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Pero con todo eso, te sé decir que hay en la rústica vida nuestra tantos resbaladeros y trabajos, como se encierran en la cortesana vuestra.

(\textit{La Galatea} II, 34)

For centuries, truth has been at odds with Spanish pastoral romance. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the genre’s popularity was at its peak, and even later, once its readership declined, pastoral narratives withstood no few criticism from moralists and literati alike. For some, Arcadian literature was deleterious because it dealt \textit{ad nauseam} with idle shepherds who sing their woes in beautified sylvan settings (\textit{loci amoeni}), thereby focusing too much on \textit{otium} which is, as Cull claims, “the breeding ground of lascivious thoughts” (66). Its effect was judged even more pernicious to women, whose imagination could be dangerously spurred by what they read. Yet for others, the problem lied on the genre’s lack of \textit{verosimilitud}. The luxuriant nature, the flaunting of indecorous rustics belying refined courtiers, and the

---

1 The inception of Spanish pastoral fiction is still discussed. While scholars agree that Montemayor’s \textit{Diana} was the first Spanish pastoral fiction, there is much discrepancy on its date of composition and publication. Professor H. D. Purcell supports a date of publication “somewhere between 1554 and 1560” (364). In his edition of Montemayor’s work, Arribas tries to demonstrate “primero, que la edición de Valencia no es la príncipe, y en consecuencia cabe la posibilidad que la primera no se haya publicado en esta ciudad; y segundo, que ha debido de haber al menos dos ediciones anteriores, que no se han conservado, y en consecuencia que la fecha de composición, y probablemente de publicación, sea anterior a 1559” (10). In the preface to his edition of the \textit{Diana}, Juan Montero asserts that “Algunos indicios apuntan a la posibilidad que durante la estancia portuguesa, que dura desde finales de 1552 a mediados de 1554, Montemayor tuviese ya entre manos algunos de los materiales que acabarían por integrarse en \textit{La Diana}” (XXX). Still, Montero defends as “su fecha a quo” the year 1554 since “Montemayor no pudo ver impresa antes de 1554 la \textit{Novella} II, 36 de Bandello, fuente principal de la historia de Felismena” (XXXI), and as “el término \textit{ad quem}” the year 1558 (XXXI). All my references to the \textit{Diana} are taken from this edition.

2 This refinement constitutes by no means a defect of the genre. As Moreno Baez explains in his introduction to Montemayor’s \textit{Diana}, the presentation of a perfect nature is in accordance with Platonic thought, widely influential in Spain in the sixteenth century. In fact, “este hábito de abstraer es precisamente lo que permite a tantos escritores novelar sucesos verdaderos que, reducidos a lo esencial y renunciando a todo lo adjetivo, llevarían al plano luminoso en que se mueven ninfás y pastores” (xi).

3 Rhodes (1987) believes that the way in which women are portrayed in pastoral romance —as active, desiring, emotionally independent subjects— was in all probability what made these books so popular with women and so odious to the guardians of public morality. Curiously enough, this is the same argument that scholars have made for the success of a genre clearly related to the pastoral romance: the sentimental fiction (see Weissberger and Cortijo).

4 I use ‘indecorous’ here in the sense of lacking sociolinguistic and psychological decorum. Miñana refers as well to a generic decorum, a correspondence between character and literary genre, mode, or tradition, which indeed exists in pastoral literature. For the most part, however, those condemning the
impossible episodes narrated in some of these books, rendered them fallacious. Thus, moralists such as Fray Pedro de la Vega condemned *libros profanos*, among them “las Dianas,” on the basis that “los menos dañosos están llenos de vanidad y mentiras” (Glaser 403), and intellectuals such as Cervantes, who ironically took his first dip into narrative waters with a pastoral novel, underscored as well the falseness of such literature.

In the *Coloquio de los perros*, Berganza, one of the two dogs blessed with the gift of talking and reasoning, explains to Cipión that while working as flock guardian-dog, he realized “que no debía de ser verdad lo que había oído contar de la vida de los pastores; a lo menos, de aquellos que la dama de mi amo leía en unos libros cuando yo iba a su casa, que todos trataban de pastores y pastoras, diciendo que se les pasaba toda la vida cantando y tañiendo con gaitas, zampoñas, rabeles y chirumbelas, y con otros instrumentos extraordinarios” (Cervantes 1987, 251). He further describes that whenever his masters sang,

> no eran canciones acordadas y bien compuestas, sino un Cata al lobo dó va, Juanica y otras cosas semejantes; y esto no al son de chirumbelas, rabeles o gaitas, sino al que hacía el dar un cayado con otro o al de algunas tejuelas puestas entre los dedos; y no con voces delicadas, sonoras y admirables, sino con voces roncas, que, solas o juntas, parecía, no que cantaban, sino que gritaban, o gruñían. Lo más del día se les pasaba espulgándole o remendando sus abarcas; ni entre ellos se nombraban Amarilis, Filidas, Galateas y Dianas, ni había Lisardos, Lausos, Jacintos ni Riselos; todos eran Antones, Domingos, Pablos o Llorentes; por donde vine a entender lo que pienso que deben de creer todos: que todos aquellos libros son cosas soñadas y bien escritas para entretenimiento de los ociosos, y no verdad alguna. (254)

Berganza’s point is that these fictions induce false beliefs about the world of shepherds, a world that he has now experienced as corrupt, base and animalistic. The dog features specific examples in support of such damning remarks: Lope de Vega’s *Arcadia*, Montemayor’s *Diana*, Luis Gálvez de Montalvo’s *Pastor de Filida*, and Cervantes’ own *Galatea*. Berganza illustrates in practice what St. Thomas Aquinas
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5 The *Coloquio* is not the only place where Cervantes comments about pastoral literature. Remarks about specific works and authors are found in *Don Quijote* (especially in I, 6) and in the *Viaje del Parnaso* (102, 120, 155) as well, and ironic reference to the pastoral ideal is made in many of his works such as *La casa de los celos* (see Morley Hawk Marks). Avalle-Arce refers to Cervantes’ “eterno retorno” to the pastoral theme (1959, 217-31).

6 The irony does not escape the alert readers, for it is a fictional character, and one lacking verisimilitude, the one denying any truth to fiction. Moreover, by including his own pastoral novel...
postulates theoretically in his *Summa Theologica, pars I, quaestio 16, articulus 5* ("truth is found in the intellect according as it apprehends a thing as it is" [11]), for only after seeing the thing as it is (that is, the world of boorish rustics) can his intellect apprehend or understand the truth (in this case, that the universe depicted in books of shepherds is deceptive). The genre lacks truth inasmuch as it presents poetized characters with no match in the real world. Historic pastores do not enjoy a "felícisima vida" (Cervantes 1987, 254), do not live in *loci amoeni*, and do not spend their days articulating amorous complaints and / or compliments, playing instruments, and fainting. Such picture of pastoral routine is as implausible as the marvel episodes (encounter with supernatural beings, use of magic, unbelievable coincidences, display of prodigious memory) used to pepper some of the stories.

