

Raquel Serrano González*

Beaumont and Fletcher Rewrite Cervantes: *Love's Pilgrimage*, a Farcical Representation of Spain and a Subversion of Jacobean Patriarchy

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2022-0003>

Abstract: Co-authored by the English dramatists Beaumont and Fletcher, *Love's Pilgrimage* (c. 1615–1616) is a stage adaptation of *Las dos doncellas* (*The Novel of the Two Maidens*) (1613), an exemplary novel penned by the renowned Spanish writer Miguel de Cervantes. Produced at a time when Anglo-Spanish relations were marked by an ambivalent state of religiopolitical hostility and cultural fascination, the play offers a bitterly farcical representation of the perceived ethos and social norms of the source culture. At the same time, it engages with the target culture's political and ideological matrix, offering – oblique – commentary on the authors' own society. This article provides a comparative study of both works, to assess both the playwrights' representation of Spain and their stance on certain political and ideological contingencies that shaped Jacobean England.

Key terms: Cervantes, *Las dos doncellas*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, Beaumont and Fletcher, Anglo-Spanish relations

1 Introduction

First published in 1613, Cervantes's exemplary novel *Las dos doncellas* features two cross-dressed heroines, Teodosia and Leocadia, embarked on the hazardous quest of searching for their runaway lover, Marco Antonio. Both determined to hold him accountable for an unfulfilled marriage promise, the wronged ladies journey across a nation fraught with conflict and disruption. The gender disorder integral to the romance genre is effectively paralleled by the social and political derangement permeating a variety of strife-packed scenes that Cervantes depicts with poignant realism – mainly a robbery perpetrated by Catalan bandits and a

*Corresponding author: Raquel Serrano González, Universidad de Oviedo
E-Mail: serranoraquel@uniovi.es

fierce battle between galley crews and Barcelona citizens. Fuchs (2010) advocates a reading of the novel as exposing the domestic anarchy – social, gendered and material – caused by Spain’s prolonged imperial endeavours.

A stage adaptation of *Las dos doncellas* entitled *Love’s Pilgrimage* was co-authored by Beaumont and Fletcher c. 1615–1616, a time of heightened diplomatic relations between England and Spain. King James was immersed in the ultimately unsuccessful negotiations for the Spanish Match, and his perceived pro-Spanish policies and lenience towards Catholics intensified the nation’s hostility towards their religious enemy and political rival. Simultaneously, however, Cervantes’s country provided a fruitful and fascinating source of literary inspiration. Many were the plays which reworked, adapted and emulated Spanish texts, signalling the ambivalent state of cultural Hispanophilia and religiopolitical Hispanophobia (Griffin 2009: 1–26) that marked Renaissance Anglo-Iberian relations. *Love’s Pilgrimage* dramatises the perceived ethos and social norms of a source culture that inspired, simultaneously, hostility and admiration. At the same time, the play engages with the target culture’s political and ideological matrix, offering – oblique – commentary on the authors’ own society. This essay provides a comparative study of both works, to assess both the playwrights’ representation of Spain and their stance on certain political and ideological contingencies that shaped the Jacobean world.

Denizens of an era marked by expeditious and erratic change, the ruling elite of early seventeenth-century England were acutely troubled by the perceived threat of social disorder. Increased rural poverty, massive migration to overpopulated cities and the shift from a feudal to a mercantile, money-based economy all contributed to fuelling anxieties over the stability of a transitioning society. In this context, upward social mobility became an attainable commodity, “as representatives of the middle classes broke into the gentry, or as merchants accumulated commercially-based forms of social power” (West 2002: 143). This alarming permeability of class boundaries was fostered by King James himself: “Through the sale of monopolies, the acceptance of private loans from rich merchants, a system of favouritism and the sale of knighthoods, [...] James I contributed not a little to an atmosphere of social insecurity and unwholesome personal competition” (Stock and Zwierlein 2017: 8). In an incipient capitalist system marked by changing morals and an increased fluidity in social relations, the old power hierarchy became particularly challenging to maintain. Besides, the dominant construction of gender that upheld the foundations of patriarchal authority also came under threat. As demonstrated by Shepard (2003), the enactment of a boisterous, licentious and excessive masculinity gained wide currency among a variety of young men of diverse ranks, who shared a repudiation of the codes of manhood advocated by normative adult authorities; menacing manifestations of social anarchy

at worst, flaws of youth at best, these alternative codes of manhood put a further strain on the maintenance of hegemonic order.

Las dos doncellas offers a fruitful source to deal with the perceived threats to a social hegemony sustained by increasingly contested rigid identity categories. First, the motif of cross-dressing underscores the performativity of identity and raises the spectre of disruptive sexual transgressions, including homoerotic and even incestuous desire; besides, the recurrent instances of unresolved social strife are potentially subversive to a power hierarchy already seen in jeopardy.

2 Teodosia's Cross-Dressed Ventures: Unsettling the Fixity of Gender and the Established Paradigm of Normative Sexuality

Cervantes's novel opens with the prompt arrival of a somewhat enigmatic, solitary traveller at an Andalusian inn. Visually distressed, the character is pictured hastily undoing his breast buttons, to ashamedly button himself up again after recovering from a fleeting swoon. With its "suggestive emphasis on the ambiguous chest/breast" (Fuchs 2010: 46), this scene subtly anticipates the real gender of the traveller, urged to conceal her female anatomy under male clothing. Seeking privacy, the stranger pays a golden crown to secure the only room available at the inn, under the condition that the other bed should be left unoccupied. The amazed hosts do not spare praise for 'his' unparalleled "hermosura" ('comeliness'), "gallarda disposición" ('graceful deportment') and "gentileza" ('courtesy') (Cervantes 1613/2000: 202); still, their eulogising words are not indicative of the traveller's actual – feminine – gender.¹

Shortly afterwards, a second traveller, slightly older than the former and of equal "gallardía" (Cervantes 1613/2000: 202), arrives at the inn. The hostess reacts in amazement to his extraordinary beauty and fine demeanour; she promptly offers an idealised description of the guest, wondering if angels are visiting her house on that night. A retrospective interpretation of her words does reveal a po-

¹ For an analysis of the cross-dressed woman as enacting a plausible, culturally contingent model of masculinity see Grünngel (2013). Of special relevance is the etymologically masculine gender of the term '*gallardía*', apparent in Covarrubias's definition of the adjective '*gallardo*': "a gentleman quite handsome and vigorous" ("*gentilhombre* in bien apuesto y lozano" [qtd. in Grünngel 2013: 43; original emphasis]). Similarly, the quality denoted by the term '*gentileza*' "is also a corporal – and moral – ideal of golden age masculinity" ("*la gentileza es también un ideal corporal (y moral) de la masculinidad áurea*" [Grünngel 2013: 47]).

tentially unsettling similarity between both travellers, as we later learn the former is not a man, but a young woman named Teodosia. However, as Grünagel (2013) has demonstrated, even though the lady's camouflaged anatomy could give away her true gender, she is not feminised in Cervantes's narrative; quite the opposite, the hostess seems to interpret her gender performance according to the conventions of the period's ideal of noble male youth. Therefore, Teodosia's first appearance in *Las dos doncellas* raises the unsettling possibility that women can exhibit 'masculine' traits, thus posing a challenge to the ideological foundations of the early modern Spanish patriarchal system.

