



Auto nouamente feyto, em que entram as figuras seguintes. s. Hum mordomo cõ bũ seu moço Vicente, dous escudeyros Pero d'abreu, e Luys de saas, e a Ventura com tres Satiros que representa a obra, Flerisel filho do principe Daustria com hum seu paje Delibeo, Hum Porteyro,

The Reinvention of Theatre in Sixteenth-Century Europe

Traditions, Texts and Performance

Edited by T. F. Earle and Catarina Fouto



LEGENDA

Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing

The Reinvention of Theatre in
Sixteenth-Century Europe

Traditions, Texts and Performance



EDITED BY T. F. EARLE AND CATARINA FOUTO



LEGENDA

Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing

2015

CHAPTER 2



The *Auto da Festa* and the (Well-stocked) Workshop of Gil Vicente

José Augusto Cardoso Bernardes

Centro de Literatura Portuguesa, Universidade de Coimbra

The *Auto da Festa* in the Context of Gil Vicente's Dramatic Work

Gil Vicente (1465?–1536?) is still today the best-known name in the history of Portuguese theatre. This prominence is explained, first and foremost, by the fact that Portuguese dramaturgy as a whole is rather irregular and impoverished, at least in comparison with what was produced in Spain or England. But there is also another reason that justifies this playwright's importance almost half a millennium after his death. Gil Vicente was writing in the first third of the sixteenth century, which, as we know, was the most glorious period of Portugal's history, due to its control of the maritime spice route. In fact, Vicente's *oeuvre* is often read as a kind of sociological tract, reflecting the great transformations that occurred in the kingdom in the wake of the so-called Discoveries. It has been understood in this way by many historians, who invoke one or another play (or sometimes only a particular character) to illustrate the socio-economic situation of the period, and by literary and theatre scholars, who like to draw attention to the *testimonial* side of Gil Vicente's theatre. However, neither readings are completely convincing; for, rather than being an accurate portrait of Portugal at the time, Gil Vicente's theatre is a kind of *caricature*. This means that, though it is strongly related to reality (for that is a property of all good caricatures), it does not reflect it faithfully.

But Vicente's worth should not be gauged only by his supposed realism. Before him, there was, to our knowledge, no one in Europe that produced an *oeuvre* that is simultaneously so *extensive* (around fifty plays), so *coherent* (to the extent that his plays are like continuous chapters of the same work), and yet so *varied* (in that they make use of a whole range of medieval theatre genres from farce, mystery and *sottie* to the morality play and chivalric fantasy).¹

These characteristics (extension, coherence and diversity) constitute the true basis for valuing Vicente's *oeuvre*. But, as if this were not enough, others also indicate *originality* as an important factor, considering him to be an *original* creator in the Romantic sense of the word, that is, someone who does not follow models, but whose art constantly and freely comes up against reality or the imagination. But

this needs to be qualified. While his work is undoubtedly very inventive (an aspect that has been insufficiently studied to date), this does not mean that there are no underlying models. On the contrary, in recent times both formal and thematic/morphological sources have been identified: the Iberian song books, in the first case (at least as regards versification), and a wide range of references in the second that extends from fifteenth-century Iberian theatre to medieval drama from the north of France.

As Gil Vicente's *oeuvre* as a whole came to light for the first time only in 1562 (twenty-five years after his death), there have always been doubts as to the extent to which the published material was exclusively by him. It seems that one of his sons (Luís Vicente) may have intervened, at least in the arrangement of the text. The only thing we know for sure is that Gil Vicente had begun the task of organizing and editing his plays with a view to publishing them in a complete edition. But he most probably did not finish the job himself, and it seems to have been taken over and completed by his son. Though we cannot determine exactly the extent of Luís's intervention in the texts, it is generally considered to be minimal.

However, rather than speculating about the role played by father and son in the editing of the former's plays, it is more important to try to identify the *stability* of the texts that figure in the *Copilaçam*. Are these exactly the same texts that were used for the theatrical performances, or have they been adapted from a literary or rhetorical perspective? Unfortunately, we do not have enough data to be able to answer this question definitively. All that we know is derived from a comparative study of a very small set of plays that have survived in more than one version, such as the *Auto da Barca do Inferno* and *Farsa de Inês Pereira*. In both of these cases, there are reasons to believe that the versions collected in the 1562 edition underwent some alterations, which included literary or rhetorical improvements to highlight their relationship with the works of the *Cancioneiro*,² and the suppression of the stage directions.