Ironically, views such as Berganza’s, so intent on denouncing the fictionality of pastoral books, have been overturned, and scholars now believe that there is some degree of realism in bucolic romances.7 In Mujica’s words, the opinion whereby "pastoral literature portrays an idyllic paradise far removed from the tribulations of everyday existence,” could not “be further from the truth” (1986, 127). Don Quixote and Sancho experience this axiom when they are trampled upon by bulls while in the company of the “Arcadia fingida” (II, 58). At this moment, “Arcadia becomes the golden land tainted with malice” (Finello 125). While it is true —and frequently avowed by pastoralists and by many authors of laudatory preliminary poems—8 that among the works listed by Berganza as examples of the genre’s falsehood, Cervantes blurs the limits between reality and fiction.
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7 See, for example, Krauss, Damiani, Damiani & Mujica, Mujica (1979, 1986), Rhodes (1986), Shepherd. I agree with Finello’s view in reference to the Marcela-Grisóstomo episode in *Don Quijote* (I, 11-14) that “many have ignored the authenticity of the “unreal” world created by its so-called “false” shepherds” (120), and that this episode and others in Cervantes’ masterpiece illustrate common practices during the Spanish Renaissance, whereby people (not shepherds) toyed with the pastoral.

8 In his introduction to the “Curious readers” found in *La Galatea*, Cervantes anticipates the criticism his book will receive in light of its lack of linguistic decorum (“no temeré mucho que alguno condemne haber mezclado razones de filosofía entre algunas amorosas de pastores, que pocas veces se levantan a más que a tratar cosas del campo, y esto con su acostumbrada llaneza. Mas advirtiendo […] que muchos de los disfrazados pastores della lo eran sólo en el hábito, queda llena esta objección” [8]). Similarly, after mentioning that Diana’s voice and conceits seem to be those of someone at court, Gil Polo quickly offers an explanation: “Mas esto no ha de maravillar tanto los hombres que lo tengan por imposible, pues está claro que es bastante el amor para hacer hablar a los más simples pastores avisos más encumbrados, mayormente si halla aparejo de entendimiento vivo e ingenio despierto que en las pastoriles cabañas nunca faltan” (147-48). According to Rhodes, while Cervantes was bothered by this lack of decorum and thus justifies its usage in his prologue (151), Montemayor “supports the literary artifice rather than undermining it” (1986, 152). In the preliminary sonnets to Luis Gálvez de Montalvo’s *El pastor de Filida*, Diego de Lasarte, don Lorenzo Suárez de Mendoza, and Gregorio de Godoy, all point to the lack of decorum and to the fact that the romance is written à clef: “Pero quien os leyere dirá al punto / que sois un nuevo cortesano Apolo” (430), “Pastor, si estás de serlo tan ufano, / ¿cómo en las cortes os avéis metido? / Y si sois cortesano conocido, / ¿por qué es bueno el trage de villano? / Si tocáis el rabel con ruda mano, / ¿cómo sale de cithara el sonido? / Y si sois con los árboles nacido, / ¿quién os mostró el lenguage ciudadano?” (429-30), “Por él puede dezirse sin defeto / que so el sayal ay al, pues si queremos / apartarle el reboço con cuidado, / un Gálvez de Montalvo hallaremos,
pastoral rustics speak and philosophize in a manner more akin to learned aristocrats than to shepherds, it is also true that socio-economic realities infiltrate the seemingly perfect Arcadia. In a study of Fray Luis de León’s ode *Vida retirada*, another text often taken as a mere articulation of the hackneyed dichotomy between hamlet and court, Walters identifies “some blurring of what could be an obvious contrast” (74) through the ironic use of diction and the interplay of images. The poem abounds with moments in which “terminology more apt for one side of the antithesis refers to the other” (76), thus suggesting that the luminous, delightful side partakes of the dark side and vice versa. Not surprisingly, then, Walters concludes “that ‘engaño’ [deception] is an important factor in the work” (79). Similarly, in Spanish pastoral books terms such as *fingir*, *simular*, and *engaño* are oft-used in relation to the bucolic, and Spanish shepherds are prone to lying. Thus, books of shepherds are mendacious at many levels: they are, of course, fictions (from *FICTIO-ONIS*, meaning an invention or feigned thing), the stories they tell are not verisimilar, and the characters are deceitful by means of lies, dissimulation and disguise (an aspect that, ironically, renders them less idealistic than it is commonly noted). Excellent studies have been devoted to the genre’s lack of verisimilitude as well as to the infiltration of negative elements such as physical violence, death and chaos in Arcadian novels. Yet, deceptive behavior has received little critical attention, in spite of the fact that many characters act deceptively and that this may, in my opinion, shed some light into what constituted a sixteenth century pastoralist’s “world’s vision” (Salomon 19). In reference to Garcilaso’s eclogues, Salomon describes them as “en armonía con la ideología de un grupo bastante minoritario (un círculo de “cortesanos” impregnados de la “sociabilidad” al ítálico modo) y una tradición cultural (el neo-platonismo petrarquizante)” (19), and reckons that authors work either in consonance with the dominant ideology of their time or inhibited by it (20). The Spanish pastoral romances herein discussed were penned by bucolic literature connoisseurs who were also well-versed in the falseness pervading the Spanish society of the sixteenth century.

/ tan hidalgo y galán como discreto / y tan discreto como enamorado” (431, text’s emphasis). And in the prologue to his *Arcadia*, Lope comments that his rustics are not “tan bárbaros que alguna vez no se suban de pastores a cortesanos y de rústicos a filósofos” (Morby 56). Such remarks appear as well at the intradiegetic level. For instance, the narrator in *La Galatea* explains, after Lenio’s reasons and song against Love, that “dejó admirados a algunos de los que presentes estaban, especialmente a los caballeros, pareciéndoles que lo que Lenio había dicho, de más caudal que de pastoril ingenio parecía” (II, 56), and Timbrio remarks in a similar fashion after Tirsi finishes his song in favor of Love (71-72). The idea, in reference to Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, is that “the atmosphere that reigns in Arcadia is neither peaceful nor reassuring. The turmoil of the polis intrudes continually into the psychological landscape” (Damiani & Mujica 11), is applicable to all pastoral literature.

9 The idea, in reference to Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, is that “the atmosphere that reigns in Arcadia is neither peaceful nor reassuring. The turmoil of the polis intrudes continually into the psychological landscape” (Damiani & Mujica 11), is applicable to all pastoral literature.