Beaumont and Fletcher, on the contrary, are quite conspicuous in their emasculation of their lonely traveller. Teodosia – to be played by a boy – also arrives at an inn in male attire, soon to exhibit signs of fainting. Diego, the host, urges his wife to bring water to moisten “his sweet face” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.1.81)²; her response articulates a vision of the guest as exhibiting delicacy and childlike vulnerability: “Alas, fair flowre [sic]!” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.1.81). In fact, Teodosia is not only feminised, but also emphatically infantilised in the hostess's speech:

Sir, taste a little of this, of mine own water,
I did distil't my self; sweet Lilly look upon me,
You are but newly blown, my pretty Tulip.
Faint not upon your stalk, 'tis firme [sic] and fresh;
Stand up, so, bolt upright, you are yet in growing. (*Pilgrimage*: 1.1.85–89)

A variety of scholars have argued that in the Renaissance boys occupied an ambiguous, if not outright feminine, sexual space. Both Lisa Jardine (1983) and Stephen Orgel (1996) have suggested that the perceived likeness between women and boys is grounded, precisely, on their shared dependency; the reasoning follows that “boys were, like women – but unlike men – acknowledged objects of sexual attraction for men” (Orgel 1996: 70). The erotic potentialities of this similarity turn more intricate when several layers of artifice are superposed, and it is a boy that plays a woman dressed in male clothing. Men in the audience would probably have been titillated by a boy actor mirroring the vulnerability traditionally ascribed to the character's – feminine – gender.

Theodosia's double emasculation seems to endorse the interchangeability between women and boys as objects of male erotic desire. However, the existence of a distinct masculine identity – of a gendered desiring agent – is ultimately challenged. The subsequent arrival of a second male traveller of remarkable looks

² Here and henceforth, Beaumont and Fletcher's *Love's Pilgrimage* (1647/1970) will be referred to as *Pilgrimage*.

makes an impact on the innkeepers, who are also drawn to compare both guests; whilst Diego refers to the newcomer as “[a]nother Fayerie” (1.1.180), his wife speaks of Theodosia in the following terms: “So sweet a creature, I am very sorry / I cannot lodge you by him; you look so like him, / Yo’are both the loveliest peeces” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.1.194–196). The comparison between both characters explicitly formulated in *Love’s Pilgrimage* has different implications from those established in *Las dos doncellas*. In this case, given Theodosia’s emphatic infantilisation, the acknowledged similarity between both travellers does suggest the emasculation of the latter; what is more, the erotic titillation presumably engendered in the male members of the audience by Theodosia might easily be provoked by an actor playing a male character. The scene thus poses a challenge not only to the fixity of gender, but also to the established paradigm of normative desire.

Even if the second traveller in *Las dos doncellas* is not emasculated by comparison with the first, the potentiality of illicit sexuality is still raised. Upon learning of Teodosia’s virtues, he recurrently expresses an eager desire to see ‘him’, his words being suggestive of a voyeuristic homoerotic drive. Eventually, the intrigued traveller manages to secure the other bed at the inn’s room. During the night, half asleep, Teodosia breaks down into a fit of sorrow and despair. It is through her fervent – gendered – speech that her roommate learns she is not a man, but an afflicted lady. His passion is flared up by the discovery, which “further piqued his desire to meet her, and he decided several times to go to the bed of the person he believed to be a woman” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 294). Teodosia then relates the story of her seduction and abandonment to the attentive stranger. The betrayed lady, still in possession of an engraved ring as proof of a forsaken betrothal, is intent upon regaining her lost honour and, as observed by Abella Padrón (2015), has left her father’s house resolved to eschew the prescribed passive role outlined for women. Though transgressive in terms of gender politics, Teodosia’s determination to wield ‘manly’ agency operates within the boundaries forged by her culture’s patriarchal discourse of honour and nobility; thus, she aims to tackle the situation by either redressing or revenging Marco Antonio’s affront: “I shall make him keep his word to me and the faith he promised or I shall take his life” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 297).

The account of Teodosia’s misfortunes plunge her roommate into deep unrest, which he evinces tossing about in his bed. The narrative’s portrayal of the character’s frantic state in the bed adjacent to the unmasked lady’s teases the reader with the prospect that he might be sexually aroused. More straightforwardly supportive of this interpretation is Teodosia’s acknowledgement, judged plausible by the narrator, that “she suspected that some amorous passion was troubling him, and she still thought she was the reason, and it was a sensible to suspect and think so” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 298). Nevertheless, these implications are soon overturned, as Teodosia learns her roommate is none other than

her blood brother, Rafael. Sticking to the prevailing code of honour, she humbly surrenders to his will and judgment, offering him a dagger so that he can surreptitiously punish her transgressions. He, however, restrains from performing the expected act, as there is still hope of atonement for her offence if Marco Antonio fulfils his marriage promise.

Beaumont and Fletcher's plot evolves along similar lines. Unaware of her roommate's presence, Theodosia experiences a fit of grief and regret, later to reveal herself to the solicitous stranger. There is, however, a fundamental difference between both works. In contrast to her Spanish counterpart, Theodosia has resolved not to surrender her chastity to Mark-antonio, as she endeavours to stress in her confession:

Contracted Sir, and by exchange of rings
 Our souls deliver'd: nothing left unfinish'd
 But the last work, enjoying me, and Ceremony.
 For that I must confess was the first wise doubt
 I ever made[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 1.2.84–88)

Her transgression is thus comparably lighter; as she herself remarks, Theodosia never acted on her desire: “[Y]et neither loves [sic] law, Signiour, / Nor ty of maidens duty, but desiring / Have I transgrest in” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.2.95–97).

Though less transgressive, Theodosia's infringement of gender dictates is not as agency-constraining. Cervantes's Teodosia is, as observed by Hardman (2016: 32), worthless unless she manages to call herself Marco Antonio's wife. Otherwise tainted and ruined beyond remedy, she pursues the only hegemonically-sanctioned outcome to her disgrace: the restoration of her own and her family's honour through marriage. Theodosia, on the contrary, has not been dishonoured by Mark-antonio, as her own brother will later acknowledge: “'tis no dishonor Sister / To love, nor to love him you do” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.2.151–152). Therefore, her quest is not motivated by a solemn need to redress a wrong she has done. Her decision to seek Mark-antonio is not made in pursuit of the reinstatement of an otherwise irreparable honour, but to accomplish the fulfilment of her own amorous desire.

Upon hearing Theodosia's confession, her roommate groans and proclaims his misery quite eloquently, and thus makes her “fear intemperance” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.2.121). The prospect is raised not only of sexual urgency, arguably even of violence, as he hastily approaches Theodosia's bed, but also of voyeurism, since he demands that he must see her and asks the awakened host for a candle. It is under the candlelight that Theodosia recognises her brother, renamed Philippo, and offers her life in payment for her transgressions. However, he resolves to forgive and assist his sister, precisely because she remained virtuous: “I wear no sword for women: nor no anger / While your fair chastity is yet untouch'd” (*Pilgrimage*: 1.2.145–146).