However, there is one case that could be understood quite differently. While the vast majority of the plays are only available in the *Copilaçam*, which means we cannot compare them with other versions (if these existed, they have not survived or have not been found), there is one text (only) that was not included in the 1562 collection, or at least not in its entirety. I am referring to the *Auto da Festa*, which is one of this author's least-read plays, despite the fact that it has particular points of interest, at least as refers to the *workshop aspect* of the playwright's creation. The *Auto da Festa* came to light in 1906, having been kept for years in a private library. It was part of a miscellany of twenty-one texts that had been printed in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries, most of them being sixteenth-century dramatic works.³

Unsurprisingly, this find was greeted with great enthusiasm, as the early twentieth century was a very propitious period for events of this kind. We should remember that less than a century had elapsed since the Hamburg edition (of 1834) had generated a spectacular revival of interest in Gil Vicente;⁴ while the 400th anniversary of the *Monólogo do Vaqueiro*, in 1902, had also generated considerable public interest.⁵ Indeed, those latter commemorations proved to be an inaugural moment for an intense activity that continued unabated for thirty-five years, and

which was unusual in its continuity and coverage. In order to better understand the sense of opportunity generated by this event, we should remember that this was a time of great philological excitement, when there was great receptivity to anything that could be added to the very special heritage that was sixteenth-century literature in Portugal.

The owner of the miscellany in question was the Count of Sabugosa, a prestigious aristocrat and polymath (himself a poet, though perhaps more persistent than inspired), who threw himself energetically into the publication of the work. In fact, he not only transcribed the text with remarkable zeal, but also wrote a long introductory essay, characterized by the clarity, the sound research and the caution typical of the philology of the day.

The essay does not avoid some of the more intriguing questions. It was not known, for example (nor is it yet), why the play was not included in either of the two editions of Vicente's complete works. Various hypotheses have been put forward, some of which may still be considered valid. Perhaps Gil Vicente had himself rejected it? Or perhaps it was rejected by his children who, as we have seen, edited his *oeuvre* after his death (though in that case, we might ask why this play in particular attracted such censorship)? Could it be that the play, in its present form, resulted from the cobbling together of disconnected scenes, perhaps undertaken in the author's absence (for example, after his death)?⁶

All of these hypotheses are plausible. However, no evidence has emerged to date that definitively proves any one of them. In fact, the text contains materials (characters, situations, phrases) that can be found in Vicente's other plays (in various degrees of transposition), which might have been sufficient in itself for the dramatist to have left them out of the edition of his collected works (which, everything suggests, was in an advanced stage of preparation). We also know the letter addressed to the king that he composed as a preface to the work. But there may be other reasons for its non-inclusion. In fact, despite the high degree of impunity that Gil Vicente seems to have enjoyed, the play undoubtedly contains scandalous material. The play opens with the figure of Truth, who has been driven out of the Portuguese Court, no less!⁷ But the denunciation goes even further. Behind the criticism of 'bad times', there is a strong hint that the King himself had been complicit in the rejection of Truth (or at least had accepted it passively):

Oh grã crueldade
Que o tempo de agora tem tal calidade
Que cedo no paço já trazem por Lei
Que todo aquele que falar verdade
É logo botado da graça d'el rei. (p. 656)⁸

[Oh, great cruelty! The times now are of such a sort that soon in the royal palace they will make a law that anyone who speaks the truth will immediately lose the king's favour.]

Even though the monarch is absent, he is nevertheless invoked in various ways.⁹ For example, Truth addresses a certain lord in terms that would seem to rank him above the king, D. João III. After the comment about her poor relationship with the king, she immediately refers to that lord in terms that exceed what one might expect in

the circumstances. As well as praising him for his intrinsic virtues, the character also recognizes him as an *alternative protector*, declaring herself prepared to move her seat ('assento') from the royal palace to other lodgings ('pousada'):

E tendo sabido que vós, meu senhor,
Me tendes amizade e fê verdadeira,
E por isso venho de aquesta maneira
Dar-vos as graças por tão grande amor.
E com pensamento
De em vossa pousada fazer aposento,
Pois me amais com tanta firmeza,
De vossa boca farei fortaleza
Para estar nela sempre de assento. (pp. 656–57)

[Since I know that you, my lord, feel genuine friendship and loyalty towards me, I have come to thank you for your great affection. My idea is to take up my lodging in your house, since you love me so constantly. Your word will be my protection so that I can always remain there.]

In addition to these implications (which were potentially scandalous politically), there are others of a moral nature. We only have to recall the first peasant (João Antão, from Beira), who brags shamelessly about a sexual encounter he had with the judge's wife, no less, one Sunday. Of course the theme of the peasant who sleeps with a married woman of a higher social standing is a common one in medieval farce,¹⁰ but even so, there are a number of contextual differences here that should be pointed out. The burlesque and inversion of values that characterize farce (which of course was a popular urban tradition) may not have gone down well at Court, particularly in a book composed at the king's request and dedicated to him. Furthermore, in its crudeness, an allusion of this type would have been inconvenient, not only on the abstract plane but also as regards the personal references that are brought into play.¹¹ In the light of this, if the *Auto da Festa* had been included in the *Livro das Obras*, it would have seemed out of place, alien to the logic of the whole.