10 Damiani & Mujica pay particular attention to the presence of physical violence and death in Arcadian novels. Shepherd considers the presence of chaos (manifest in the forms of violence and death) in Cervantes’ *Galatea*. 
The likeness between the Spanish books of shepherds and their Italian prototype, Jacopo Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, has been amply discussed. The similarities are striking when it comes to situations, affected style, literary topoi and themes, format (verse mingles with prose), and philosophical background. Additionally, certain characters in the Italian *Arcadia* are a reflection of real people, a claim that is made as well by the authors of many Spanish pastoral novels. Such is the case of Sincero (a nickname given to Sannazaro himself by his friend Giovanni Pontano), or of Ergasto (another *nom de plume* for Sannazaro). But whatever the debt to Sannazaro, Spanish
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11 See, for instance, Ricciardelli’s article about the similarities as well as innovations of the Spanish pastoral novels (specifically Montemayor’s *Diana*, Gil Polo’s *Diana enamorada*, Cervantes’ *Galatea*, and Lope’s *Arcadia*) with respect to Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce remarks: “El positivismo, dadas sus preferencias metodológicas, acentuó, en forma desmedida, por lo general, los parecidos con sus antecedentes, dedicando especial atención a trazar paralelos con la *Arcadia* de Sannazaro” (1959, 59). Fucilla studied the genetic links between Gil Polo’s *Diana enamorada* and Sannazaro’s pastoral romance, although Avalle-Arce dismisses these links as merely “episódico” (1959, 100). For other references on the presence of Sannazaro in Spanish literature see Arturo Farinelli and Reyes Cano. Mia Gerhardt devotes chapter IV of her study to the Spanish pastoral (130-205). Here, she mentions how Montemayor drew from Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* in specific instances (179), but she also cautions that “ne doit-on s’exagérer sa parenté [i.e.of *La Diana*] avec l’*Arcadia* de Sannazaro: les deux livres n’ont pas grand’chose de commun” (185). As for *La Galatea*, Gerhardt considers “qu’il est étroitement imité de Sannazaro” (191). Fernández-Cañadas de Greenwood pays particular attention to rhetorical and thematic conventions in the pastoral, and underscores the importance of appropriating words, expressions and themes “successfully used in other works of the genre by masters of both classical and contemporary fame” (95) to engage the audience “in an intellectual game involving both playfulness and textual recognition” (95). While pastoral poetics demand the “recuperation of earlier texts through the repetition, quotation, and reproduction of themes and expressions already used in other works” (133), there is still room for originality, and Fernández-Cañadas de Greenwood shows how *La Galatea* is not a slavish follower of Sannazaro or Montemayor (see especially 133-87). Mujica acknowledges the existence of a long pastoral current in Spanish poetry and didactic prose, “But it was Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* that provided the principal model for the new Spanish literary genre” (1986, 11).

12 Montemayor warns in the *argumento deste libro* that “y en los demás hallarán muy diversas hystorias de casos que verdaderamente an sucedido, aunque van disfraçados debaxo de nombres y estilo pastoril” (125). Elicio and Lauso, two characters from *La Galatea*, have been traditionally said to be masks for Cervantes himself, and attempts have been made at identifying other characters as well (for a summary of the different hypotheses, see Avalle-Arce’s introduction to *La Galatea*, specifically pages xxx-xxxi). Morby begins his introduction to Lope’s *Arcadia* with the following remark: “Remóntase la historia de la *Arcadia* a los célebres amores de Lope de Vega con Elena Osorio” (9). According to Morby, the hero of the *Arcadia* is don Antonio Álvarez de Toledo, fifth duke of Alba, “apenas disfrazado” (10), “Belardo es Lope, desde luego, con su seudónimo predilecto; Brasildo […] es el distinguido músico Juan Blas de Castro […]; Celia, evidentemente una amante de Lope; Benalcio, tal vez el matemático Juan Bautista Labaña; Bresinda, la madre del duque, doña Brianda de Beaumont […]; Lucindo, don Diego de Toledo, hermano bastardo de D. Antonio; Alcino, su secretario Jerónimo de Arceo; y Tirsi su ayo, el poeta Diego de Mendoza” (12). For Lope’s *Arcadia* as a *novela en clave*, see also Collins. For *El pastor de Filida*, see Francisco Rodriguez Marin (1927). Rennert considers that many pastoral romances used the device “of introducing well-known poets or nobles as shepherds” which “added piquancy and color” to these works, “especially in the eyes of those classes for whom they were chiefly written, and for whom it must have afforded no little amusement to discover—picted beneath the thin veil of disguise, either their friends or themselves” (17). But not every Spanish pastoral fiction is
pastoralists introduced worthy innovations as well. Damiani & Mujica note, for instance, that “unlike the Spaniards who follow him, Sannazaro does not introduce violence through evil characters,” and that in Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, “Violence and evil exist not in the person of the villain, but as omnipresent underlying realities, common to both man and nature” (9).

Indeed, references to betrayal and hidden dangers abound in Sannazaro’s book of shepherds. Montano warns that “the wolf is outside, full of deceits, / and does a thousand harms in the region” (37) and cautions that “No one should place his trust in the shrewd treacheries / of false wolves that steal away the herds” (38); Serrano talks in pessimistic terms about a world ruled by envy, wealth, and falsehood, in which “One smiles at my good, who simulates his smile; / one weeps at my ill, who scarifies me then / behind my back with a sharpened file” (65); and even Opico laments “O how many could I number among these woods, / shepherds virtuous in appearance, who steal everything” (68-69). However and in spite of all the warnings about the omnipresence of hypocrisy, for the most part Sannazaro’s Arcadian shepherds are portrayed in a truthful light, and there are only a few isolated instances of
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13 In a previous study, Mujica mentions that “the negative elements that characterize the Spanish pastoral novels are present in a muted form in their principal model, Jacopo Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*” (1979, 263). See also Mujica’s 1986, 14.

14 Nash says of Montano’s comments that they “are evidently intended to be obscure, in a manner befitting socio-political satire” (37). The same applies to Serrano and Opico’s statements. Purportedly, Serrano’s remarks stem out of a personal situation: as he explains in eclogue 6, Lacinio has stolen two goats from him. However, Damiani & Mujica reasonably interpret such comments as allusions “to the political conniving taking place in Naples” (10) during the years surrounding King Frederick III’s (and Sannazaro’s) exile from Naples in 1501.
inconsequential dissimulation and deceit in the work. For instance, Galicio encrypts in his canzone his beloved’s identity under the pseudonym Amarantha. Recognizing herself as Amarantha, a beautiful girl inadvertently drops the flowers she had been picking from the meadow, blushes, and then, “thinking perhaps the better to hide the unexpected blush that arose from her maidenly modesty, she bent again to earth to gather them up, as if she cared for nothing else” (50). Later, the narrator (Sincero-Sannazaro) avows –quite ironically in view of his name– to his lack of sincerity with the woman he has loved since childhood, a situation that has driven him into a voluntary exile away from his homeland, Naples.\footnote{Sincero contrasts with Carino. To be sure, their stories are quite similar, except for the fact that Sincero is a courtier who lacks the courage to face the truth, and Carino is a shepherd who also conceals his feelings for some time, but who eventually discovers the truth to his loved one, thus earning first her anger but ultimately her love.} Finally, Carino’s story contains also references to deceptive behavior. To wit, he himself boasts of the tricks used by him and his beloved to entice and ensnare different kinds of birds; at some point, the woman he loves listens from a hiding place as Carino delivers his “last” speech; finally, her “sweet words and chaste embraces” (84) reveal that she had also been dissimulating her feelings for him. Carino appears again in chapter 11; this time he is winning a race when he falls and trips Logisto to prevent him from getting the first prize. Logisto complains and is awarded a consolatory prize, but so does Carino, for he astutely claims that he has suffered the same fate as Logisto. By contrast, lies of all kinds abound in Spanish pastoral prose.