3 The Adventures in Iguialada: Two Culturally Contingent Narratives of Social Disruption and Transgression

At this point, both works present the reconciled siblings resolved to pursue the same quest. Both brothers learn, thanks to a fortuitous encounter with an acquaintance, that the man they are seeking intends to join the war effort in Naples and has boarded a galley en route to Barcelona. Rafael and Teodosia – still cross-dressed and renamed Teodosio – set off on their trip, which turns out uneventful until they reach a wood near Iguialada. There they are witnesses to the most bizarre of spectacles. A miscellaneous group of travellers have been tied to trees and robbed by Catalan bandits; deprived of most of their clothing, some remain half-naked, others, dressed in the robbers' own tattered garments. Among them stands out “a boy who seemed to be sixteen or so tied to an oak in just a shirt and canvas breeches, but with a face so beautiful it moved deeply anyone who looked at him” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 301). Rafael and Teodosia are happy to have him join in their journey, as he declares his intent on getting to Italy and trying his fortune in war. The sister soon notices that their new travel companion has his ears pierced and exhibits what she deems a bashful gaze, and thus rightly infers ‘he’ must be a lady.

Fuchs analysed the threat that the “equalizing robbery” (2010: 53) perpetrated in Iguialada poses to the stability of the dominant social hierarchy: “In stealing the travelers’ clothes, the bandits have removed signs that locate them precisely within a social structure” (2010: 51). Stripped of any sartorial marker of class or gender, the rescued captive weaves a fictional narrative (re)shaping her identity as she finds convenient. First, she produces two wealthy parents, Don Enrique and Don Sancho, whom Rafael happens to know have no sons; it is only the latter that has offspring: a daughter known for her admirable looks. Pressed by Rafael, she later masquerades as being not only a different gender, but also a lower social class. In this last account she is self-fashioned as the son of a steward, intent upon joining a war “by means of which [...] even those of obscure birth can become famous” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 302). Fuchs interprets this episode as encapsulating even more subversive energies than a rank trespass:

The phrase *de escuro linaje*, moreover, may refer not only to the lower classes but also to New Christians ostracized for their ‘unclean’ blood. Embedded in a larger genealogical fiction, this tale of class—or caste—transgression makes the suggestion of generalized social disarray even greater. (2010: 53; original emphasis)

Produced in a culture where blood purity and masculinity were constructed as defining features of an imagined national identity, this narrative potentially un-

dermines the ideological foundations of Spain's social orthodoxy. Gender and class – arguably even blood purity – are proven fluid identity categories that cannot be identified by stable signifiers.

Beaumont and Fletcher's rewriting of the episode offers revealing alterations. The forest is also depicted as a space of social disruption, but the idiosyncrasies of the target culture and genre shape the – altered – scene, which incorporates “the extended bouts of sexual imagery and bawdy wordplay that are hallmarks of Beaumont and Fletcher plays” (Hicklin 2013: 75). Diego pictures this setting as a marginal space of heightened transgression, both sexual and material. Rape – a practice emphatically disruptive of patriarchal order – seems to be a frequent issue, as the wind often brings echoes of women voicing “supplications / And subdivisions for those toys their honours” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.19–20). Even more unsettling is another strikingly common occurrence, female thieves seducing and having sexual intercourse with assaulted men:

I fear none but fair wenches: those are theeves
 May quickly rob me of my good conditions
 If they cry stand once: but the best is, Signiours,
 They cannot bind my hands; for any else,
 They meet an equall [sic] knave, and there's my pasport [sic]:
 I have seen fine sport in this place, had these trees tongues,
 They would tell ye pretty matters: do not you fear though,
 They are not every days [sic] delights. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.8–15)

After “[s]uch turning up of taffataes” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.17), the men “are stript and bound, / Like so many *Adams*, with fig leafs afore 'em” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.36–37; original emphasis). This image offers a prelude to the playwrights' rewriting of the robbery perpetrated in Igualada; the alluded “Adams” mirror and forecast the plundered travellers, also deprived of their clothes and mercilessly tied to bushes. This bawdy comic addition to Cervantes's story does more than lighten the tone: it emblematises the period's heightened anxiety over the stability of a social order deemed in jeopardy. As has already been mentioned, the Jacobean ruling elite was deeply disturbed by the menace of increased social mobility, which came alongside new claims to economic power. Rose sees a correlation between the increasing fluidity among social ranks and classes and the representation of sexuality undertaken in Renaissance city comedies, which often “takes dramatic form as the struggle for female independence” (2018: 47). In this volatile context, the elite's need to secure gender and economic order seems quite imperative.

Beaumont and Fletcher project all these perceived threats to social stability onto a marginal space which powerfully typifies both erotic and economic anarchy. The scene features an alternate, threatening social order of illicit sex where women subdue and rob men, capitalising on the aforementioned latent anxieties

over the disruption of patriarchal rule. As Philippo and Theodosia penetrate the forest, the events occurred in Igualada are recreated. However, the trenchant social critique offered of Spain's widespread domestic anarchy is diffused, as the agency for the robbery is shifted from Catalan bandits to a bunch of rascals.³ Within this group of loud, odd behaving captives there is also one that stands out from the crowd, whose exceptional demeanour fascinates the bailiff:

Amongst the rest,
 There is a little Boy rob'd, a fine child,
 It seems a Page: I must confesse my pittie
 (As 'tis a hard thing in a man of my place
 To shew compassion) stir'd at him; so finely,
 And without noyse he carrys his afflictions,
 And looks as if he had but dreamt of loosing.
 This boy's the glory of this robbery[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.90–97)

The character is portrayed, like Theodosia, in an emphatically infantilising – and therefore emasculating – light. Significantly, in the afore-quoted fragment, “he” is initially referred to by the gender-neutral pronoun “it”, which indicates the ambiguous sexual space that boys seemed to occupy in the Renaissance mind. The text capitalises on the captive's ‘female’ ‘childlike’ vulnerability; whilst the usually unsympathetic bailiff is moved to pity, Philippo condemns the captors' ruthless brutality: “A sweet fac'd Boy indeed: what rogues were these? / What barbarous brutish slaves to strip this beauty?” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.113–114). His portrayal of the ‘boy’ is equally reminiscent of the description previously offered of the disguised Theodosia – and himself –, also depicted as boasting a sweet face and extraordinary beauty. Even Theodosia contributes to the infantilisation of the rescued captive, whom she comically addresses as “[m]y pretty Sir” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.156).

The plot then unravels parallel to Cervantes's. After lying about ‘his’ father's identity on two different occasions, the siblings' new travel companion produces the following third version:

[...] for by the claiming
 Such noble parents, I beleev'd your bounties
 Would shew more gracious: The plain truth is gentlemen,

³ Fuchs (2010) analyses the bandits scene as one of the episodes of sharpened realism which intrude the romance narrative, offering social criticism on the Crown's oblivious and negligent management of the nation's internal affairs. The narrative capitalises on the powerful potential for public disorder that Catalan bandits held in early modern Spain: “Catalonian banditry was the domestic equivalent of English or Moorish piracy, with spectacular robberies of Spanish bullion on the scale of Drake's plunder on the sea” (Fuchs 2010: 51).

