalted and powerful status, but this claim should not be missed. Introducing the question of autonomy to the text so early, I would argue, is indicative of the Restorationist sentiment that forms the backbone of this work. Of additional importance is the fact that Sousa de Macedo speaks of Portugal as a collective body. The author's conception of this community comes into focus throughout the course of the text.

In his dedication to Portugal, Sousa de Macedo confesses his unworthiness to relate the accomplishments of his homeland, seeing that they are so exceptional. He explains that the great rulers of antiquity employed the finest literary talent of their day (e.g., Homer, Virgil) to dress their deeds with elegance and majesty. Sousa de Macedo, in

¹ Sousa de Macedo briefly takes up the matter of the title in his words to the reader, where he anticipates the complaint that the title mentions Spain but the text only highlights Portugal, to which he reinforces his previous contention that as a part of the empire, any praise of Portugal indirectly elevates Spain.

contrast, reverses the relationship between the artist and his object of interest (in this case Portugal). Instead of giving the author the credit for his representation of the past, Sousa de Macedo argues that Portuguese history, by virtue of its grandeur, honors and ennobles the rudest of tongues. The artist, therefore, does not make Portugal, but Portugal the artist. This conception of the artist/object relation coincides directly with Faria e Sousa's contention that the greatest of fictions cannot compare with Portuguese reality (see chapter three). He concludes his words to the Kingdom of Portugal by offering a brief explanation of his choice to write in Spanish rather than Portuguese: "Y perdonad si dexada la excelente lengua Portuguesa escribo en la Castellana, porque como mi intento es pregonaros por el mundo todo, he usado desta por mas universal, y porque tambien los Portugueses saben estas excelencias, y assi para ellos no es menester escribirlas." Here the author reiterates one of the guiding premises of my entire study: that Portuguese authors wanting to make the glorious past of Portugal known to a broader audience, chose Spanish as a means of expression.

Sousa de Macedo focuses his final prefatory section on the reader. Since the king is not likely to read his work and his countrymen supposedly know everything he has to say—reinforcing the idea of a shared vision of Portugal—the author takes aim at the many individuals throughout Europe who may not know much about his fatherland. As he explains to the reader, this treatise comes in response to his desire to "hazer algun servicio a mi patria." In his entry on *patria*, Covarrubias affirms the word's Latin base and defines it as the "tierra donde uno ha nacido" (857). What the lexicographer does not clarify, however, is the extension of the land in question. It could refer to the town or

village one comes from, but may also designate a larger community. In Sousa de Macedo's case, it is evident that *patria* is not Spain, Iberia, or even Sousa de Macedo's birthplace, Porto, but Portugal. His work constitutes a conscious effort to recover Portugal from the threat of oblivion that it faced half a century after becoming part of the Spanish Empire: "No le bastan a un Reyno para ser famoso heroicas virtudes de sus naturales si le faltan escritos que las publiquen, porque la memoria de aquellas con el tiempo (como todo) se acaba, y estos hazen con que viva eternamente libre de las leyes del olvido." In order to complete the arduous task of condensing Portuguese greatness into a relatively brief work, the author explains that his preparation included reading as many works about Portugal as possible, giving special attention to non-native voices so as to authenticate the perspectives of his countrymen, who might be suspected of partiality. His encyclopedic use of references to substantiate his claims seems to suggest that Sousa de Macedo is out to prove Portugal's superiority, not merely call attention to her merits. With that the author closes the preface to his work. Each of the dedications that follow have something to say about the social, political, and historical moment in which Sousa de Macedo penned his work. Altogether they acknowledge Portugal's provincial place in Iberia, her relative obscurity in the world, and her self-awareness as a unique community.

At the end of the prefatory sections is a table of contents that further prepares readers for the nationally-charged rhetoric that is to follow. Each of the twenty-four chapters of *Flores de España* highlights some unique aspect of Portuguese excellence, including the "buen clima del Reyno de Portugal" (chapter 1), "la fidelidad de los

Portugueses” (chapter 13), and “lo mucho que Portugal ha sido siempre estimado de Dios” (chapter 24), to mention only a few. It is as if Sousa de Macedo had taken all of the aspects of *Portugalidade* that other annexation authors mention in part, and wrote a chapter on each one. Sousa de Macedo maintains, for example, that Portugal is geographically superior to other nations of the world (a common declaration among annexation authors attempting to resituate the Portuguese nation in the physical world). Overall, his argument develops in the following way: (1) Europe is the best of the four parts of the world, (2) the Iberian Peninsula is the best part of Europe, and (3) Portugal is “el primer lugar entre todas las tierras” (3-4). He extends his praise further by identifying God as the author of Portugal’s superiority: “está Portugal puesto en tal sitio, y parte del mundo, que queda como cabeça de todo el, que parece, que previendo Dios en la creacion del mundo las grandes excelencias que este Reyno avia de tener, le quiso hazer cabeça del mundo, y dar al mundo tal cabeça (5). Such providencial claims are a common feature of nationalist rhetoric. As is so often the case among seventeenth-century Portuguese writers, Sousa de Macedo’s inspiration for this claim comes from the following verses from *Os Lusíadas*: “Eis aqui, quase cume da cabeça / En Europa toda, o Reyno Lusitano” (3.20.1-2). Rather than a people, these passages from Sousa de Macedo and Camões emphasize the geographic superiority of the Portuguese nation.