In order to shed light on these questions, it would be useful to know more about the circumstances surrounding the play's performance. But this does not seem to be possible. We do not know with any accuracy when and for whom the text was performed for the first time. Following Óscar de Pratt, José Camões (who has undoubtedly produced the most important study of this text of all those published since 1906) thought that it was performed one Christmas, some time after 1526. However, with his habitual caution, he hesitates to specify the place and audience. For my part, I would go a little further. On the basis of all the various textual and extratextual elements that are available to us, I might risk suggesting that the play was performed outside the royal space, quite probably in a lord's court. That in itself would be enough to endow the text with a relatively exceptional status.¹²

After some hesitation (hesitation seems to plague philology in all periods!), the Count of Sabugosa suggested that the play might have been performed in Évora at Christmas 1535 for the 1st count of Vimioso, D. Francisco de Portugal. In support of this thesis, there exists a curious similarity between Truth's encomium to the dedicatee of the play and the words that Gil Vicente places in the mouth of the

same character in the lines he composed to celebrate the acclamation of the king, D. João III (cf. p. 87).

However, more important than knowing if this play was rejected, banned or merely forgotten (and the three possibilities may be complementary), it is worth exploring the text itself with a view to establishing its usefulness for capturing something of Gil Vicente's creativity 'in process'. In fact, as there are few doubts about the authorship of the play, someone must have decided that this particular work by Gil Vicente should not figure in the *Copilaçam*. We do not know who took that decision, nor even if it was taken freely or conditioned in some way. Given the lack of evidence to help us answer these questions, the best thing is to focus, for now, on another type of problem. Despite the various unknowns that I have been highlighting, and which have almost entirely occupied the attention of Vicente scholars, it is very likely that the text that we have today may tell us something new about another aspect: I am referring specifically to the way in which it functioned as a kind of workshop for the dramatist. This is not a minor point. On the contrary, the possibilities it offers for understanding the dramatist's creative processes may be a particularly promising line of research. It could help solve some of the dramaturgical and theatrical mysteries of this play and of the *autos* as a whole. Moreover, provided that certain precautions are taken, an inquiry into this material could also yield a better understanding of Gil Vicente's place in the artistic panorama of the sixteenth century, possibly thereby helping him achieve the recognition that is due to him in the history of European theatre.

In the light of this encouraging prospect, I shall, therefore, formulate some questions, which to date have scarcely been raised. In other words, I propose to use the *Auto da Festa* to take a peep into Gil Vicente's workshop, as this play that seems to have emerged from it in a very different state to the others that we know.

As has been repeatedly noted since 1906, this play may indeed be perceived as a kind of mosaic of a significant part of Vicente's dramatic works. I propose to look at how the pieces of that mosaic fit together, resorting not only to the most obvious analogies but also to others that are less visible. Let us begin with the gypsy women. As in the short farce entitled precisely the *Farsa das Ciganas* [Farce of the Gypsy Women], the *Festa* also has gypsies who have gifts of divination.¹³ Differences have been pointed out, which I shall return to later. But we cannot ignore the fact that clever gypsy women who are well-spoken and claim to understand the arts of divination only appear in two of Vicente's plays.¹⁴ Still with regard to the characters, there is a peasant (the second, called Janafonso), who is undoubtedly a typical example of the displaced rustic — displaced not only in space (though unfortunately we don't know exactly where he is from) but also in terms of his speech and values. In this case, the peasant makes the effort to travel from Braganza to ask the newborn God to marry him, refusing not to be received:

Ca se Deus fosse ocupado
Como homem diz a respeito,
Mas ele tem tudo feito
Dantes que ele fosse nado
E meu visavô desfeito. (p. 668)

[For if God was busy, as people say... But he has done everything since before he was born and my great-granddad died.]

In terms of its discourse and theatricality (which is clearly parodic), this is in fact the clearest example of duplication. The *Templo de Apolo*, which had been performed in 1525, included a peasant of this type, a parody that would naturally have amused the audience.¹⁵

This calquing of roles, which has been repeatedly pointed out by critics, raises a larger problem — the question of Gil Vicente's originality. There are so many aspects to this that I cannot analyse them all here. However, it does appear that we might have given too much credence to the simplified notion that such issues were not important at the time Vicente was writing; that literary composition was still formulaic in nature and the concept of the *author* (at least as conceived from the eighteenth century onwards) was largely dispensable; and also that Vicente's creation was defined more by political commitment than by aesthetic criteria (in the Romantic sense). However, the sensation I have is that it was not entirely like that. As Daniel Arasse, Andrew Bennett and others have shown, the modern idea of the author developed gradually, and in literary creation and the arts generally, important changes took place precisely in the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.¹⁶ (This very question has been recently reassessed in the context of late medieval theatre.) Without going into aspects that I have developed in more detail elsewhere,¹⁷ it seems to me perfectly reasonable that the *Livro das Obras* should have obeyed a civic, ideological and aesthetic plan that includes the very idea of *originality*, expressly invoked in some of the paratexts of that book.