I am Don *Sanchios* stewards [sic] son, a wild boy,
 That for the fruits of this unhappiness,
 Is faine to seek the wars. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.2.179–184; original emphasis)

This narrative engages with the pressing threat of social mobility, which involves not only a perceived fluidity among social classes, but also an unsettling difficulty in circumscribing and distinguishing rank. Deprived of any sartorial signifier of social status, the ‘boy’ fashions himself as a steward’s son attempting to pass as a nobleman for economic gain. The financial benefit allegedly sought, absent from Cervantes’s text, offers a representation of an incipient money-based society marked by competition and social betterment aspirations. There is no trace of an implied caste transgression, as the emphasis is displaced from blood purity to the prospect of social mobility, stimulated by new economic fluidity. Though a fiction-within-a-fiction, the narrative subtly articulates the pragmatism of many city comedy characters who aspire to accumulate money. The character’s narrative, however, does not hold; Theodosia is instantly persuaded by ‘his’ quick wit and fearful disposition that the boy must be a woman.

4 Leocadia’s Discourses of (Self-)Fashioning: Exploring the Malleability and Performativity of Gender Onstage

Both Theodosia and her Spanish homonym reveal their suspicions to their new travel companion, who admits to being Don Sancho’s renowned beautiful daughter, Leocadia. At this point, both works have her narrate the story of her amorous misfortunes. In her version of the events, the Cervantine character relates that upon becoming acquainted with a high-born and rich gentleman named Marco Antonio, she became persuaded that “acquiring him as a husband was all the happiness my desire could hold” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 304). Leocadia’s interest in the young man seems to stem largely from his – socially established – eligibility as a spouse, highly determined by wealth and status. Far from being herself courted, the lady takes the lead in the pursuit of her chosen desire, glancing at the gentleman “more than was licit for a modest young lady” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 304). As Linda Britt puts it, “it is Marco Antonio who is pulled egotistically into the trap of feeling desired: ‘Él vino a caer en que yo le miraba’”⁴ (1988: 40). He

⁴ “[H]e became aware that I was looking at him” (Cervantes 1613/2000: 304).

then proceeds to make the most solemn marriage oaths and seals the betrothal with a signed contract, after which a night encounter is arranged in Leocadia's chamber.

The prospect that Marco Antonio may have taken Leocadia's virginity devastates Teodosia; unable to restrain herself any longer, she throws a plethora of hasty, anxiety-laden questions to find out whether the sexual encounter occurred. During this moment of heightened suspension, the possibility is raised that Marco Antonio may also have dishonoured Leocadia; each lady would thus have an equally pressing claim to his hand in marriage, the only outcome that would restore one's wounded honour – and most likely doom the other. The spectre of two mutually exclusive 'happy fates' effectively underscores one of the social issues addressed in the story, which offers "an artistic representation of some of the legal and moral problems that are connected with the social institutions of courtship and marriage" (Aylward 1999: 219). This tension is reduced, however, when Leocadia declares that Marco Antonio never appeared at the appointed place. Because the virgin damsel is still entitled to pursue another honourable marriage, Teodosia holds the most convincing moral claim on Marco Antonio. Even so, she still has to endure an agonising wait to learn that she most likely holds the strongest legal argument as well, as Leocadia finally declares that the bandits took the signed contract.

Linda Britt (1988: 46) has demonstrated that despite the obvious and numerous similarities between the titular maidens, Cervantes offers a nuanced and well-rounded characterisation where Teodosia is portrayed more sympathetically. Combined with her 'legitimate' urgency to marry Marco Antonio, Teodosia's kinder nature contributes to steering the readers' sympathies towards her cause. Particularly revealing of their distinct personalities are the motives that prompt each damsel's quest. Whilst Teodosia embarks on the pursuit of Marco Antonio for honourable reasons, Leocadia is driven by a violent desire to take a dreadful revenge on her rival, under the mistaken assumption that she is 'enjoying' Marco Antonio: "I plan to die or come into their presence so that the sight of me upsets their tranquility. That enemy of my rest should not think she can enjoy at so little cost what is mine! I shall look for her, find her, and take her life if I can" (Cervantes 1613/2016: 306). Cervantes paints a very vivid portrait of female amorous jealousy; Leocadia is seized by an intense jealous rage that makes her eager to destroy Teodosia, even if she is aware that she has done nothing to harm her: "that she has not offended me, looking at it without passion, that I confess" (Cervantes 1613/2016: 306). Teodosia, on the contrary, does not let her passion completely blind her judgement, but she does also fall prey to "the raging disease of jealousy" (Cervantes 1613/2017: 307).

As fervently passionate as the enraged damsels is Rafael, who develops an ardent desire for Leocadia the instant her identity is disclosed: "as soon as he

heard who Leocadia was his heart began to burn with love for her” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 308). The prospect is thus raised of an alternative marriage that would guarantee the maiden’s honour. However, Rafael’s passionate infatuation makes the potential matrimony quite less than idyllic, as he is determined to use any means to earn Leocadia’s hand: “this hope was already promising him a happy conclusion to his desire, either by means of force or by means of gifts and good works” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 308). As observed by Zimic (1989: 32), this declaration of intent has two relevant implications. First, the suggestion is made that Rafael’s intention to marry Leocadia is motivated by a craving to quench his lust; besides, the possibility is reinforced that his urgency to approach Teodosia’s bed at the inn may actually have been prompted by erotic desire. Fuchs has demonstrated that the social and gender disorder embedded in the novel are not successfully contained by the apparently conventional marriage resolution, as “the romance values of chivalric service to a damsel in distress prove unsustainable in a world where some knights have more than one lady and others are ladies themselves” (2010: 53). Despite the almost consistently courteous behaviour he exhibits throughout the episode, Rafael’s words retain a trace of subversion that suggests that he also falls short of the chivalric ideal. The character can thus be analysed as offering another intrusion to the romance genre that is not completely erased.

Beaumont and Fletcher’s Leocadia does not exhibit her counterpart’s distinctive assertiveness and boldness. Confronted by Theodosia about her gender, she reveals her identity among sighs, shivers, blushes and contained tears that let her vulnerability show through. The damsel then moves on to narrate how she became acquainted with Mark-antonio. Leocadia fashions herself as the passive victim of the man’s urgency and importunity, explicitly forswearing all agency in the affair and denying any carnal motivation:

Leocadia. From these we bred desires sir; but lose me heaven
If mine were lustful.

Theodosia. I beleeve.