One aspect of Portuguese geography one would expect Sousa de Macedo to address is the preeminence of Lisbon. Whereas many annexation authors remain fairly general in their glorification of Lisbon, likening the greatness of the city to the quality

(not number) of those living there, Sousa de Macedo lists many specific reasons for exalting the Portuguese capital above all other cities:

Basta tener por cabeça la ciudad de Lisboa la mas grandiosa del mundo, y en que mas bienes de naturaleza, y fortuna concurren: por la sanidad, y templança de los ayres, por la fertilidad, y amenidad de los campos, en que todo el invierno ay flores, por la grandeza del pueblo, por la magestad de los edificios, por la hermosura, y comodidad del puerto capacissimo, y seguro, por el comercio, y trato de las mercaderias del Oriente, y Occidente, y de todas las partes del mundo, por la riqueza de los ciudadanos, por la frecuencia de tantas naciones que a ella concurren, que parece un mundo abreviado. (25)

In all of his descriptions of the Portuguese nation and its capital, Sousa de Macedo exemplifies the kind of widespread simultaneity found in Portuguese annexation literature. The work also foregrounds his epic poem *Ulisippo* (1640), which breathes new life into the mythical beginnings of Lisbon: “la leyenda de la fundación de Lisboa por Ulises da pretexto al autor para inventar una complicada trama argumental con mezcla de Mitología y Cristianismo en la que no falta la visión profética de las hazañas llevadas a cabo por la aristocracia lusa a través de los siglos” (Vázquez Cuesta 644). Building on the untouchable assertions of his national poet regarding Iberia, Portugal, and Lisbon, Sousa de Macedo reverts to the past in an effort to reconstruct a present imaginary through which the Portuguese nation can once again take shape and resume its longstanding sovereignty.

In *Flores de España*, Sousa de Macedo literally leaves no stone unturned when it comes to his affection for his native soil. What makes this, in many ways, the single most important expression of nationally conscious annexation literature, is the fact that the young Sousa de Macedo shows complete mastery of the canon. That is, he cites the

authors treated in this study and many others, both within and without Portugal, brilliantly gathering all of the best descriptions of *Portugalidade* into one single narrative. As an exclamation point to his hyperbolic account of the Portuguese nation, the author concludes by taking up a question put forward in *Os Lusíadas*:

Aquí se infiere la respuesta a la question, si es mejor ser Rey de todo el mundo sin Portugal, ô de solo Portugal sin mas cosa alguna del mundo? La qual excitó el gran Camões, quando hablando con el Rey Don Sebastian le dixo en sus *Lusíadas*: “E julgareis qual he mais excelente, / Se ser do mundo Rey, se de tal gente?” (1.10.7-8). Y podemos responder que mejor es ser Rey de Portugal solamente. (fol. 236)

The effort to celebrate Portugal’s exalted status is on full display in this passage. Sousa de Macedo adds his voice to that of Camões—an obvious appeal to authority—in concluding that it is better to govern Portugal alone, than all the rest of the world combined. Overall, *Flores de España* documents the self-sufficiency and supremacy of Portugal and can be read as an argument for Portuguese autonomy. I am not talking about a “we can get by on our own” type of statement, but a “we are better off without them,” better yet, “because we are preeminent in all things respecting the nation, the Unification has lost any logic it may have ever had.” The work, therefore, anticipates the Restoration of 1640 as well as the many defenses of Portuguese sovereignty that were written in the decades that followed.

Besides Sousa de Macedo and Camões, it is interesting to consider just exactly who we are to read in the first person plural “podemos” used in the previous passage from *Flores de España*. Whether in the writings of Violante do Céu, Melo, or Sousa de Macedo, it is not difficult to detect the nationalist sentiment expressed by their immediate precursors (Faria e Sousa, Cordeiro, Azevedo), as well as the paramount figures of the

sixteenth century (Vicente, Ferreira, Camões). Sousa de Macedo's *Flores de Espanha*, for example, cites heavily from these authors. Violante do Céu's poetry maintains some of what Faria e Sousa accomplished in his poetic compositions, to say nothing of how much her Restorationist writings hearken back to Camões. Melo's *Guerra de Cataluña*, as well, fits into a long line of nation-minded Portuguese historiographers, including Faria e Sousa. In all cases, the influence is obvious and the impact is clear. Portuguese annexation literature written in Spanish did not begin in 1580 nor did it end in 1640. Within this body of works are those who put forward a cohesive view of Portugal and *Portugalidade*. They each seem to have something to say about what it means to be Portuguese, which typically includes references to Camões, Portuguese history, *saudade*, and Lisbon, among others. What we find in this literature, then, are a variety of nationalisms—geographic, ethnic, linguistic—that anticipate the advanced theories of nation and nationalism of the modern age.