But let us return to our inventory of similarities between the *Festa* and the other *autos*, because that will form the basis for the conclusions that I hope to propose shortly. Like the *Barca do Inferno* [Boat of Hell], *Juíz da Beira* [Judge from Beira] and *Floresta de Enganos* [Forest of Deceits], this play criticizes the functioning of justice (this time it is Truth that points out that João Antão has to 'buy' the Judge's favour with partridges); the peasant for his part, following in the footsteps of Pêro Marques (the famous husband of Inês Pereira, later the magistrate of Beira), compares the justice of the codes with the justice of nature — if the judge's wife had agreed and enjoyed the relationship, then why should he be condemned?¹⁸

Still within this sphere of analysis, we should not forget to mention the figure of the Fool. Various models of the Fool exist in Gil Vicente, of course, almost all taken from the medieval *sotties*. However, the character that appears in the *Festa*, though occasionally showing a more sensitive side, is above all both *evangelical* and *obscene*, evoking in this duality the famous Joane in the *Barca do Inferno*. In this case, the Fool even proposes marriage to Truth, who is not aghast at the idea (a complicity that reminds us of the heavenly guarantee that the Angel grants Joane in the first *Barca*). Another affinity between the two fools results from the fact that, in both cases, the character remains on stage even after having obtained his orders to leave: in the *Barca do Inferno*, Joane stays at the Angel's side, while in this play the Fool remains with Truth, conversing with Janafonso and old Filipa Pimenta (his mother).

The parallels (and I am not speaking of pure transpositions) are coming to an end. Even so, we should not overlook old Filipa Pimenta who, in her amorous

folly, is akin to Brásia Caiada of *Triunfo do Inverno*. Both represent the same grotesque subversion of nature and are prepared to make all sacrifices to fulfil their belated desires. Another common topic (though one that is even more diffuse) is the connection between punishments from God ('que é verdade acabada' [who is perfect truth]) and the flight from Truth. This same punitive logic is applied throughout the whole of the *Auto da Feira* [*Auto of the Fair*] and, in particular, to the character of Rome, chastised by Providence for having made a pact with the Devil. If we want to take this parallelism to the extreme, we could call attention to the scene immediately preceding the nativity scene. I am referring to the group of nine shepherds that come to the Fair (in the *Auto da Feira*) not to buy and sell but only to show their unconditional devotion to the Virgin, thereby revealing themselves to be the antithesis of all the other unsatisfied characters who cultivate deceptive appearances to the detriment of their true essences (Rome, the *compadres* and *comadres*). As in the *Feira*, the *Festa* also finishes with a group of shepherds (in this case a boy and three girls) who in fact celebrate Christmas and Truth on the pretext of a marriage between the shepherd Gil Tibabo and Filipa Pimenta.

The Allegorical Figure of Truth

In the light of this, it is tempting to suggest that this *auto* is, in a sense, a 'repetition' or 'duplication', and that it was for this reason that it was considered to have no place, either in the *Copilaçam* or in Vicente studies in general. Indeed, this has been the general tone of the assessments made hitherto, with some basis. But we should not confuse the various dimensions on which these plays operate. While this might be the effect of the play on the common reader (the kind of public that Gil Vicente or his sons would have had in mind when they put together the *Copilaçam*), it is not the case for the more demanding reader. The echoes and foreshadowings of other texts, which appear to subvert the basic precepts of authorial originality, might have been a reason for excluding it from the book that was edited in 1562. But as this play is effectively an extensive repository of theatrical formulae, it occupies a unique position in relation to the other Vicente plays that we know. If we discount the very particular case of the *Barcas* and the holy, angelic and diabolic characters that appear in the morality plays, the presence of the same character in more than one *auto* is really very rare (Pêro Marques and Inês Pereira are unique cases in the whole of the *Copilaçam*). This is surely significant, confirming what we said a short time ago about the idea of the author that underpins the whole of Gil Vicente's work.

In fact, although these similarities are important, they may mask an aspect that could prove decisive in our evaluation of this play. Firstly, it should be pointed out that the similarities indicated are not all of the same type. While the second peasant (Janafonso) recalls, in his speech and attitude, the peasant in the *Templo de Apolo* (performed in January 1526), and the two gypsy women, despite their differences in tone, are reminiscent of those others in the *Farsa das Ciganas*, all the other overlaps merely indicate the remarkable cohesiveness of the extraordinary edifice constructed by Gil Vicente. Indeed, we could go as far as to say that, across the *oeuvre* as a whole, such approximations can also be seen in other plays by this author

(discounting the cases already mentioned of Janafonso, the gypsy women and the old woman who wants to get married).