Virtually every story included in Montemayor’s Diana offers an example of mendacity. This pastoral romance begins with the story of Sireno, Diana, and Silvano. On return from an inexcusable leave, Sireno finds out that his beloved Diana has married Delio, a rich shepherd. Sireno judges Diana deceitful and disloyal. In the past, Diana swore eternal love to him, both in person and through letters; and during Sireno’s absence, Silvano even overheard Diana’s laments, sighs, outpourings, and cries, all signs of her desperation due to his leave. Diana’s defense is that her father forced her to marry (“moça me casó mi padre, / de su obediencia forçada” [281]), but this sounds more like an excuse to Sireno.\footnote{This is also Ricciardelli’s opinion: “Diana, aunque posea todas las cualidades que la naturaleza puede dar a una mujer, es infiel a Sireno, a quien ella juró todo su amor” (2).} While Diana acknowledges that she forgot Sireno after marrying Delio, the truth is that she still cares for him. Diana is hurt to find Sireno and Silvano cured from the love they once felt for her after their return from Felicia’s palace, but she tries to conceal her true feelings:

Cada palabra d[‘]éstas, para Diana, era arrojalle una lança, que Dios sabe si quisiera ella más yr oyendo quejas que creyendo libertades; y aunque respondía a todas las cosas que los pastores le dezían con un cierto descuydo, y se aprovechava de toda su discreción para no dalles a
Diana reappears in Gaspar Gil Polo’s sequel to Montemeyor’s pastoral novel, *La Diana enamorada (Enamoured Diana)*. Gil Polo explains at the outset of his work how Sireno’s present indifference has rekindled Diana’s love for him, and makes good use of Diana’s propensity towards feigning and dissimulation. At the beginning of the work, Diana talks to Alcida (a noblewoman dressed as shepherdess whom she has just met) about her feelings for Sireno. As she sees Delio approaching them from a hill, she asks Alcida “que por disimular lo que aquí se trataba, al son de nuestros instrumentos comencemos a cantar, porque cuando llegue se contente de nuestro ejercicio” (103). It is ironic that while singing Diana makes reference to the opposition between country and court, and describes the latter as a place where “es el hablar contrario y diferente / de lo que el corazón y el alma siente” (107). To be sure, one can witness this vice in the country as well, and Diana is ‘living’ proof of it. Not only is she able to make her husband believe that she was not singing about love (“Mas cuando entendió que las canciones eran diferentes de lo que él [i.e. Delio] con su sospecha presumía, estuvo muy contento” [109]), but she appears in front of him as the perfect wife, as she greets him courteously and “con un angélico semblante” (109). Throughout Gil Polo’s continuation, the reader finds Diana concealing information (as when she does not tell Marcelio that the runaway shepherdess is his beloved Alcida), advising others to lie (as when she instructs Marcelio to keep the shepherd costume he is wearing and to hide his real identity), and pretending to be worried about Delio’s whereabouts when what really troubles her is her future with Sireno. Indeed, Diana is a master at manipulating information so as to appear as victim and thus justify her infatuation for Sireno. In the end, as Alcida explains, it is partly the knowledge that Diana will see Sireno at Felicia’s palace that kills Delio and, ironically, leaves Diana free to marry Sireno.

---

17 Quotes are taken from Francisco López Estrada’s edition of Gil Polo’s *Diana enamorada*.

18 At the end of the first book, Diana gathers her and her husband’s relatives in order to break the news that Delio has run after a shepherdess. The narrator in Gil Polo’s book adds: “Sobre ello mostró hacer grandes llantos y sentimientos, y al cabo de todos ellos les dijo que su determinación era ir luego por la mañana al templo de Diana por saber de la sabia Felicia nuevas de su esposo. Todos fueron muy contentos de su voluntad, y para el cumplimiento de ella le ofrecieron su favor, y ella, pues, supo que en el templo de Diana hallaría su Sireno, quedó muy alegre del concierto” (141). This paragraph was translated by B. Yong thus: “At which wordes she seemed to make so greeuous complaints, and indeed to be so sorrie, that in the end she told them all, that carely in the morning she was purposed to go to Diana’s Temple, to enquire of sage Felicia some newes of her husband Delius. They were all well content, that she should go, and offered her all the fauour and helpe they could in her iourney, but the intent thereof was for no other end but to see Syrenus, whom she knew assuredly to be there...” (61). There is no doubt in the translator’s mind that Diana is acting out her tears and complaints, and that she is indeed happy to have an excuse to see her Sireno. Of the same opinion is Solé-Leris, who notes, “she (i.e. Diana) goes to Felicia’s palace, ostensibly to seek news of her erring husband, but in fact to meet Sireno” (1980, 53-54).
Another story of importance in Montemayor’s romance is that of Selvagia, Ismenia, Alanio, and Montano. In this case, it is Ismenia’s lie to Selvagia that triggers a tangled web of falsehood and relationships. Ismenia meets Selvagia during a vigil at Minerva’s temple, making her believe that she is Alanio, her cousin and own beloved herdsman. When Selvagia, wracked by Alanio-Ismenia’s love, meets the real Alanio, he too falls in love with her, thus leaving Ismenia deeply sorry for her joke. Eager to undo this new relationship, Ismenia feigns affection for Montano, a shepherd whom she knows to be in love with her. Her only aim is piquring Alanio’s jealousy, but she eventually starts truly caring for Montano. However, Ismenia’s new trick works as initially hoped, for Alanio is again enthralled by her. Ismenia will get a taste of her own medicine when Montano bestows his affections on Selvagia, who rejects him because she is still in love with Alanio. Selvagia, who reports the whole story to Sireno and Silvano, explains that her father took her away from her village, and that she later learned that Montano married Ismenia, and that Alanio was about to marry a sister of Ismenia’s, leaving her heartbroken (162). Sireno and Silvano ask her to join them on their quest to find a remedy for their own troubles at the hands of Felicia. Selvagia’s story ends happily when, due to the sage’s magic, she and Silvano fall in love and get married.

In his sequel, Gil Polo is more interested in Ismenia, who is going in search of her husband Montano, when she runs into Diana and Marcelio. Ismenia mentions that Diana probably knows her from Selvagia’s account (although the reader is never aware that Selvagia told her story to Diana), and describes herself as the woman who “arrebozada la engañé [i.e. Selvagia], y cómo con mi propio engaño quedé burlada” and who later “por vengarme del traidor Alanio […] fingí querer bien a Montano, su mortal enemigo” (160, my emphasis). At present, Montano has estranged her due to Fileno’s slanderous comments about her. Fileno is no other than Montano’s father. In spite of his old age, he has madly fallen in love with Ismenia, who rejects him to marry Montano. Angered, Fileno marries Felisarda, a woman who is in love with Montano. Montano’s mother-in-law continues paying amorous compliments to him with the aid of a servant, Silveria. When Felisarda is unable to get what she wants, she and Silveria plot against Montano. Silveria tells Montano that Felisarda has a lover, and that he needs to look after his father’s honor by killing the adulterer. Thus, Montano almost kills his own father. Fileno, spurred by Felisarda, stirs up the townsman against his son, and tells everyone that Montano was probably instigated by Ismenia, who is secretly seeing Alanio. The calumny together with the threat of an angry mob force Montano to leave. Indeed, lies function as the story’s thread.