It is difficult to find any Portuguese author more suited for this study than Manuel de Faria e Sousa. He offers readers a seemingly endless amount of nationalist writings to work with, including several different genres. From his early writings to his posthumous publications, one can follow Faria e Sousa as he works through the benefits and challenges of being a Portuguese writer during the annexation. His works capture both the clarity and complexity of annexation literature: clear in its stated purposes, complex—linguistically, culturally, etc.—in the carrying out of these objectives. I believe that my analysis in chapter three substantiates the author's love for his homeland at the same time that it exposes some of the shortcomings of such a perspective. Accompanying Faria e

Sousa's frequent expressions of nationalism is an identity-driven anxiety. He is not sure who he is within the early modern Peninsular world, nor the place of his *patria* therein. He seems confident in Portugal's yesterdays, unsure of its todays, and hopeful that tomorrow will combine the glories of the past with the promise of the future. This is apparent in his commentaries of Camões's writings, his volumes of historiography, and in his poetry. He nationalizes each genre in such a way that allows them to converge at a single point: the glorification of the Portuguese nation.

While Faria e Sousa is perhaps the most important author of this body of nationally conscious works and a pioneer of comparative Iberian studies, the most effective genre for spreading the glories of Portugal—drama—was not one that the author employed. Instead, his contemporaries, including Jacinto Cordeiro and Ângela de Azevedo, composed *comedias* wherein characters depict Portuguese history and identity. These works were not limited to the literate elite, but performed for the masses, making them an early form of mass media. Not only did Cordeiro and Azevedo construct works based on critical figures and events from Portuguese history, but they also found frequent occasion to reinforce the brand of Portuguese identity circulating in the works of the time. If Faria e Sousa's patriotic gaze was fixed primarily upon Camões, Cordeiro and Azevedo seemed to look to Gil Vicente for their inspiration. After all, the father of Portuguese theater had masterfully allegorized and exalted his *patria* in *Lusitânia*, *Fama*, and other dramatic texts. While neither Cordeiro nor Azevedo rely so heavily on allegory, their commitment to Portugal is comparable to Vicente's (the former articulating his

nationalism much more overtly than the latter). The underlying character of their *comedias*, however, is Portugal.

While this study addresses a number of issues related to early modern Iberian culture, namely the interaction of language, literature, politics, and identity, many questions remain unanswered. How, for example, did the rest of the Peninsula interpret the *Portugalidade* so common in annexation literature? Did the dominant culture feel threatened by the national consciousness of the Portuguese? In shedding new light on such an important thread of Portuguese annexation literature, I have not been able to consider, at length, other Peninsular perspectives. Lope de Vega—considering his relationship with Faria e Sousa—and many of the other Spanish dramatists who actively engaged Portugal as a literary topic, provide some insight as to how others throughout Iberia perceived the Portuguese (at least among the educated elite). I would like to find out whether the antagonisms between Spain and Portugal that played out on the literary landscape following the Restoration, can also be detected in Spanish works published during the annexation. Were there Catalanian authors (or other Iberian peripheral identities) who felt bonded to their Portuguese contemporaries by their common struggle against Spanish hegemony? These questions, and others, follow quite naturally from the work that has taken place in this investigation.

Spain's sixty-year rule over Portugal carries several different names. Some describe it as the Spanish Occupation, others call it the Spanish Annexation of Portugal, and still others refer to it as the Iberian Unification (not to mention those who have referred to it as the "Babylonian Captivity"). In the same way that the term "Spanish

Golden Age” conveys a plurality of meanings depending on the disciplinary lens one uses (i.e., art, history, politics, economics), I believe that the designation “Iberian Unification” can speak to a number of fields of study.² However effectively or ineffectively it describes the political situation on the peninsula from 1580 to 1640, the “Iberian Unification” is absolutely the right way to capture the literary climate at this time. The *comedia* travelled throughout Spain and Portugal, with playwrights and actors from all over Iberia trying their hand at what would become the Peninsular pastime during the seventeenth century. The Portuguese adopted the form championed by Lope, but the Portuguese also influenced the content of the *comedia nueva*, inspiring a host of texts related to the Portuguese imaginary. As José Ares Montes, Edward Glaser, and many others have argued, our understanding of early modern Iberian poetry is incomplete without learning of the artistic cross-pollination that created a web of intertextuality on the Peninsula; something that critics have only begun to uncover. What is more, Faria e Sousa may have written more about early modern poetic theory than any other critic of his time, making his various introductory essays on poetry from his commentary of Camões’s *Rimas* and *Fuente de Aganipe*, invaluable for any scholar of Golden Age poetics.