I would like to draw attention to the fact that the *Auto da Festa*, as well as displaying numerous marks of Vicente's vision, also bears important traces of individuality, which suggests that it would not have been impossible to eliminate the repetitions. The most impressive original feature is the character of Truth, a structuring allegory that does not feature in any of Vicente's other plays. As has already been noted, it is she that opens the play with a Prologue which is a kind of sermon about the state of the world and the Portuguese Court in particular; and she also presides over the procession of pilgrims, thereby linking together the different scenes. This prominence is also marked formally; for, as has been noted since 1906, Truth is the only character that expresses herself in lines of more than seven syllables (*versos de arte maior*), in keeping with the persuasive declamatory register of her speeches. This was a very common device in medieval theatre: a fixed character would have the function of connecting the movable parts of the play (as happens in *Agravados*, *Templo de Apolo*, *Cortes de Júpiter* and in the three *Barcas*). But in this case, there is more to it than that. In addition to the theatrical component, Truth also fulfils another function. On Christmas day, the character actually assumes the role of the Nativity, so that all meanings centre upon her. She speaks of herself, evidently, and of the lack of welcome she has received; but at the same time she also confronts the other characters with her presence. Thus, all the characters that arrive are necessarily identified by their relationship to the figure who has taken her seat on stage, dominating the scene even when she does not expressly intervene. In her axiological dimension, this allegorical character occupies the place that, in Vicente's other Christmas plays, is occupied by Christ or by the Virgin.

I have previously pointed out how Truth's lamentations are particularly incisive: the scorn she receives from all sides, including from the Court, makes her into a lyrical figure, an attribute straight from the field of Good. It is this that explains how she is affirmed as the direct daughter of the Holy Trinity, alongside faith. The fact that she addresses herself to a particular lord, after being expelled from other places, in the belief that she might find shelter with him, makes her indirectly the daughter of hope, another theological virtue. Thus, the allegory becomes so central that the two aesthetic pillars that sustain Vicente's whole *oeuvre* — satire and lyricism — are concentrated in her. In fact, she embodies not only the dimension of moral criticism directed at society (for having abandoned Truth), but also, in her moral appeals (and her marked affinity with the dispossessed Fool), the values of Humility and Justice, which in the sermon books of the era, so often function as conventional oppositions to the lie.

Thus defined, the allegory of Truth is not valid only for this play, but irradiates outwards to touch Gil Vicente's whole *oeuvre*. In the end, this is the same Truth that was put to the test in the *Auto da Alma* [*Auto of the Soul*] (where she is antagonized by the Devil's lie); and in the *Barcas*, it is the lack of Truth that causes those condemned to Hell and Purgatory (many of whom are liars, flatterers or alienated souls) to enter the boat of the damned. On the other hand, it was for having recognized Truth *in extremis* that the great of the world are touched by the gesture

of mercy in the *Barca da Glória*. Proclaiming himself the lover of truth, the shepherd Gil (who in Christmas 1502 was played by Gil Vicente himself) crafts his image before the royal Court, declaring that he is ready to distance himself from the lying hubbub of the world and detach himself from his companions in order to decipher the mysteries of the Nativity.¹⁹ It was also for having proclaimed the truth that the Philosopher in *Floresta de Enganos* (the author's last play, performed in Évora in 1536) complains of having been put 'en cárcel muy teneblosa' [in a very dark gaol], bound to a simple-minded fool who humiliates and represses him, thereby preventing him from continuing to express himself in the Court (and only in the Court).

The *Livro das Obras* obviously contains other characters of this type. But there is no doubt that the presence of one more reinforces the gallery of moralizing characters, which are clearly unifying factors in such a heterogeneous *oeuvre*, as well as being extensions of the author's own thought.

The Theatricality of the *auto*

The effect of this unique character is not only semantic in nature; there are also theatrical consequences. By concentrating the message of the whole play onto a single figure, the dramatist achieves another unexpected result: he reinforces the theatricality of all the other characters. We should note that the scenes were also punctuated by music, which also served as an emblem for some of the pilgrims. There are also elements of pure theatre, which go beyond the words pronounced. For example, the gypsy women have little value dramaturgically, but are important devices from the theatrical perspective; the fool, an accident-prone swineherd, who is distracted and often fails to perceive the meaning of what is said to him, is a source of amusement amongst the audience, generating ambiguity; while the peasant Janafonso is not only there for his social representativity, but also because he is the most festive and parodic peasant in Gil Vicente, not only for what he says but also for what he suggests (going, in this respect, further than his predecessor in the *Templo de Apolo*). The same happens with the grotesque Filipa Pimenta who, giving up as lost the time when she raised the Fool (her son), now tries obsessively to recover the fires of passion; transcending the conventional representation of the old woman crazed by love, she becomes yet another of the many foolish figures that abound in the theatre of Gil Vicente.²⁰ But irrespective of the relationship that any of these characters might maintain with others in this vast frieze of Vicentine action, they are clearly less bound in this play to the rhetoric of the message, appearing more detached and genuine. That is to say, they seem to be endowed with a greater degree of theatricality than what we have been used to in the *Copilaçam*.