Leocadia. This neerness

Made him importunate; When to save mine honor,

Love having ful [sic] possession of my powers,

I got a Contract from him. (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.84–88; original emphasis)

Leocadia then relates how after obtaining the sealed contract, now lost in the robbery, arrangements were made for Mark-antonio to visit her chamber. Inflamed with anguished anticipation, Theodosia also fires a string of exhorting, quite aggressive questions to learn whether a sexual relation occurred. The sexual imagery evoked is blunter and more explicit than in Cervantes’s original:

Were ye in one anothers [sic] arms, abed? the Contract
 Confirm'd in ful [sic] joys there? did he lie with ye?
 Answer to that; ha? [...]
 did that nights [sic] promise
 Make ye a Mother? (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.98–100, 102–103)

Theodosia's (self-)fashioning as a naïve, modest maiden sits oddly with these forthright words, pronounced at a brief moment of unchecked passion. Her strong personal investment in the story is not overlooked by Leocadia, whom the playwrights, in an act of dramatic irony, have utter the following words: "Why do you ask so neerly? / Good Sir, do's [sic] it concern you any thing?" (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.103–104). Theodosia, however, soon finds relief in learning that Mark-antonio never came to the appointed encounter, and thus manages to restrain herself. It is then Leocadia's turn to vent her passions; and so she rants quite violently against Mark-antonio and Theodosia, under the erred assumption that both have eloped together. Facing the accusation that her demeanour lacks honour, she offers the following reply:

Honor?
 True, none of her part, honour, shee [sic] deserves none,
 'Tis ceas'd with wandring Ladies such as she is,
 So bold and impudent. (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.159–162)

This extract provides a particularly illustrative example of the discursive malleability and performativity of identity. Ironically, Leocadia accuses "wandring [l]adies" – not at all unlike herself – of boldness and impudence; however, in what can be considered an act of interested self-representation, she still performs the role of the "poor unhappy wench" (3.2.129), widely known as being "without pride" (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.63). Both Theodosia and – more blatantly – Leocadia produce and enact an identity that incurs certain contradictions. Their self-interested adherence to these unstable constructs underscores "the ability of performance to create and sustain a believable fiction" (Hardman 2017: 101). The performativity, even the theatricality of identity is overtly articulated in Leocadia's narrative, as she accuses Theodosia of seducing, and what is more, bewitching, Mark-antonio by means of – theatrical – artifice:

But I shal [sic] find her out, with all her witchcrafts,
 Her paintings, and her powncings; for 'tis art,
 And only art preserves her, and meer spels [sic]
 That work upon his powers[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.182–185)

This passage offers a dramatization of early modern anxieties about cosmetics, which were often inveighed against by the period's moralists. Recurrently em-

bedded in this criticism was the “clichéd analogy [...] that painted ladies are like painted devils”, which “draws upon the popular links made between poisonous ingredients, moral corruption and the female body” (Karim-Cooper 2012: 67). This view is signified in Leocadia’s accusation that her rival has “Devils in her eyes [sic], to whose devotion / He offers all his service” (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.150–151). Theodosia is misogynistically represented as a guileful woman who has immorally subjugated Mark-antonio by means of artifice, deception and charms. Quite like in the wood scene, the power elite’s perceived threats to patriarchal stability are articulated as women – unnaturally – subduing men. However, this threat is smoothed over in the upcoming lines. Not only does Leocadia apologise for her unrestrained diatribe, but she keeps on displaying subversive “metatheatrical awareness” (Hardman 2017: 101):

Pray forgive me
 If I have spoke uncivilly: they that look on
 See more then [sic] *we that play*: and I beseech ye,
 Impute it loves offence, not mine; whose torments,
 If you have ever lov’d, and found my crosses,
 You must confesse are seldom ty’d to patience;
 Yet I could wish I had said lesse. (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.197–203; my emphasis)

Leocadia’s words signify identity as performative, and her portrayal of Theodosia, as an act of – theatrical – representation. After Leocadia’s confession, Philippo is informed of the damsel’s true identity; like Rafael, he soon shows signs of impassioned infatuation: “bless me from a feavor, / I am not well o’th sodain” (*Pilgrimage*: 3.2.266–267). Equally vehement is Theodosia’s reaction to the fortuitous encounter with her ‘rival’, as she is also stricken by intense amorous jealousy.

5 The Battle in Barcelona (Re-)Interpreted: Two Culturally Specific Narratives of Social Critique and Subversion

Both texts then feature the travellers’ arrival in Barcelona, where a fight is taking place between the townspeople and galley crews. Fuchs provides a detailed analysis of the political and ideological critique embedded in the episode:

As a coastal entrepôt for bullion – and impromptu galley slaves – shipped to Italy to support an increasingly untenable empire, Barcelona marks both the limits and limitations of Spain’s imperial reach. [...] [T]he pitched battle at the coast suggests how the pursuit of that empire produces internal conflict in Spain. (2010: 57)

The stage adaptation is devoid of the grave criticism that Cervantes's original makes of a disorderly nation marked by frequent episodes of civic strife. In *Love's Pilgrimage*, the conflict is prompted by a more mundane, even comical occurrence: Mark-antonio's obstinate wish to publicly unveil Eugenia, the Governor's wife and "a Lady of unblemish'd fame" (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.42). The playwrights' satirical portrayal of the practice of veiling⁵ articulates a mocking critique of Spain's code of honour and shame, as a gentleman admonishes Mark-antonio against attempting so daring an offence:

You do not know the custome of the place:
To draw that curtain here, though she were mean,
Is mortall [sic].
[...] 'tis an attempt
More dangerous than death; 'tis death and shame. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.24–26, 29–30)

In Mark-antonio's speech, Spain is represented as a kind of backward nation of strict sexual and moral values, and the Catholic moralists' prescription to cover and cloister women, judged as barbaric:

Then let me go;
If I can win her, you and I will govern
This Town Sir, fear it not, and we will alter
These barbarous customes then; for every Lady
Shall be seen daily, and seen over too. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.34–38)

Besides mocking the Spanish sartorial signifier of chastity, decorum and respectability, the text makes the veil function as an oxymoronic signifier of effacement and voyeurism: to a gentleman's assertion that he knows the veiled lady well, Mark-antonio offers the following reply: "Is she a Lady? / I shall the more desire to see her Sir" (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.31–32). Ironically, it is precisely Eugenia's concealment from sight – intended to signify and preserve her chastity – that titillates Mark-antonio. The staged scene of an enticing veiled lady played by a boy superposes several layers of theatricality that evince the performativity of identity. In fact, the veil frustrates any attempt to ascribe a fixed class or gender identity to the character. Particularly revealing in this regard is Mark-antonio's seeking confirmation that Eugenia is actually a "[l]ady", a term that can conveniently refer to

⁵ Tight garments and veiled attires intended to efface the feminine body were in wide currency between the 1550s and the 1630s, significantly the most trenchant years of the Catholic Reformation, to ensure female chastity and thus preserve the household's honour (Guarino 2019: 26).

either gender or social status. This added scene can be read as dramatising Jacobean anxieties over social mobility and female independence, as the ability to circumscribe identity through sartorial signifiers is thwarted.