A Peninsular view of early modern Iberia—that is, a perspective that considers Iberian intercultural and not just a single national cultural system—is best suited to

² By this I am referring to the elasticity of the term “Golden Age.” In literature, for example, the Golden Age covers a period of about 100 to 130 years (i.e., 1550-1680). Historians, however, have offered at least two other perspectives on the “Golden Age” of Spain. From an economic standpoint, the richest period of the empire does not coincide with the Golden Age of Spanish letters, as extreme debt underlined this time of crisis (see Maravall). From a political standpoint, the apex of the Spanish Empire were the sixty years of governance over Portugal; the largest empire in the history of the world. Spain controlled the Americas, several parts of Africa, India, a number of other territories in the Orient, and were actively fighting a number of wars in Europe.

identify and appreciate the open cultural exchange that occurred at this time. While some scholars proudly walked this path during the past century, comparative approaches to early modern Iberian literature remain the exception.³ Despite their widespread acceptance and readership during the early modern period, the seemingly numberless works written in Spanish by the Portuguese during the annexation have long been cast aside by literary critics and historians unwilling, for the most part, to threaten the “purity” of their respective canons with these hybrid cultural products. Attitudes towards seventeenth-century Portuguese literature of this kind remain more or less unaltered. As a result of these critical postures, most Portuguese literature written in Spanish during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries remains frozen in time, unknown and unread by twenty-first century readers. That they are not given a voice within their own context is unfair to the writers; that they are kept from dialoguing with our day is unfair to us. The story of the Portuguese authors writing in Spanish during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is a story worth telling. It is a narrative that reminds us that border-crossings, hybridity, code-switching, and many other frequently-studied aspects of twentieth- and twenty-first century literature are not entirely recent phenomena.

³ Fernando Bouza’s *Corre Manuscrito* (2001) and Gwyn Fox’s *Subtle Subversions* (2008) are bright examples of the kind of work I am describing. In general, early modern scholars studying women writers tend to show greater openness to the mutual consideration of Spanish and Portuguese writers, although in some cases this is due to the fewer number of female-authored works available among the Spanish. This, of course, would go against the point I am trying to make. Critics should not turn to Portuguese authors as a last resort, but instead consider them coterminously with their Spanish contemporaries.

WORKS CITED

- Albuquerque, Martim de. *A consciência nacional portuguesa: Ensaio de história das ideias políticas*. Lisboa: [s.n.], 1974.
- Anastácio, Vanda. Prefácio. Camões, *Teatro* 7-73.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Anedotas portuguesas e memórias biográficas da corte quinhentista*. Ed. Christopher C. Lund. Coimbra: Almedina, 1980.
- Ares Montes, José. *Góngora y la poesía portuguesa del siglo XVII*. Madrid: Gredos, 1956.
- . "Los poetas portugueses, cronistas de la Jornada de Felipe III a Portugal." *Filología Románica* 7 (1990): 11-36.
- . "Portugal en el teatro español del siglo XVII." *Filología Románica* 8 (1991): 11-29.
- Asensio, Eugenio. "La autobiografía de Manuel de Faria y Sousa." *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 13 (1978): 629-37.
- . "España en la épica filipina." *Revista de Filología Española* 33 (1949): 66-109.
- Askins, Arthur. "Os inéditos camonianos de Manuel de Faria e Sousa." *Critique textuelle portugaise; actes du colloque, Paris, 20-24 octobre 1981*. Ed. Eugenio Asensio. Paris: Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian, Centre culturel portugais, 1986. 219-26.
- Atkinson, William C. Introduction. *Os Lusíadas*. By Luis Vaz de Camões. Trans. William Atkinson. London: Penguin, 1952.

- Azevedo, Ângela de. *Dicha y desdicha del juego y devoción de la Virgen*. Soufas, *Women's* 4-44.
- . *La margarita del Tajo que dio nombre a Santarén*. Soufas, *Women's* 45-90.
- . *El muerto disimulado*. Soufas, *Women's* 91-132.
- Barbosa Machado, Diôgo. *Biblioteca Lusitana histórica, crítica e cronológica*. Vol. 1-3. Lisboa: Com. Nac. para as comemorações dos descobrimentos portugueses 1930-35.
- Barrera y Leirado, Cayetano Alberto de la. *Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español*. Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1860.
- Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens. "Polyglot Literature and Linguistic Fiction." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 15 (1978): 91-102.
- Bernheimer, Richard. "Theatrum Mundi." *The Art Bulletin* 38.4 (1956): 225-47.
- Bessa-Luis, Agustina. Commemorative Speech. *Camões e a identidade* 113-24.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Narrating the nation." Introduction. *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990. 1-7.
- Birmingham, David. *A Concise History of Portugal*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*." *Ficciones*. Madrid: Alianza, 1999.
- Botelho, Afonso, and António Braz Teixeira. *Filosofia da saudade*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1986.