Conclusion

Strictly speaking, nothing that I have said up to now has undermined the two hypotheses already put forward to justify the non-inclusion of the *Auto da Festa* in the *Copilaçam* of 1562 and 1586, and its disappearance for over three centuries. Nevertheless, I think it is legitimate to propose a third possible explanation, not to

exclude any of those that are under appreciation, but to complement them. As we have known since 1906, the *Auto da Festa* consists of unworked theatrical material that the author had not intended to appear in the printed book and song book that would later collect together most of his *oeuvre*. Vicente's creative process would probably have involved several different phases. Firstly, there would have been the theatrical invention, often done quickly. Only later would that be subjected to literary treatment, which would operate on two levels: technical and formal improvement, which would bring gains in the rhetorical and expressive dimensions though with some possible loss of theatricality,²¹ and preparation for inclusion in the macrotext (the *Copilaçam*), which would involve reinforcing internal connections and accentuating parallelisms with other works.²²

Before or after the death of Gil Vicente, the *Auto da Festa* was a theatrical performance. For one reason or another, it remained in that state, and was never reworked dramaturgically. In the form that we know it today, this play is an important vestige of the abundant material that Gil Vicente kept in his prodigious workshop. Everything suggests that this workshop was not so different from other workshops, in that it contained raw material for later use mixed up with vestiges of other things that may occasionally have been taken advantage of and then dismantled for convenience. This was a mental and material workshop, and I imagine it as having many ordered shelves, labelled to distinguish the various genres (Gil Vicente had a keen awareness of genre), formulas, characters and topics. In this type of workshop, there is always a place for recyclable materials. And, as all of us that work with literature and the products of the mind know well, that type of material may constitute not only an opportunity and comfortable reserve, but also a form of moral martyrdom. They are materials which, today, we would save on a back-up disk, awaiting the long summer holidays. I am speaking of those things that people our memory, but which, with the passing of time, gradually become pure nostalgia. Yesterday, as today, the time for those tasks may never arrive, particularly when the task in question is not an easy one (as was definitely the case here), requiring not only time but also a creative spurt of the kind that only occurs once in a while. Parts of the play would have had to have been erased (Janafonso, undoubtedly), others adjusted (the gypsies and the old woman), and there would have had to have been a major reorganization of the whole in order to allow the rest to be preserved.

Although I have not seen any records to this effect, I believe that, at the time of Gil Vicente's death, the *Auto da Festa* was on that top shelf, the one containing the materials that had served a purpose for a particular occasion and were now awaiting an opportunity when they could be reworked. It was from that shelf that the work was taken, without Vicente's knowledge, for a one-off edition, later to end up in the so-called miscellany that the Count of Sabugosa inherited and published in the euphoric climate of the early twentieth century.

If this was indeed the case, two conclusions may be suggested. One, while neither consensual nor controversial, is already well known and has been put forward by a number of Vicente scholars; the other is more theoretical, and perhaps for this reason has attracted less attention. In fact, we might imagine that Vicente, like Camões,

Bocage and Almeida Garrett after him, worked in phases, with much trial-and-error (a vision that will not appeal to those that prefer the Romantic image of the inspired genius given to sudden spurts of inspiration). In this respect, common sense can come to our aid. As a man of the theatre, Gil Vicente would have been dependent on collective dynamics, and could only have worked in that way. But this little visit to his workshop has proved something else: that in his time, there was a clear awareness of the differences of register between the text that directly served the performance (whether published or not), and that other one that could be given to the public to read in the form of a book.²³ Very probably, the texts that figure in the *Copilaçam* derived from theatrical versions that have since disappeared. The *Auto da Festa* did not make it to that last phase; for that would have cost too much effort, and/or because the final result may not have pleased the king, D. João III, for whom Gil Vicente had worked hard for fifteen consecutive years and for whom, at the end of his days, he collected together his works 'out of pity for my old age'. Or even — and now it is merely my intuition speaking — because this work was produced during a period of bitter circumstances. As I interpret the material available, this play not only developed outside the royal Court but also against it — so outside it and against it, in fact, that it was not possible to give it, later, the rhetorical and moral varnishing that covers most of Gil Vicente's *Cancioneiro* — which, benefiting from protection at the highest level, came off the press of João Álvares ('printer to the king') in Lisbon in September 1562, exactly 452 years ago.