---

19 This plot bears close resemblance to the story of Potiphar’s wife and Joseph (Genesis 39), and to the Greek myth of Phaedra and her stepson, Hippolytus. Both young men were falsely accused by their stepmothers of having attempted to ravish them, when they reject their advances. Although according to Ferreres, in his edition of Gil Polo’s Diana enamorada, the story betrays an influence of Euripides’ or of Seneca’s Phaedra, Avalle-Arce believes that “la historia está calcada de la que cuenta Gménón en el libro I de la Historia etiópica de los amores de Teágenses y Cariclea de Heliodoro” (1959, 107), thus revealing the novel’s bizantinización.
Moreover, even Gil Polo betrays Montemayor’s storyline. According to Selvagia (in Montemayor’s romance), Montano was really in love with her when he wedded Ismenia. In Gil Polo’s continuation, Ismenia overlooks this detail. Thus, manipulation is at work at an extradiegetic level (as one author borrows information from another) and at an intradiegetic level (as a character-narrator chooses to silence some circumstance and to enhance other components of the story, which might be or not be true).

Generally, critics have emphasized Felismena’s significance in the Diana (Mujica 1986, 115 & 131; Rhodes 1987, 143). Felismena is not a shepherdess, but a lady who makes use of several disguises, thus heralding the female characters found in seventeenth century’s novela cortesana and in the comedia nueva. Unlike every other female pastoral character, Felismena is an enterprising woman, capable of following her lover don Felis to court dressed as a man. While at court, she makes don Felis and his new lady, Celia, believe that she is a gentleman by the name of Valerio. Celia actually falls in love with Valerio and finds her death when she is rejected by him. Distraught by Celia’s passing, don Felis disappears. For two years, Felismena has searched for him clad in herdsman’s clothes. Besides concealing her physical appearance and countenance, there are many instances in this story where Felismena is forced to dissimulate her feelings. At first, she fakes disinterest and displeasure towards don Felis and one of his letters. As Valerio, she becomes don Felis’ page and confidant(e), and eventually his messenger. While Felismena is truly at court in order to regain don Felis’ affections, as his servant, she tries her best to make Celia correspond to his feelings. Unfortunately, Celia perishes in the end due to Felismena’s role-play, thus showing once more the fatal power of lies. If the dénouement is a happy one for Felismena (pastoral novels conventionally end happily), it is only after her two-year penitence and through Felicia’s intervention.

Felismena is not a primary character in Gil Polo’s Diana enamorada. However, her twin brother, of whom the reader / audience knew almost nothing in Montemayor’s romance, appears in the sequel under the name Marcelio, and is one of the main characters. In Montemayor’s novel, Felismena explains how her mother died giving birth to her and her brother, and how her father Andronio “del grandíssimo pesar que uvo, murió de hay a pocos días” (190). Thereafter, the twins were raised in a monastery until they turned twelve, at which time the brother was sent to serve the king of Portugal, and she was taken to live with her grandmother. Gil Polo uses this information to create Marcelio. However, as we will see, Gil Polo distorts some of the details given by Felismena in the Diana. In the first book of Gil Polo’s work, Marcelio.

---

20 Mujica underscores Felismena’s agency in taking leave to follow don Felis (1986, 115) and describes the maiden as “aggressive, willful, and unlucky at love” (131). Damiani & Mujica refer to the scene in book II in which Felismena kills the three wild men as “unique…because of its vividness and grotesqueness” (60). In addition, while scholars such as Solé-Leris (1980, 32) or Mujica (1986, 115) mention the character’s debt to the Italian novella, according to Rhodes, Felismena is also “the precursor of the mujer varonil figure that was to have such success in the comedia” (1987, 143).
runs into Diana, and tells her how at a tender age he was sent to the Portuguese court, and how subsequently, the king sent him to North Africa, where he met a nobleman, Eugerio, his son Polidoro, and his two daughters, Alcida and Clenarda. He falls in love with Alcida, and plans to wed her in Lusitania, but on their way there, a storm forces him, Alcida, and Clenarda to abandon ship. As for Eugerio and Polidoro, they try as well to jump into the skiff, but Bartofano (the pilot of the ship) and a sailor beat them to it. On the skiff, they get to Formentera, where Alcida falls asleep, while the others discuss where they can look for food. Bartofano, who likes Clenarda, suggests that she accompany him and the sailor to the closest island (Ibiza), where there is abundant food. His intentions are far from good. At Clenarda’s pleas, Marcelio tags along, only to find himself tied up by the treacherous sailors, who tell Clenarda that her future brother-in-law wants to take advantage of her. Eventually, Clenarda finds out the truth, but Bartofano and the sailor abandon Marcelio in Ibiza and take Clenarda with them. In the meantime, Alcida wakes up from her sleep, only to find herself alone and thinking that Marcelio has betrayed her with her own sister. By the time Marcelio is able to get back to Formentera, Alcida is gone. At present, he tells Diana, he is still looking for her. Diana invites him to walk with her to Felicia’s palace, where he will indeed find Alcida and, to his surprise, his long lost twin sister, Felismena. He quickly recognizes her, and asks her if she has a brother, to which she replies: “Has de saber que yo tuve un hermano, que él y yo nacimos de un mismo parto. Siendo de edad de doce años, lo envió mi padre Andronio a la Corte del rey de lusitanos, donde estuvo muchos años” (245, my emphasis). Felismena (or is it Gil Polo?) forgets that her father, Andronio, as she explained in Montemayor’s novel, died only days after his wife.

The story of Marcelio, Alcida, Clenarda, Polidoro, and Eugerio is a miniature Byzantine novel, where the lovers are separated by different circumstances, endure difficult tests to their love, and end up being reunited and getting married. But it is also a story where we find deceit upon deceit. Although the characters involved in this novella are, for the most part, courtiers, the fact that they are clothed as shepherds and moved into a pastoral setting implies, metaphorically, that falsehood and turbulence can easily penetrate the rural peace.