- Bouza, Fernando. *Corre manuscrito: Una historia cultural del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2001.
- Braga, Marquez, ed. *Poesias castellanas y autos*. Por Luís de Camões. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1929.
- Braga, Teófilo. *História da literatura portuguesa: Os Seiscentistas*. Vol. 3. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1984.
- Brasil, Reis. *Gil Vicente e a Cidade de Lisboa*. Lisboa: Livraria Portugal, 1968.
- Bustamante, Ciriaco Pérez. Introducción. *Historias portuguesas*. By Manuel de Faria e Sousa. Madrid: Atlas, 1943. 9-10.
- Calderón, Manuel, ed. Prólogo. *Teatro Castellano*. Por Gil Vicente. Barcelona: Crítica, 1998. xxiii-liii.
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *El príncipe constante*. Ed. Fernando Cantalapiedra and Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez. Madrid: Cátedra, 1996.
- Camões, Luís de. *Os Lusíadas*. Ed. Manuel de Faria e Sousa. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1972.
- . *Teatro completo*. Ed. Vanda Anastácio. Porto: Edições Caixotim, 2005.
- Camões e a identidade nacional*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1983.
- Carabias Torres, Ana María. “Castilla y Portugal: el trajín de la cultura académica.” *Castilla y Portugal en los albores de la edad media*. Salamanca: Varona, 1997.
- Castillejo, David. *Guía de ochocientas comedias del Siglo de Oro: para el uso de actores y lectores*. Madrid: Ars Milleni, 2002.

- Cervantes, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Tom Lathrop. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2005.
- . *Numancia*. Ed. Robert Marrast. Madrid: Cátedra, 1990.
- Cidade, Hernani. *A literatura autonomista sob os Filipines*. Lisboa: Livraria Sá da Costa, 1950-1959.
- Cisneros, Luis Jaime. "La polémica Faria-Espinoza Medrano: Planteamiento crítico." *Lexis* 6.1 (1987): 1-62.
- Contente Domingues, Francisco. Prefácio. *O mito de Portugal: a primeira história de Portugal e a sua função política*. By Fernão de Oliveira. Ed. José Eduardo Franco. Lisboa: Fundação Maria Manuela e Vasco de Albuquerque d'Orey, 2000. 9-11.
- Cordeiro, Jacinto. *De la entrada del Rey en Portugal*. Lisboa: Jorge Rodríguez, 1621.
- . *Los doze de Inglaterra*. Cordeiro, *Segunda* 60-78.
- . *Prospera e adversa fortuna de Duarte Pacheco em duas Comedias*. Lisboa: Pedro Craesbeck, 1630.
- . *Segunda parte de las Comedias*. Lisboa: Lourenço Craesbeck, 1634.
- Costa e Silva, José María da. *Ensaio biographico-critico sobre os melhores poetas portuguezes*. Lisboa: Imprensa Silviana, 1850-1855.
- Covarrubias Orozco, Sebastián de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Ed. Martín de Riquer. Barcelona: Alta Fulla, 2003.

- Cruz-Ortiz, Jaime. "Hybridity in the Portuguese Comedia." Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spanish Drama. MLA Annual Convention. Marriot, San Francisco. 28 Dec. 2008.
- Darst, David H. "Numancia: 'Nuestra historia.'" *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 56.1 (2004): 45-54.
- Davies, Mark. *Corpus del Español* (100 million words, 1200s-1900s). (2002-). 13 Nov 2008. <<http://www.corpusdelespanol.org>>.
- Davies, Mark, and Michael Ferreira. *Corpus do Português* (45 million words, 1300s-1900s). (2006-). 13 Nov. 2008. <<http://www.corpusdoportugues.org>>.
- Dias, Jorge. *Estudos do carácter nacional português*. Lisboa: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar, Centro de Estudos de Antropologia Cultural, 1971.
- Doménech Rico, Fernando. Introducción. *La margarita del Tajo que dio nombre a Santarén; El muerto disimulado*. By Ângela de Azevedo. Ed. Doménech. Madrid: Publicaciones de la Asociación de Directores de Escena de España, 1999. 5-31.
- Duarte, Dom. *Leal conselheiro*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1983.
- Estruch Tobella, Joan. Introducción. *Historia de los movimientos, separación y guerra de Cataluña*. By Francisco Manuel de Melo. Barcelona: Fontamara, 1982. 7-41.
- Faria e Sousa, Manuel de. *Africa Portuguesa*. Lisboa: A. Craesbeeck de Mello, 1681.
- . *Ásia Portuguesa*. Vol. 1. 1666. Porto: Livraria Civilização, 1945.
- . *The Cancionero de Manuel de Faria*. Münster Westfalen, Germany: Aschendorff, 1968.
- . *Epítome de las historias portuguesas*. Madrid: F. Martínez, 1628.