Bibliography

- ARASSE, DANIEL, *Le Sujet dans le tableau* (Paris: Flammarion, 1997)
 BENNETT, ANDREW, *The Author* (London: Routledge, 2005)
 BERNARDES, JOSÉ AUGUSTO CARDOSO, 'O Juiz da Beira e os sentidos da sátira vicentina', in *Revisões de Gil Vicente* (Coimbra: Angelus Novus, 2003), pp. 89–111
 ———, *Sátira e lirismo no teatro de Gil Vicente* (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional — Casa da Moeda, 2004)
 ———, 'A *Copilaçam* de todas as obras: o livro e o projecto identitário de Gil Vicente', *Diacrítica. Ciências da Literatura*, 18–19 (2004–05), 179–98
 BONFIM, ENEIDA DO REGO MONTEIRO, 'Uma leitura dos autos de Gil Vicente: o *Auto da Festa*', *Semear*, 8 (2003), 193–211
 CAMÕES, JOSÉ, *Festa* (Lisbon: Quimera, 1992)
 FAIBRE, BERNARD, *Répertoire des farces françaises. Des origines à Tabarin* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1993)
 MATEUS, JORGE OSÓRIO, *Livro das Obras* (Lisbon: Quimera, 1993)
 ———, 'Teatro e Literatura', in *De teatro e outras escritas* (Lisbon: Quimera, 2004), pp. 212–18
 MELLO MOSER, FERNANDO DE, 'Gil Vicente da Meia Idade ao Renascimento', in *Discurso Inacabado* (Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2004), pp. 15–154
 PRATT, ÓSCAR DE, 'Ainda o *Auto da Festa*', in *Gil Vicente: notas e comentários* (Lisbon: Livraria Clássica Editora, 1970), pp. 231–38
 RECKERT, STEPHEN, "'Gil Terrón lletrudo está'", *Leituras. Revista da Biblioteca Nacional*, 11 (2002), 15–33
 TISSIER, ANDRE (ed.), *Farces françaises de la fin du Moyen Age. Transcription en français moderne* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1999)
 VICENTE, GIL, *Auto da Festa*, intro. and ed. by Count of Sabugosa (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1906)

— *As Obras de Gil Vicente*, ed. by José Camões, vols. II & IV (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional — Casa da Moeda, 2002) [facsimile edition in vol. IV, pp. 675–90; transcription in vol. II, pp. 655–85]

Notes to Chapter 2

1. There is a full list of the plays in Chapter 11 (eds).
2. The name *Cancioneiro* may legitimately be applied to the *Copilaçam*, or *Libro das Obras*, not only because of the coherence of the texts included in it, but also because the word 'cancioneiro' is repeatedly used in the printing privilege of 3 September 1561.
3. The complete collection had been kept in the Palácio do Calvário. The text in question was in the form of a quarto volume, bound in calf, with gold lettering on the spine reading 'Varias crusid. Tom-III'. The miscellany also included texts of a lyrical nature, such as the famous 'Coplas por la muerte de su padre' by Jorge Manrique, plays by Ribeiro Chiado, Fernando Mendes, Afonso Álvares and Baltasar Dias, and other works by Gil Vicente (*Fé*, *Breve Sumário*, *Cananeia* and *Barca do Inferno*). There also two *autos* of uncertain authorship (*Deus Padre* and *Geração Humana*).
4. The person who discovered the *auto* described the circumstances of the find in the following terms: 'The atmosphere generated in cultured circles in both Europe and Brazil by that group of Lusophiles [he is referring to figures such as Alexandre Herculano, Gama Barros, Teophilo Braga and Carolina M. de Vasconcelos] meant that the neo-Vicentine movement was followed sympathetically, as can be seen in the celebration of his fourth centenary [...] This will certainly favour the reception of this play, the publication of which will bring a lost jewel of no mean value to the treasure hoard of Literature' (Count of Sabugosa, in *Auto da Festa*, p. 519).
5. The Hamburg edition, produced by Gomes Monteiro and Mascarenhas Barreto, had, nevertheless, limited circulation. As if this were not enough, a fire in the depository also meant that the book soon became a relative rarity. Under those circumstances, the appearance of the 1852 edition, which formed part of the prestigious collection known as the 'Bibliotheca Portuguesa' [Portuguese Library], was also important in affirming the canonical status of Vicente's *oeuvre* in Portugal and Brazil.
6. Óscar de Pratt, 'Ainda o *Auto da Festa*', in *Gil Vicente: notas e comentários* (Lisbon: Livraria Clássica Editora, 1970) has expressed a somewhat depreciative opinion of this play: '[...] curiously, despite its portrayal of the times and customs (which in fact do not add anything new to what we already know from Vicente's other canvases), this is perhaps the least carefully wrought of all that poet's works' (p. 235). The list of Vicente's works does not even mention the piece, which might mean that he did not recognize it as one of his — see *Livro das Obras* (Lisbon: Quimera, 1993). For another example of a text altered after the author's death, see Chapter 13 (eds).
7. For the allegorical figure of Truth in Protestant drama, see Chapter 15 (eds).
8. The quotations from the play are taken from the transcription by José Camões in vol. II of *Obras*.
9. Referring to expressions such as 'vim-me à Corte' [I came to the Court] or 'vós outros que andais no paço' [you others that are at the palace], José Camões does not seem to exclude that possibility, though he recognizes that the allusions could have been transposed from other plays (p. 3).
10. For the reader who does not have time to consult a complete edition of the farces (I am thinking particularly of the magnificent edition that André Tissier began to publish with Editorial Droz in 1999), there exists a useful directory of topics, involving 176 texts, which makes it possible to explore systematically the affinities with the Vicente *corpus*, in the certainty that there is no material missing. See Bernard Faivre, *Répertoire des farces françaises. Des origines à Tabarin* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1993).
11. A similar situation is of course evoked in the *Juíz da Beira*. I am referring to the complaint lodged by the procuress Ana Dias, involving a son of Pero Amado who has taken advantage of the fact that the wheat he had been tending was now 'grown' to embark on a sexual relationship with her daughter, Beatriz. Faced with the mother's protestations (now that her ambitions of marrying