Many other interpolated stories in the Diana and in the Diana enamorada offer examples of characters who deceive or who are duped by somebody or by circumstance into believing something untrue. One such story is the one involving Belisa, Arsenio, and Arsileo, which is narrated in book three of the Diana. Belisa is wooed by Arsenio and by his son Arsileo, the man she truly loves. One night, Arsenio spies Belisa talking to a man from her window and, blinded by jealousy, kills the man with a poisoned arrow. When Arsenio realizes he has killed Arsileo, he stabs himself to death. Belisa can find no solace. Not even Sireno, Silvano, Selvagia, Felismena, or the nymphs that have patiently listened to her account know what to say or do for her. The impression, even for the reader, is that there can be no relief whatsoever for the grievous and distressed shepherdess. We, just as the characters in the novel, are being
cunningly beguiled by Montemayor into believing that father and son are dead. It is not until book five that we find out what truly happened that night. In book five, Felismena stumbles upon Arsileo, who is talking to a shepherdess named Amarílida. Felismena listens secretly to their conversation “y quando vió que hablavan en Arsenio y Arsileo, servidores de la pastora Belisa, a los quales tenía por muertos, […] verdaderamente pensó lo que veya ser alguna visión o cosa de sueño” (273). Arsileo subsequently tells Amarílida that Alfeo, a necromancer from his town and who also happened to be in love with Belisa, is responsible for the hoax. Apparently, the two men killed were only spirits following Alfeo’s orders.

In Cervantes’ *Galatea* deception is observed at both the diegetic and the intradiegetic levels of narration. Lisandro, for instance, tells Elicio his tragic love story. His beloved Leonida is dead as a result of Carino’s hatred, muddling and tall tales. When Silvia, a friend and go-between of Leonida’s, informs her relative Carino of Lisandro and Leonida’s plan to secretly marry, Carino decides to get back at Lisandro and at Crisalvo, Leonida’s brother and also the man in love with Silvia. He dislikes Lisandro because one of Lisandro’s brothers had conquered the heart of the woman he was in love with, and Crisalvo because he had lost against him in a fight in front of the whole town. Carino asks to take Leonida to the village where the nuptials will take place, but on the night of the trip, he asks Libeo to take her in his stead, telling him that Leonida is a girl with whom he plans to get married. Meanwhile, he informs Crisalvo that Silvia is escaping to marry Lisandro. Furious, Crisalvo kills Libeo and Leonida, believing her to be Silvia. Lisandro kills Crisalvo and, after some persecution, is able to kill Carino as well (Carino’s killing happens at the diegetic level).

In another embedded story, Silerio tells his audience, among many other things, of how he disguised himself as a knave and called himself Astor in order to get into Nísida’s house, and of how he conceals his feelings for Nísida and lies to his friend Timbrio when he denies loving Nísida and says, instead, that he is in love with Nísida’s sister, Blanca.

In another story of importance in *La Galatea*, it is Rosaura’s purported indifference that drives Grisaldo away and her lie to her father that allows her to go in search of Grisaldo. A similar lie is at play when Nísida and Blanca tell the captain of a ship that they are pilgrims on their way to Santiago, when they are indeed in quest of Timbrio.

Finally, Maurisa qualifies as “el más sotil engaño que jamás se ha visto” (159) the trick played by Leonarda in order to marry Artidoro, and Teolinda herself describes her sister’s deceptive comportment as a “falso engaño” (255).

In all, there are two cases involving nobles (the stories of Timbrio and Silerio and of Rosaura and Grisaldo) and two involving rustics (the stories of Lisardo and Leonida and of Teolinda and Leonarda), thus underscoring the omnipresence of lies, in spite of the hackneyed belief, captured in Lauso’s song, that the court is a “falso, el mentiroso.
In the first part of Gálvez de Montalvo’s *El pastor de Filida*, Elisa and Mendino, who love each other, trick Galafrón and Filis respectively into believing that they actually favor them. An eclogue performed by some shepherds in the *quarta parte* in order to entertain Filida is based on the ‘real-life’ situation of Delio, Liria and Fanio, three shepherds known to all in the banks of the river Tagus. It is ironic that the eclogue begins with Delio’s *alabanza de aldea* and ends with Delio and Fanio’s malicious mutterings. Dissimulation is at play in the *quinta parte* as well when Andria, a noblewoman in search of Alfeo, arrives at the bower performing the role of a forlorn shepherdess from the Jarama river. She claims her name is Amaranta and that she needs to talk to Alfeo. Advised by Finea, Alfeo’s friends tell Amaranta that he’s gone, but she doesn’t believe the lie and decides to stay in the region. In the *sexta parte* a plaintive nymph, Filis, tells her friends of her suspicions: Mendino’s neglect makes her think there might be someone else. Indeed, her words make another nymph, Alvanisa, quite nervous.

Typically, the parts of *El pastor de Filida* start with considerations on love and on the differences between *corte* and *aldea*. The narrative voice in the *séptima parte* mentions first the suffering of those who are jealous or who have been forgotten by a beloved person, but claims that no pain can compare to “la injusticia de un engaño” (389), adding “vuélvame la verdad de mis pastores a la agradable ribera, donde, ya que como humanos hagan mudanzas, no como dañados harán engaños” (389). The narrator, a mouthpiece of Montalvo’s, seems to believe that deceit is pervasive in the court and only exceptional in the countryside.

Lope’s *Arcadia* is not exempt from deceptive characters. Interestingly enough, the work opens with the praise of Arcadia, an idyllic setting where rustics mislead and abhor each other. Galafrón and Leriano, for instance, are “igualmente aborrecidos” by every Arcadian (81), and Leriano is so envious of Anfriso, that he confesses to Galafrón that “muy cerca me ha tenido de perderme, porque una tarde en este mismo bosque estuve para matarle, y después acá infinitas noches me ha descubierto el alba con las armas en las manos, y en su sangre la imaginación” (84). Galafrón reassures his friend that he has a plan that will rid them of Anfriso. Indeed, book II starts with Anfriso’s farewell to Belisarda, all because of Galafrón, who has told Anfriso’s parents that everyone is talking about their son’s affair with Belisarda as something scandalous and that Anfriso’s life is in danger because Leriano wants to kill him. Hence the order to go to Mount Liceo for a while.

In book I, Menalca comments in front of Isbella, Leonisa and Alcino on how Olimpio boasts about having received Isbella’s favors, unaware that Olimpio is

---

21 Similarly, the narrative voice in Gálvez de Montalvo’s *El pastor de Filida* reflects thus in the opening pages of the *quarta parte*: “No dudo yo que en la mayor Babilonia permita amor algún pecho lleno de fe y lealtad, y entre la soledad de los campos alguna intención dañada para confusión de aquéllos y ventaja destotros; mas pocos son, y tan pocos que por milagro se puede topar con ellos” (212).
actually eavesdropping from behind some myrtles. Olimpio pretends that he hasn’t seen the group by singing a sonnet and by talking to the trees, until they call him to their side. Alcino in turn pretends that they were listening to a story, and requests that Menalca continues with the story. Menalca mentions that he will start the story from the beginning so that Olimpio can hear it, and he improvises a tale of love between a shepherdess, Crisalda, and a giant who falls in love with her, Alasto.