- . *Europa Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Antonio Craesbeeck de Mello, 1678.
- . *The "Fortuna" of Manuel de Faria e Sousa: An Autobiography*. Ed. Edward Glaser. Münster Westfalen, Germany: Aschendorff, 1975.
- , ed. *Os Lusíadas*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1972.
- Faria e Sousa, Pedro. "Aos que lerem." Manuel de Faria e Sousa, *Ásia* 15-26.
- Fernandez, Domingos. Prologue. *Lusitânia transformada*. By Fernão Álvares do Oriente. Ed. António Cirurgião. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, Casa da Moeda, 1985. 9-10.
- Ferreira, António. *Castro*. Ed. F. Costa Marques. Coimbra: Atlântida, 1967.
- . *Poemas Lusitanos*. Ed. F. Costa Marques. Coimbra: Atlântida, 1961.
- Ferreira, Vergílio. "Da ausência, Camões." *Camões e a identidade* 13-21.
- Flasche, Hans. *O método de comentar de Manuel de Faria e Sousa*. Lisboa: Comissão Executiva do IV Centenário da Publicação de *Os Lusíadas*, 1973.
- Forster, Leonard W. *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1970.
- Fox, Gwyn. *Subtle Subversions: Reading Golden Age Sonnets by Iberian Women*. Washington D.C.: Catholic U of America P, 2008.
- Franco, José Eduardo, ed. *O mito de Portugal: a primeira história de Portugal e a sua função política*. By Fernão de Oliveira. Lisboa: Fundação Maria Manuela e Vasco de Albuquerque d'Orey, 2000.
- Frèchs, Claude Henri, ed. Introduction. *Comedias portuguesas*. By Simão Machado. Lisboa: O Mundo do Livro, 1971. Print. 9-49.

- Freeland, Alan. "The People and the Poet: Portuguese National Identity and the Camões Tercentenary (1880)." *Nationalism and the Nation in the Iberian Peninsula: Competing and Conflicting Identities*. Ed. Clare Mar-Molinero and Angel Smith. Oxford: Berg, 1996. 53-67.
- Fucilla, J. G. "The Spanish and Portuguese Imitations from the Italian of Manuel Faria y Sousa." *Philological Quarterly* 8 (1929): 124-44.
- García Pérez, Domingo, ed. *Catálogo razonado, biográfico y bibliográfico de los autores portugueses que escribieron en castellano*. Madrid: Colegio nacional de sordomudos y de ciegos, 1890.
- Gascón, Christopher. "Female and Male Mediation in the Plays of Ángela de Azevedo." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 57.1 (2005): 125-45.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.
- Glaser, Edward. *Estudios hispano-portugueses: Relaciones literarias del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Castalia, 1957.
- . Introduction. Faria e Sousa, *The Cancionero* 1-85.
- . "Lope de Vega e Manuel de Faria e Sousa: Acheegas para o estudo das relações literárias entre Portugal e Espanha." *Colóquio* 8 (1960): 57-59.
- . "Manuel de Faria e Sousa and the Mythology of *Os Lusíadas*." *Portuguese Studies*. Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Centro Cultural Português, 1976.
- . "On Portuguese *Sprachbetrachtung* of the Seventeenth Century." *Studia Philológica: Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso*. Madrid: Gredos, 1961.

- . *Portuguese Studies*. Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Centro Cultural Português, 1976.
- . Preface. Faria e Sousa, *The "Fortuna"* 5-122.
- Góngora, Luís de. "Soneto CLXVI." *Renaissance and Baroque Poetry of Spain*. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1988. 168.
- Godinho, Vitorino Magalhães. *Portugal: a emergencia de uma nação: das raízes a 1480*. Lisboa: Colibri, 2004.
- Guérios, Rosário Farâni Mansur. *Dicionário etimológico de nomes e sobrenomes*. São Paulo: Ave Maria, 1973.
- Haberly, David T. "Colonial Brazilian Literature." *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*. Ed. Roberto González Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 47-68.
- Hart, Thomas R. "The Literary Criticism of Manuel de Faria e Sousa." *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 21 (1974): 31-41.
- Hawkins, Harriet Blocker. "'All the World's a Stage' Some Illustrations of the *Theatrum Mundi*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 17.2 (1966): 174-78.
- Heiple, Daniel L. "Political Posturing on the Jewish Question by Lope de Vega and Faria e Sousa" *Hispanic Review* 62.2 (1994): 217-34.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Herrera, Fernando de, ed. *Obras de Garcilaso de la Vega con anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera*. Sevilla: Alonso de la Barrera, 1580.

- Hobsbawm, E. J. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." *The Invention of Tradition*. Ed. E. J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- . *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Holy Bible. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003. Authorized King James Vers.
- Jorge, Ricardo d'Almeida. *A intercultura de Portugal e Espanha no passado e no futuro*. Porto: Araujo & Sobrino, 1921.
- Juana Inés de la Cruz. *Carta Atenagórica. Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz e o Padre António Vieira, ou, A disputa sobre as finezas de Jesús Cristo*. Ed. Joaquim de Montezuma de Carvalho. Lisboa: Vega, 1998. 117-38.
- King, Willard F. "Cervantes' *Numancia* and Imperial Spain." *MLN* 94.2 (1979): 200-21.
- Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Lemos, Esther de. "Faria e Sousa, comentador das rimas de Camões." *Boletim da Academia Portuguesa de Ex-Libris* 11 (1966): 1-17.
- Leyva, Aurelia. "La *preceptiva* de un comentador barroco: A propósito de Manuel de Faria y Sousa." *Homenaje al profesor Antonio Gallego Morell*. Ed. C. Argente del Castillo, A. de la Granja, J. Martínez Marín, and A. Sánchez Trigueros. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1989. 201-12.
- Livermore, H. V. *Portugal: A Short History*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1973.
- Lopes d'Almeida, M. Introdução. Manuel de Faria e Sousa, *Ásia* iv-xxxii.
- Lourenço, Eduardo. *O Laberinto da Saudade: psicanálise mítica do destino português*. Lisboa: Gradita, 2000.