Both *Las dos doncellas* and *Love's Pilgrimage* have the cross-dressed heroines find their runaway lover immersed in a chaotic fight. In Cervantes's novel, Marco Antonio's *mien* and attire are described in vivid visual detail: "among those from the galleys who most distinguished themselves was a youth of twenty-two or so, dressed in green, with a hat of the same color adorned with a rich band, apparently made of diamonds" (1613/2016: 309). Even though he is reported to fight skilfully, the narration is punctuated with details that subtly undermine Marco Antonio's heroic stature. As observed by Clamurro (2001: 68), his rich and flamboyant outfit signals the character's immaturity and lack of good judgment, all too proven in his dishonourable, neglectful attitude towards the maidens. It is precisely his ostentatiously inappropriate attire that turns Marco Antonio into the target of all gazes; thus, the stone blow that hurts him badly at the end of the battle is, as described by Clamurro (2001: 68), an almost inevitable occurrence rather than a fortuitous event.

Marco Antonio's male aristocratic heroism is also undermined by Teodosia and Leocadia, who unsheathe their masculinising daggers and swords and bravely join in the fight. Significantly, the text underscores their martial heroism, both being jointly referred to as "valiant and new Bradamantes and Marfisa or Hippolytas and Penthesileas" (Cervantes 1613/2016: 310). In a reversal of normative gender roles, it is the 'female warriors' that save the – arguably emasculated – Marco Antonio, holding up his unconscious body once he has been hit by the impending stone. Only the more assertive Leocadia makes it into the ship. Teodosia, her strength faltered, sees her lover depart in her rival's arms; devastated and on the verge of a fainting fit, she is assisted by Don Rafael. Both then manage to have Marco Antonio and his inseparable female companion accommodated at the house of a Catalan knight.

In *Love's Pilgrimage*, the damsels arrive to see Mark-antonio being struck down in the fight. The fear-inducing prospect of his death throws Theodosia into a brief swoon; far from playing the martial heroine, she re-enacts the role of the delicate, vulnerable damsel in distress:

[...] alas!

You men have strong hearts; but we feeble maids

Have tender eyes, which only given be

To blind themselves, crying for what they see. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.117–120)

Enraged at Leocadia's disappearing in the tumult, Philippo rants against women's dissembling, denouncing

[...] that seal'd religion
 You women bear to swoonings; you do pick
 Your times to faint, when some body is by
 Bound or by nature, or by love, or service
 To raise you from that well dissembled death[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.153–157)

Though conventionally misogynistic, these words depict Theodosia's chosen enactment of vulnerable femininity as self-conscious performance. They underscore the theatricality of identity and social interaction, particularly threatening to a power elite struggling to ground their jeopardised privileges on essentialised identity categories. The incident also serves to disclose Philipppo's self-centred drive to pursue his own benefit: "would I had let thee layen, / And followed her" (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.164–165). Shortly afterwards, his previous contempt is cynically turned into grateful devotion, when Theodosia declares she knows Leocadia must have followed Mark-antonio, and thus asks the Governor to have both accommodated in town: "Blest be thy thoughts / For apprehending this: blest be thy breath / For utring it[!]" (*Pilgrimage*: 4.1.237–239).

6 Heteronormativity Scrutinised: The Subversive Imprint of the Tales' 'Happy' Endings

At this point, both the novel and the play feature the four travellers' reencounter under the same roof. There, Cervantes's Leocadia addresses Marco to remind him of his obliging promise to take her hand in marriage. Predictably, the wounded adventurer recognises Teodosia as his true wife and acknowledges his sins in a confession imbued with theatricality (Collins 2002: 42):

I did so without thinking very much about it and with the judgment of a young man, which I am, believing that all those things were of small importance and that I could do them with no scruples of any kind [...]. But heaven, grieving over me, undoubtedly has allowed me to be brought to this stage in which you see me so that, confessing these truths, born of my many faults, I could pay what I owe in this life, and you would be undeceived and free to do what you think best. (Cervantes 1613/2016: 314)

Solemnly intended as a kind of deathbed confession, Marco Antonio's words convey his repentance for displaying youthful recklessness and neglecting his heteronormative duty. His happy reunion with Teodosia, though apparently signalling the providentially ordained restoration of the normative social and sexual order, still bears traces of subversion. The narrator does not overlook the attraction that the erotically transgressive sight of the reconciled couple holds for all witnesses,

“who were looking attentively at what the patient was doing with the page he held in his arms” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 315). The gender and social anarchy exposed in the episodes of public disarray finds subtle echoes in the subversive traces embedded in the apparently conventional romance.

Beaumont and Fletcher’s rewriting contains significant alterations that fuel anxieties over the stability of social and gender standards perceived as threatened. Aware that his wound is only superficial, Mark-antonio intends to satisfy his overpowering lust with Eugenia under her husband’s own roof. In a fleeting, failed attempt at ‘manly’ self-restraint, he conveys the crucial role that heterosexual households played in the period’s consciousness:

O lust, if wounds cannot restrain thy power,
 Let shame: nor do I feel my hurt at all,
 Nor is it ought, only I was well beaten:
 If I pursue it, all the civill [sic] world
 That ever did imagine the content
 Found in the band of man and wife unbroke,
 The reverence due to households, or the blemish
 That may be stuck upon posterity,
 Will catch me, bind me, burn upon my forehead,
 This is the wounded stranger, that receiv’d
 For charity into a house, attempted—
 I will not do it. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.11–22)

The ignoble spectre of adultery is represented as threatening the authority relations and public reputation of a family whose head has offered civic, selfless hospitality. This threat has, moreover, broader political implications; since the household was “seen as the smallest unit in a system of analogies that stretched right up to the nation itself” (Richardson 2010: 18), the threat of domestic anarchy was signified as a threat to patriarchal authority at large.

Mark-antonio’s transgressive – politicised – attempt to get intimate with the Governor’s wife is conducted under the guise of a confession. The result is a highly theatrical parody of the Catholic confessional discourse pervading *Las dos doncellas* and shaping the religious life of the source culture:

But yet there are
 Some things that sit so heavy on my conscience
 That will perplex my mind, and stop my cure,
 So that unlesse [sic] I utter ’em a scratch
 Here on my thumb, will kill me.—Gentlemen,
 I pray you leave the room, and come not in
 Your selves, or any other till I have
 Open’d my self to this most honour’d Lady. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.33–40)

Mark-antonio mockingly appropriates the solemn, ritualised discourse of the Catholic sacrament to perform the role of the penitent and try to quench his lust, deceiving all present:

Whilst they imagine I am talking here
 With that short breath I have, ready to swound
 At every full point; you my ghostly Mother
 To hear my sad confession, you and I
 Will on that bed within, prepar'd for me,
 Debate the matter privately. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.76–81)

He is, however, overheard, and Leocadia takes it on herself that he must truly repent. She wittily pretends that Mark-antonio is in his last hour and instils in him an apparent willingness to produce a proper confession:

Mark-antonio. Oh heavens, an hour?
 Alas, it is to [sic] little to remember
 But half the wrongs that I have done; how short
 Then for contrition, and how least of all
 For satisfaction?
Leocadia. But you desire
 To satisfie?
Mark-antonio. Heaven knows I do. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.138–142; original emphasis)

This fragment is articulated in the Catholic rhetoric of penance, as both contrition and satisfaction are sought. The parodic use of the latter term is quite evident, as “the playwrights gleefully seize on the linguistic connection between the man’s spiritual atonement and the woman’s erotic gratification” (Hirschfeld 2014: 140). What is more, given Mark-antonio’s recent attempted seduction of Eugenia, it is also sexual – rather than penitent – satisfaction that the audience will most probably picture him seek. Leocadia’s focus on having her sexual urge gratified is overtly addressed, as she discloses her true identity to demand that Mark-antonio fulfil his husbandly duty:

[...] it is within your power
 To give me satisfaction; you have time
 Left in this little peece of life to do it:
 Therefore I charge you for your conscience sake,
 And for our fame, which I would fain have live
 When both of us are dead, to celebrate
 That Contract, which you have both seal’d and sworn. (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.150–156)

Leocadia’s demand undercuts her own self-fashioning as an innocent, passionless damsel as she conveniently moves on to perform a different role. She subversively foregoes ‘female’ passivity to take the initiative and act in pursuit of an erotic desire

she previously denied. The fluidity and performativity of identity apparent in Leocadia's changing roles are plainly conveyed when she discloses her name to Mark-antonio: "Then know / That I am he, or she, or what you will / Most wrong'd by you, your *Leocadia*" (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.143–145; original emphasis). Even more layers of artifice are superposed in the staged episode, where the self-declared "he, or she" cross-dressed girl would be played by a boy.

Leocadia's plan to earn back her 'lawful husband' backfires; apparently repentant, Mark-antonio confesses his love for Theodosia. Though conducive to the story's happy ending, the rake's repentance is hardly believable; not only has he tried to publicly unveil and unashamedly seduce Eugenia, but he is also consistently characterised as a misogynistic dissembler. The play features an added scene where he cynically assumes contradictory identities that underscore the performativity of human subjectivities. First, Mark-antonio fashions himself as embodying the normative ideal of heroic adult masculinity:

Mark-antonio. In those 'tis wonder,
That make their ease their god, and not their honour:
But noble Generall [sic], my end is other,
Desire of knowledge Sir, and hope of tying
Discretion to my time, which only shews me,
And not my years, a man, and makes that more,
Which we call handsome, the rest is but boys [sic] beauty,
And with the boy consum'd.

Rodorigo. Ye argue well Sir.

Mark-antonio. Nor do I wear my youth, as they wear breches [sic],
For object, but for use: my strength for danger,
Which is the liberall [sic] part of man, not dalliance;
The wars must be my Mistresse [sic] Sir. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.3.13–24)

Mark-antonio declares renouncing the self-indulgence associated with youth and boasts 'masculine' heroism, bravery and discretion. However, this self-fashioning is plain performance. Only a few lines afterwards, he portrays himself as an elusive and inconstant lover, interested in the diversions he previously rejected in favour of more honourable quests:

Rodorigo. How long love ye Signiour?

Mark-antonio. Till I have other businesse.

Rodorigo. Do you never
Love stedfastly one woman?

Mark-antonio. 'Tis a toyle Sir
Like riding in one rode perpetually;
It offers no variety. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.3.71–75)

Rodorigo. Did you ne'r love?

Mark-antonio. Faith, yes, once after supper,
And the fit held till midnight. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.3.108–109)

Mark-antonio does manage to persuade Theodosia, who steps forward to reveal her identity and is reconciled with her beloved. Once again, the existing social anxiety over the performativity of gender is dramatised, as Eugenia comically gives voice to her concern that “they wil [sic] all four turn women / If we hold longer talk” (*Pilgrimage*: 4.3.191–192).

Once the couple have been reunited, both texts feature Leocadia leaving the scene, overwhelmed with hopelessness and sorrow. After an anxious search, Don Rafael finds the runaway damsel and proclaims his desire. Apparently an impassioned declaration of love, his words have a coercive impetus; he grounds his eligibility as a spouse on his wealth and lineage – in no way inferior to Marco Antonio’s – and most importantly, offers the ‘disgraced’ damsel the only viable, honourable outcome:

instead of finding you alone and in clothes unworthy of your honor [...] you can return to your homeland in your own honoured and true clothing, accompanied by a husband as good as the one you could choose for yourself, rich, happy, esteemed, served and even praised by all those made aware of the facts of your story. (Cervantes 1613/2016: 317)

In a display of her characteristic rational pragmatism, a faltering Leocadia is persuaded to acquiesce to the proposal: “Well, then,’ the hesitant Leocadia said at this point, ‘if heaven has ordained this, and it is not in my hands or those of any living being to oppose what He has determined, let what He wishes and you desire, Señor, be done’” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 317). Leocadia’s resigned acceptance of her lot, added to Don Rafael’s unwavering resolution to gain her by will or by force – presumably to quench his unchecked lust –, render their marriage quite less than God’s ideal design. Though subtly, the text hints at the self-serving husband’s failure to live up to the standards of desirable masculinity. There is textual evidence to argue that both male protagonists embark on the frivolous pursuit of their own sexual and personal gratification and thus provide poor behavioural models of Spain’s aristocratic masculinity.

Beaumont and Fletcher’s Leocadia is similarly approached by Philipppo. Along the same lines, he speaks of his personal worth as rivalling Mark-antonio’s and appeals to the damsel’s good judgment and practicality. The playwrights provide a more thorough exploration of the nuances and complexities underlying the institution of marriage, a cornerstone of social stability in convoluted seventeenth-century England. First, the scene articulates the period’s anxieties over the ambiguities and uncertainties in the prevailing marriage legislation. Despite the

rogue's insolent disregard for his oath, Leocadia feels morally bound to Mark-antonio, whom she full-heartedly takes for her legitimate husband: "Oh, though he dispence / With his faith given, I cannot with mine" (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.87–88). It is Philippo who frees Leocadia of the morally binding obligation, as he provides rational and moral grounds for the union's annulment:

You do mistake (cleer soul); his precontract
 Doth annul yours, and you have giv'n no faith
 That ties you in religion, or humanity;
 You rather sin against that greater precept,
 To covet what's anothers; Sweet, you do[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.89–93)

Her pre-contracted marriage proven legally – and morally – null, Leocadia is free to take another spouse. Philippo describes his own marriage proposal as the single honourable course of action she is entitled to pursue. His speech conveys the dominant culture's demonisation of women operating outside the marriage economy and untouched by the sway of the patriarchal household:

Think but whither
 Now you can go: what you can do to live?
 How neer you ha' barr'd all Ports to your own succor,
 Except this one that I here open: Love,
 Should you be left alone, you were a prey
 To the wild lust of any, who would look
 Upon this shape like a temptation
 And think you want the man you personate,
 Would not regard this shift, which love put on,
 As vertue forc'd but coveted like vice;
 So should you live the slander of each Sex,
 And be the child of error, and of shame,
 And which is worse, even *Mark-antonie*
 Would be cal'd just, to turn a wanderer off,
 And Fame report you worthy his contempt[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.97–111; original emphasis)

The demonisation of unmarried women rests largely upon their construction as economically and sexually deviant. Should she reject Philippo's proposal, Leocadia would not only be despised as an idle wanderer, but also judged erotically transgressive. What is more, her male attire would potentially arise unorthodox desires, threatening the sexual and monetary economy of patriarchal households. Marriage is represented as a miraculous catalyst for change, enabling Leocadia to perform a socially sanctioned female identity, that of the wife: "Go home, and by the vertue [sic] of that Charm / Transform all mischiefs, as you are transform'd" (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.118–119). However, the threat posed by marginal women is not fully contained. After ambiguously acknowledging being changed – "I am: but

how, I rather feel than [sic] know” (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.125) –, Leocadia is believed to have disappeared once again, as Philipppo fears he may have lost her forever. The suspense about her final decision is conveniently prolonged, the social threat of female insubordination lingering a little longer.