One of the main themes in the story of Crisalda and Alasto is deceit. Jupiter tricks Alania leaving her pregnant with Alasto. Alania tries in vain to conceal her pregnancy from goddess Diana who, upon noticing, punishes her by transforming her into a hill, which explains Alasto’s size. All the love smitten giant asks of Crisalda is that she allows him to see her often. Instead, she promises to visit him frequently, but never does. When Alasto goes to the village in search of Crisalda, she lies again, saying that she has been sick. The townspeople plot to kill Alasto. They ask Crisalda to pay a visit to Alasto and to pretend to favor him. When Crisalda returns from her visit, she celebrates her nuptials with Orfindo. A cowboy named Galicio, who had served Crisalda for seven years, is lamenting his losing Crisalda to another man when he is overheard by Alasto, who returns to the village enraged. Here, he is once again duped into believing that Crisalda’s family approves of his relation with Crisalda and that she intends to wed him. He is invited to have dinner with all the people that had attended Crisalda and Orfindo’s nuptials. Among the dinner guests, there is an old man who, as a child, had heard the story of how Ulysses had deceived Polyphemus. He requests that a caldron full of wine be brought, and after getting Alasto drunk, they tie him up and kill him.

In addition, a group of rustics talks in book I about the effects of tears, and how these can be true or pretended. It is difficult to distinguish between real and fake tears because men have “el pensamiento en lo más escondido del corazón” (114-15). The fable of Jupiter and the snake ensues to prove that men must guard themselves “de amigos fingidos, lisonjeros, mentirosos y aduladores” (118). It is indeed ironic that book I, which ends with Celio’s madness, with the struggle between him and Cardenio el rústico, and with the force inflicted by a group of shepherds to take both Celio and Cardenio back to the village, closes with Benalcio’s song about the freedom enjoyed by country dwellers.

Olimpio’s role in the Arcadia becomes key in book III. At the end of book II, a disdained Olimpio decides to follow Belisarda to Cilene, where he will try to conquer her love in order to forget about Isbella. He claims to be Anfriso’s friend, but Anfriso doesn’t trust him completely. When Anfriso appears in Cilene, in spite of his disguise, Belisarda’s father Clorinardo invites him over to his cabin, where “todos a un mismo tiempo se hallaron fingidos” (212). Olimpio himself “procuraba muy falso disimular su envidia” (213). The agitation motivated by Anfriso’s visit to Belisarda moves

---

22 Later in the Arcadia the narrator says in reference to Isbella that “antes que la pastora hubiese visto a Menalca dicen que agradecía la voluntad de Olimpio” (185). Thus, it is left unclear whether Olimpio simply boasted or whether it was actually true that he had received Isbella’s favors in the past.
Belisarda to request Anfriso’s temporary leave until things calm down. Dressed as a pilgrim, Anfriso decides to walk to Italy, but he gets lost instead and is taken by Dardanio, a rustic wizard, to his cave. The following morning Dardanio tells Anfriso that he will grant him one wish. Anfriso asks to see Belisarda, so they both fly to Cilene. Once there, Dardanio transforms Anfriso into an old man and as such he witnesses the amorous compliments Olimpio is paying Belisarda. Despite Belisarda’s resistance to Olimpio, when he insists that she accepts a spoon and asks her for a black ribbon in return, she ends up accepting, thus making Anfriso very jealous.

Anfriso returns to mount Ménalo and asks his friend Silvio for advice. Silvio suggests wooing another shepherdess, Anarda, and Anfriso follows the suggestion rigorously. When Belisarda returns to Ménalo from Cilene, after receiving news of Anfriso’s change, she confirms the rumors with Leonisa. Heretofore, a game of feigning disdain to each other and love for Anarda and for Olimpio respectively starts. Hence the narrator’s comment “Finalmente, los unos a los otros se agraviaban, de suerte que sólo Anarda y Olimpio gozaban con inocencia el fruto de sus agravios” (333). The characters’ foolishness eventually leads to Belisarda’s union to Salicio, and to Anfriso’s cure from love with the help of the sage Polinesta who takes him to the Temple of Disillusion (Desengaño).

The theme of engaño-desengaño runs through the whole work as one of its richest veins. In fact, the final desengaño is anticipated several times in the romance. Belisarda dreams in book I that Anfriso is embraced by a shepherdess who calls him husband, only to wake up and realize the power of dreams to make-believe. In book II, Gaseno sings a song to Lidia, an old shepherdess who used to be beautiful but has long lost her charms. Anfriso and Belisarda realize if only too late that they had come to believe each other’s lies. Finally, Anarda and Olimpio are as well desenganados when they realize that Anfriso and Belisarda have been using them to spite each other.

In Spanish Arcadian romance, even items traditionally associated with a picture perfect rustic setting can trick, if only temporarily, the minds and souls of those affected by Love. Thus, the ‘zampoña’ (panpipes), is described by the narrator in the Diana enamorada as “engañadora de trabajos” (144); the bright, dazzling light of the day can “engañar un alma entristescida” (144); and nature itself, in all its splendor, can bring happiness only to those free of love (150). The quavers and conceits with which Montemayor’s Diana adorns her songs are extolled by the narrator, “porque eran tales que parescían salidas de la ausiada corte” (66). The alleged rustic solitude of forests and pastures is also false in pastoral literature. For every person who sings or vents, there is an eavesdropper hiding behind some trees or outside a hut, and people stumble upon other people even in the most isolated corners of the woods. Shepherds listen to each others’ conversations, songs and laments even when they are conscious of “la bajeza que es escuchar a nadie” (Arcadia 92). Furthermore, and as Rhodes points, the role of these mirones is “that of the reader, the greatest ‘mirón’ of all” (1986, 139).23

23 On occasion, shepherds are ashamed when they realize that they have been secretly observed by someone. In La Galatea, the newly reconciled Grisaldo and Rosaura are caught embracing by Teolinda,
In the end, the question remains: why do the Spanish shepherds lie and deceive so much and why is deception at the core of these and other Spanish pastoral fictions? Solé-Leris defines the *Diana* as “the forerunner of the modern psychological novel” (1980, 35), and marvels at the “degree of realism” shown in “the treatment of the lovers’ psychology in Gil Polo’s *Diana*” (1962, 43). In fact, Gil Polo places a novel emphasis on free will and on human reason that ultimately leads his characters to solve their amorous situation without resorting to magic, and that makes them less abstract, more human. It has often been noted that many pastoral works are in fact *romans à clef*. Courtiers are ‘pastoralized’ but the atmosphere remains one of sophistication. Indeed, Montemayor uses his own experience at the Emperor’s court to design his characters and their behavior. Thus, speculates Solé-Leris, the two different scenes (in Books V and VI, respectively) in which Diana encounters Sireno, Silvano, and Selvagia and flounders in her attempt to show indifference at Sireno’s and Silvano’s disaffection, are most likely scenes “such as Montemayor would often have witnessed at court: a light bantering tone masking undercurrents of shifting, precarious personal relationships” (1980, 36). Similarly, Lope’s *Arcadia* was written in Alba de Tormes, at the ducal house, and many characters are based on real people such as the fifth Duke of Alba. Thus, as Morby explains, “al leer el libro, con sólo devolverles los ricos paños habituales, nos formamos una idea de cómo sería esa existencia [i.e. courtly existence], por lo menos en las horas de ocio” (11). However, as Morby cautions, “no todo era idílico […]. También nos imaginamos las envidias, decepciones, servilismos, y tedios inherentes a una sociedad como ésa” (13). As for Luis Gálvez de Montalvo, “Montalvo was attached to the house of Infantado” (Rennert 104) and many of the *Pastor de Filida’s* shepherds represent real noble people (Rennert 107-08). Cervantes was thirty eight when *La Galatea* was published. By then, he was a seasoned soldier who had survived captivity in Algiers and who had acquired plenty of experience at court. Once again, some of his shepherds are based on real people. Inescapably, then, reality interpenetrates the idealized Nature and the no