- Machado, Simão. *Comedias portuguesas*. Ed. Claude Henri Frèchs. Lisboa: O Mundo do Livro, 1971.
- Maldonado, Felipe C. R. “‘Fortuna de Manuel de Faria e Sousa’: Cronica de un resentimiento.” *La estafeta literaria* 585 (1976): 10-13.
- Marín, Nicolás. “Camoens, Faria y Cervantes.” *Homenaje a Camoens; estudios y ensayos hispano-portugueses*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1980. 239-46.
- Maroto Camino, Mercedes. “Transvestism, Translation and Transgression: Angela de Azevedo’s *El muerto disimulado*.” *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 37.3 (2001): 314-25.
- Mattoso, José. *A Identidade Nacional*. Lisboa: Gradiva, 1998.
- Melo, Francisco Manuel de. *Epanáforas de vária história portuguesa*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1931.
- . *Historia de los movimientos, separación y guerra de Cataluña*. 1645. Ed. Joan Estruch Tobella. Madrid: Castalia, 1996.
- . *Hospital das letras*. 1657. Rio de Janeiro: Bruguera, n.d.
- Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Carolina. Preface. *A intercultura de Portugal e Espanha no passado e no futuro*. By Ricardo d’Almeida Jorge. Porto: Araujo & Sobrino, 1921. xviii-xxxiv.
- . *A saudade portuguesa*. Porto: Renascença Portuguesa, 1922.
- Molina, Tirso de. *Las Quinas de Portugal*. Ed. Celsa Carmen García Valdés. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Tirsianos, 2003.

- Morby, Edwin S. "Portugal and Galicia in the Plays of Tirso de Molina." *Hispanic Review* 9 (1941): 266-74.
- Mujica, Bárbara Louise. *Women Writers of Early Modern Spain: Sophia's Daughters*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.
- Múzquiz-Guerreiro, Darlene. "Symbolic Inversions in Ángela de Azevedo's *El muerto disimulado*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 57.1 (2005): 147-63.
- Namora, Fernando. "A pretexto de Camões." *Camões e a identidade* 43-61.
- Nascentes, Antenor. *Diccionario etimológico resumido*. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Nacional do Livro, Ministério da Educação e Cultura, 1966.
- Navarrete, Ignacio. "Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon." *PMLA* 106.1 (1991): 21-33.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: Nacional, 1984.
- Neruda, Pablo. *Obras completas*. Vol. 1. Ed. Hernán Loyola. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, Círculo de Lectores, 1999-2002.
- Núñez C., Javier. "Las anotaciones bilingües de Manuel de Faria e Sousa." *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 60 (1980): 261-98.
- Oliveira, Fernão de. *Grammatica de linguagem portugueza*. Porto: Imprensa Portugueza, 1871.
- . *O mito de Portugal: a primeira história de Portugal e a sua função política*. Ed. José Eduardo Franco. Lisboa: Fundação Maria Manuela e Vasco de Albuquerque d'Orey, 2000.

- . *The Voyage of Ferdinand Magellan = Viagem de Fernão Magalhães*. Ed. and Trans. Peter Schreurs. Manila: National Historical Institute, 2002.
- Oliveira e Silva, John de. "Exile Under Fire: Reassessing the Poetics and Practice of Manuel de Faria e Sousa." *Global Impact of the Portuguese Language*. Ed. Asela Rodriguez de Laguna. London: Transaction, 2001. 61-76.
- Oliveira Marques, A. H. de. *História de Portugal*. Vol. 1. Lisboa: Palas Editores, 1976. Print.
- Oriel, Charles. "Cervantes' *Numancia*: A Speech Act Consideration." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 47 (1995): 105-19.
- Oriente, Fernão Alvares do. *Lusitânia transformada*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, Casa da Moeda, 1985.
- Pap, Leo. "On the etymology of Portuguese SAUDADE: an instance of multiple causation?" *Word* 43.1 (1992): 97-102.
- Parker, Jack Horace. *Gil Vicente*. New York: Twayne, 1967.
- Pascoaes, Teixeira de. *Arte de Ser Português*. Pôrto: Renascença Portuguesa, 1920.
- Payne, Stanley G. *A History of Spain and Portugal*. Vol. 1. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1973.
- Picchio, Luciana Stegagno. *História do teatro português*. Lisboa: Portugália, 1969. Print.
- Pierce, Frank. "The Place of Mythology in the *Lusiads*." *Comparative Literature* 6.2 (1954): 97-122.
- Pires, Maria Lucília Gonçalves. *Xadrez de palavras: Estudos de literatura barroca*. Lisboa: Cosmos, 1996.