- her daughter into a different social level have been thwarted), the Judge ignores the Ordinances, which lay down harsh penalties in such cases, and merely orders that it be determined whether the girl put up any resistance or if, on the contrary, the act occurred with mutual consent. Despite the similarity of the situation, the terms in which the episode is narrated (by the mother) and commented on (by Pero Marques) seem to reveal that some effort had been made to achieve that moral nuancing (the act occurred between peasants) and literary adaptation which, despite everything, can be detected in the texts of the *Copilaçam*.
12. In the study mentioned above, the first modern editor suggested that this might explain why the text was lost: 'it was perhaps because it had not been engendered in the noisy atmosphere of the Court, because the original was not stowed away in the council chests, that it was condemned to oblivion' (Pratt, 'Ainda o *Auto da Festa*', p. 67). In fact, we have information of only one such play that appeared in the *Livro das Obras*, but was not performed at Court. That was the *Cananeia*, a mystery play staged at the Monastery of Odivelas in 1534 or 1535.
 13. As we know, divination, like astrology and presumption, was a common target of Vicente's satire.
 14. As Eneida Bonfim has pointed out, the gypsy women in the *Festa* (Lucinda and Graciana) are less polite (or coarser) than their counterparts in the *Farsa das Ciganas* ('Uma leitura dos autos de Gil Vicente: o *Auto da Festa*', *Semear*, 8 (2003), 193–211 (p. 200 ff.)). However, given the uncertainty surrounding the date when the *Festa* was first performed, José Camões speaks both in terms of 'memory' (in the event that the *Farsa das Ciganas* had been performed earlier) and of 'anticipation' (to account for the scenario — less plausible to my mind — of it having been performed afterwards).
 15. See Bonfim, 'Uma leitura' for a detailed comparison of Janafonso of the *Festa* and the peasant in the *Templo de Apolo*.
 16. See in particular the detailed introduction to Daniel Arasse's *Le Sujet dans le tableau* (Paris: Flammarion, 1997), and Chapters 2 and 3 of Andrew Bennett's *The Author* (London: Routledge, 2005).
 17. 'A *Copilaçam de todas as obras*: o livro e o projecto identitário de Gil Vicente', *Diacrítica. Ciências da Literatura*, 18–19 (2004–05), 179–98.
 18. I have written elsewhere (2003) about the satirical logic that inspires the sentences issued by the Judge of Beira.
 19. See Stephen Reckert, "'Gil Terrón lletrudo está'", *Leituras. Revista da Biblioteca Nacional*, 11 (2002), 15–33, and Cardoso Bernardes, 'A *Copilaçam de todas as obras*: o livro e o projecto' on the significance of this character in the *Auto Pastoril Castellano* and in Vicente's *oeuvre* as a whole.
 20. Unreasonableness is of course a powerful generator of theatricality in itself, and is much satirized in Vicente's theatre. For an overview of the different satirical foci in Vicente's *corpus*, see my *Sátira e lirismo no teatro de Gil Vicente* (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional — Casa da Moeda, 2004), pp. 303 ff.
 21. These are also the conclusions that may be drawn by comparing most of the texts that figure simultaneously in the *Copilaçam* and outside it: *Maria Parda*, *Histórias de Deus*, *Ressurreição*, *Barca do Inferno* and above all, *Inês Pereira*.
 22. This is what happened, very visibly, with the *Barcas*. We can see from the stage directions and through various internal corrections and omissions that the versions that appeared in the *Livro* offered the reader a much more interconnected piece of theatre.
 23. In Portugal, it was Osório Mateus who most frequently emphasized that difference. Indeed, he did so repeatedly throughout his Vicente studies and even wrote a complete article on the subject: 'Teatro e Literatura', in *De teatro e outras escritas* (Lisbon: Quimera, 2004), pp. 212–18.