Galatea and Florisa, and “con no poca vergüenza de que los hubiesen hallado de aquella suerte, se levantaron, y limpiándose las lágrimas, con disimulación y comedimiento recibieron a las pastoras” (17). Other times, in spite of the fact that literary shepherds seem to be voyeurs by definition, voyeurism is condemned by the narrator. In Lope’s *Arcadia*, Olimpio eavesdrops Menalca and Isbella from behind some myrtles. When he comes out of hiding, “suspendiéronse de verle, y él, por disimular la bajeza que es escuchar a nadie, cantó así” (92). And still, after singing, “estuvo hablando con los árboles por disimular mejor que aun no veía a los pastores” (93). In her analysis of Bernardim Ribeiro’s *Menina e moça*, Mujica notes that “significantly, there are few people” (1986, 67) in the valley where the *menina* expresses her melancholy. Moreover, adds Mujica, “The most salient characteristic of the menina’s valley is its emptiness” (68). But not even the *menina* can escape from the reader’s gaze.

24 See Solé-Leris’ 1962 study. Solé-Leris acutely shows how characters in Gil Polo’s work accept responsibility for whatever existing problem there is in their amorous relationship. Thus, Diana blames herself and not Felicia’s arts for Sireno’s change. Solé-Leris does not mention, however, how characters also admit their guilt regarding the consequences derived from their lying. Thus, Ismenia introduces herself as the person who deceived Selvagia.

---

24 See Solé-Leris’ 1962 study. Solé-Leris acutely shows how characters in Gil Polo’s work accept responsibility for whatever existing problem there is in their amorous relationship. Thus, Diana blames herself and not Felicia’s arts for Sireno’s change. Solé-Leris does not mention, however, how characters also admit their guilt regarding the consequences derived from their lying. Thus, Ismenia introduces herself as the person who deceived Selvagia.
less idealized creatures that inhabit it. But can we affirm that the dishonesty displayed by many shepherds in these four pastoral works is solely attributable to their ‘courtlyesque’ demeanor?

*****

The obsession with deception and trickery found in sixteenth and seventeenth Spanish literature—one only needs to think about picaresque literature or about plays such as Ruiz de Alarcón’s *La verdad sospechosa*—has no parallel in any other literature at the time. Luján has said of Spain during the Golden Age that it was “un espectáculo teatral, y como tal se ofrecía al mundo” (59). At the time, ‘hybrid’ Spaniards frequently tried to pass as something else and there was a proliferation of *mentideros* in Spanish cities. Madrid alone had at least two *mentideros*, the *Mentidero de los representantes*, in the street of Cantarranas, and the *Mentidero de los soldados*, located in the vestibule of the church of San Felipe el Real in the calle Mayor. Plays such as Moreto’s *De fuera vendrá quien de casa nos echará* capture the types of transactions that took place in *hervideros* such as the one located in *Las Gradas de San Felipe*. The Alférez Aguirre tells Lisardo that “Estas lasos me tienen hechizado, / Que en todo el mundo tierra no he encontrado / Tan fértil de mentiras” (57), and when Lisardo inquires “¿De qué suerte?” (57), he explains that lies “Crecen tan bien aquí, que la mas fuerte / Sembrarl a por la noche me sucede, / Y á la mañana ya segarse puede” (57). The Alférez mentions as well that “hay aquí de tabla unas figuras, / Que para entretener basta cualquiera” (57). One needs not attend a *corral* in order to catch a performance: regular attendees of *Las Gradas* include two *galanes* (don Martín and the *licenciado* Celedón), a *dama* (doña Francisca), her *criada* and her aunt, and a “vejete, que es archivo / de todos los sucesos mas extraños” (58). Soon enough, the Alférez and Lisardo will show as well their ability to lie and to get muddled in their own tall tales.

Lying and gossiping were activities available to “mucha gente ociosa” (Rodríguez Marín 1935, 445) who, like the Alférez, were amused both by telling and by listening to different made up stories. With all probability, those present (including the reader) when Menalca improvises the tale of Crisalda and Alasto to mitigate the tension produced by Olimpio’s arrival, are amused by the situation. Similarly, Diana’s performance as a good wife in front of Alcida in order to shake off Delio’s jealousy, can be very amusing. But lies are often malicious, as those told by Carino in order to

---

25 For other examples of how the ideal meets the real, see specifically pages 41-45 of Solé-Leris (1980).

26 See Barbara Fuch’s analysis. For an excellent study on the Madrid of the seventeenth century as an urban space in constant change, capable of being shaped as well as of reshaping a society and its individuals, see also García Santo-Tomás (especially 73-114). García Santo-Tomás notes how “el tráfico de noticias se convierte […] en uno de los fenómenos más relevantes del Madrid premoderno. […] La novedad procedente del exterior se recibe, manipula y distribuye por todas las esquinas del entorno madrileño” (82) and that “la Corte se dibuja entonces como el marco de infinitas verdades y mentiras” (83).
get back at Crisalvo and at Lisardo, and some dishonesty can be articulated in order to protect one’s self, belongings, or beloved from some harm. Silerio thus lies about his feelings for Nísida to safeguard his friendship with Timbrío, and Nísida and Blanca’s explanation on why they embarking to Spain signal their fear of blemishing their reputation. In every case, “untruths provide weapons for the weak to resist the strong and for the strong to moderate the antagonism that their dominance provokes from the weak” (Bailey 66).

The propensity to fib and con is not uniquely tied to the nobility or to the people living at court. Lowlifes like Lázaro, Guzmán or Justina were natural liars, and so were courtiers and rustics such as those who populate the bowers of pastoral literature—and this is not necessarily because they are modeled after aristocrats. In their repeated assertion that shepherds are honest and that falseness is exclusive to the court, narrators and rustics are either deceiving themselves or being plainly cynical. Deception is a prevalent human vice and one inextricably linked to power. In spite of its pervasiveness, it becomes more apparent at times in which there are considerable shifts in power relations. Lying seems especially endemic to the Spanish society of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, thus resurfacing in even the most ‘escapist’ genres of all, because this is a time in which “España atraviesa por un punto crucial de su historia en que el sueño de una hegemonía fundada en el control de un vasto Imperio comienza a ser sustituido por la desilusionada realidad de una creciente decadencia política” (Salas 302). And to further complicate things, it is a time in which different discourses strive to define Spain as homogeneous genealogically and religiously speaking, thus triggering different forms of passing or deliberate performances of the other (Fuchs 1-16). The “prevalence of deceit” (to use Bailey’s expression) in Spanish Arcadian fiction simply mirrors the dominance of engaño outside the literary world.
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