- Rama, Angel. *La ciudad letrada*. Ed. Hanover, N.H.: Ediciones del Norte, 2002. Print.
- Reed, Cory A. "Identity Formation and Collective Anagnorisis in *Numancia*." *Theatralia* 5 (2003): 67-76.
- Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990. 8-22.
- Rennert, Hugo Albert. *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega*. New York: Dover, 1963.
- Ribeiro, Orlando. *A formação de Portugal*. Lisboa: Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa, 1987.
- Righter, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963. Print.
- Rodríguez Cepeda, Enrique. "La relación Camoens, Lope de Vega y Faria y Sousa." *Quaderni Portoghesi* 7-8 (1980): 207-22.
- Roig, Adrien. "Los españoles en el teatro de Gil Vicente." *Encuentros y desencuentros de culturas desde la edad media al siglo XVIII*. Ed. Juan Villegas. Actas Irvine-92. Irvine, California: Asociacion Internacional de Hispanistas. 1994. 129-38.
- Sena, Jorge de. Introdução. *Os Lusíadas*. By Luís de Camões. Ed. Manuel de Faria e Sousa. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1972.
- Serrano y Sanz, Manuel. *Apuntes para una biblioteca de escritoras españolas*. Madrid: Atlas, 1975.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.

- Silveira Bueno, Francisco da. *Grande diccionario etimológico-prosódico da língua portuguesa*. VII. São Paulo: Saraiva, 1967.
- Sloman, Albert E. *The Sources of Calderón's El príncipe constante*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1950.
- Soufas, Teresa Scott. "Angela de Azevedo: Introduction." Soufas, *Women's* 1-3.
- . *Dramas of Distinction*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1997.
- , ed. *Women's Acts: Plays by Women Dramatists of Spain's Golden Age*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1997.
- Sousa de Macedo, António. *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal*. Lisboa: Jorge Rodríguez, 1631.
- Studnicki-Gizbert, Daviken. *A Nation Upon the Ocean Sea: Portugal's Atlantic Diaspora and the Crisis of the Spanish Empire, 1492-1640*. New York: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Surtz, Ronald E. "Gil Vicente's *Auto da Lusitânia*." *Creation and Re-creation: Experiments in Literary Form in Early Modern Spain*. Ed. Ronald E. Surtz and Nora Weinerth. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1983. 41-48.
- Tamayo y Baus, Manuel. Introducción. *De los autores portugueses que escribieron en castellano*. Ed. Domingo García Pères. Madrid: Colegio Nacional de Sordomudos y de Ciegos, 1890. v-ix.
- Teyssier, Paul. *La Langue de Gil Vicente*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959. Print.
- Torres Naharro, Bartolomé de. *Comedia trofea*. Ed. Fidelino de Figueiredo. São Paulo: U of São Paulo, 1942. Print.

- . *Comedias: Soldadesca, Tinelaria, Himenea*. Ed. D. W. McPheeters. Madrid: Castalia, 1973.
- Vázquez Cuesta, Pilar. “La lengua y la cultura portuguesas.” *Historia de la Cultura Española: El siglo del Quijote*. Vol. 2. *Las Letras. Las Artes*. Madrid: Espasa, 1996. 577-680.
- Vega Carpio, Lope de. *Arte Nuevo de hacer comedias*. Ed. Enrique García Santo-Tomás. Madrid: Cátedra, 2006.
- . “Elogio al comentador.” *Os Lusíadas*. By Luís de Camões. Ed. Manuel de Faria e Sousa. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa de Moeda, 1972.
- . *Laurel de Apolo*. Ed. Antonio Carreño. Madrid: Cátedra, 2007.
- Vicente, Gil. *Obras completas*. Ed. Alvaro Júlio da Costa Pimpão. Porto: Civilização, 1979.
- Vieira, António. *Sermão do mandato. Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz e o Padre António Vieira, ou, A disputa sobre as finezas de Jesús Cristo*. Ed. Joaquim de Montezuma de Carvalho. Lisboa: Vega, 1998. 95-115.
- Villaverde Cabral, Manuel. “A identidade nacional portuguesa: conteúdo e relevância.” *DADOS: Revista de Ciências Sociais* 46.3 (2003): 513-33.
- Williams, Frederick G. *Poetas de Portugal: Uma selecção bilingue de poemas do século XIII ao século XX*. Lisbon: Instituto Camões, 2005.
- White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

Wilson, Margaret. "The Last Play of Tirso de Molina." *Modern Language Review* 47.4
(1952): 516-28.

---. *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age*. London: Pergamon, 1969.

Zimic, Stanislav. "Nuevas consideraciones sobre el *Auto da Lusitânia* de Gil Vicente."
Homenaje a Alonso Zamora Vicente. Vol. 3. Madrid: Castalia, 1988. 359-69.