Cervantes’s novel ends with the marriage of the damsels, both dressed in ‘proper’ female attire, and hence apparently deprived of the transgressive power conferred during their transvestite adventure. However, a reading of the conventional romance ending of *Las dos doncellas* as signalling the restoration of a disrupted social and gendered order is problematic. Once Marco Antonio has made a miraculous full recovery, all four characters embark on a pilgrimage to Santiago. The narrator stresses the ladies’ convenient performance of ‘feminine’ traits once they have apparently kicked off their masculinised identities and submitted to their gender’s norms and limitations: “traveling as quickly as the delicacy of the two new pilgrims permitted, in three days they reached Monserrat” (Cervantes 1613/2016: 318). However, the description of the female warriors as exhibiting ‘feminine’ delicacy and fragility cannot but sound ironic after their fierce engagement in battle. More importantly, as demonstrated by Fuchs (2010: 60), this scene subversively reasserts the gender ambiguity of the damsels, as both wear the exact same pilgrim capes as their husbands until their return to Andalusia, where Leocadia’s own father revealingly takes her for a man. The social and gendered disruption conveyed in the novel’s representation of Spain’s domestic affairs is mirrored by the main characters’ failure to conform to normative gender roles.

7 The Duel Scene (Re-)Staged: Two Disparate Articulations of Virtuous Masculinity

Cervantes’s novel closes with a histrionic occurrence which sustains the social critique articulated in the chaotic, strife-ridden scenes constitutive of this disordered society. On their arrival in Andalusia, the newly married couples witness the onset of a solemn, ritualised duel whose graceful combatants happen to be each of their fathers. It is thanks to Don Rafael’s and Marco Antonio’s timely intervention that the duel is interrupted without spilt blood. Clamurro (2001: 67) observed that though absurdly archaic, the event reads as an exaltation of the long-gone values of dignity and chivalry, and thus articulates by opposition a critique of Marco Antonio’s objectionable moral standards. In fact, it is both young male protagonists – subjects and agents of a disrupted society – that fall quite short of the aristocratic ideal of honourable masculinity, and whose sense of honour and

‘masculine’ heroism pale in comparison to their fathers’, quixotically farcical as the latter may be.

Beaumont and Fletcher extend and elaborate on the duel scene to make a poignant parody of the Mediterranean code of honour and duelling. The play features a dispute between Theodosia’s and Mark-antonio’s fathers, respectively named Alphonso and Leonardo. In an explosive display of temper, Alphonso visits his neighbour to get back his eloped daughter, whom he is positive has been taken by the lecherous Mark-antonio. Theodosia’s father behaves most uncivilly; unwilling to hear reason, he threatens to take an implacable revenge on Leonardo if the culprit is not punished severely. Leonardo reacts patiently to his neighbour’s provocations and tries to argue his point rationally:

Ye urge me Signior
 With strange injustice: because my Son has err’d [...]
 Out of the heat of youth: dos’t follow
 I must be father of his crimes? (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.58–61).

In his father’s narrative, Mark-antonio’s transgression is naturalised as endemic to youth’s fervour and thus co-opted into the dominant gender discourse; by the period’s standards, the judicious governance of one’s passions was indicative of normative adult masculinity. Significantly, Alphonso’s unrestrained and irrational anger is deemed unmanly by the gentler Leonardo: “Noble Sir, / Let us argue coolly [sic], and consider like men” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.79–80). Absurdly injudicious and hot-tempered, the character is satirically portrayed as the archetypical Spaniard: “*Leonardo*. Ye are as like Sir, / As any man in *Spaine*” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.112–113; original emphasis). Sanchio, Leocadia’s father, joins in the condemnation of the behaviour exhibited by his temperamental neighbour:

Fie Signiour, there be times, and terms of honour
 To argue these things in, descidements able
 To speak ye noble gentlemen, ways punctuall [sic]
 And to the life of credit; ye are too rugged. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.42–45)

He urges Alphonso to resolve the perceived affront in accordance with the strict rules of the highly codified and ritualised practice of duelling:

Sanchio. Why Signior, in all things there must be method.
 Ye choak the child of honour els [sic], discretion.
 Do you conceive an injury?
Alphonso. What then Sir?
Sanchio. Then follow it in fair terms; let your sword bite,
 When time calls, not your tongue. (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.49–53; original emphasis)

Far from an irrational outburst of unrestrained violence, the duel was traditionally considered as “a carefully choreographed ceremony designed to restore an honourable reputation to someone who had been defamed” (Taylor 2008: 18). What is more,

the duel of honour was an integral part of the new Renaissance ideology of courtesy and civility. It was created within a new court culture, where the prime emphasis was placed on sophisticated manners and where courtiers and gentlemen were compelled to control and repress their emotions. (Peltonen 2003: 5)

Sanchio’s observation that Alphonso should conduct himself nobly and discreetly and temper his unbridled anger – “I feel the old man’s master’d by much passion, / And too high rackt” (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.132–133) – seems to endorse the link between the duel of honour and the broader ideology of Renaissance civility. However, Leocadia’s instructing father becomes the butt of the playwrights’ bitter satire when he learns that his own daughter has eloped, presumably with Mark-antonio. Seized by an explosive fit of anger and seeking deadly revenge, Sanchio arrives at Leonardo’s house, where Alphonso reminds him of his cynical defence of courtesy:

Wher’s your credit
With all your school points now? your decent arguing
And apt time for performing: where are these toys,
These wise ways, and most honourable courses,
To take revenge? (*Pilgrimage*: 3.4.52–56)

The maidens’ fathers are ridiculed as two choleric, foolish old men, as they engage in a preposterous confrontation on who has been most wronged. On learning that Leonardo has departed for Barcelona, they ally with each other to find their enemy and take bloody revenge.

Love’s Pilgrimage was published at a time were the number of duels fought in England was rising steadily; concomitantly, the practice became subject to increasing opposition, including the King’s. As argued by Peltonen (2003: 14), “[t]he anti-duelling criticism became more vociferous [...] during the second decade of the seventeenth century when James I launched his sustained campaign against duelling”. Besides opposing the Christian doctrine and royal authority to duelling practices and theories, “several critics also flatly denied that duelling was part of courteous behaviour or that it enhanced the general level of politeness in society. They found any such claim simply abominable, and for them single combats were nothing but traits of barbaric behaviour” (Peltonen 2003: 14). This critique is articulated in *Love’s Pilgrimage*, as Alphonso and Sanchio are scornfully portrayed as irascible and foolishly belligerent. The centrality of civility to

early modern urban gentlemanly culture is also embedded in Leonardo's speech. Accused by Alphonso of being "at best, a base man" (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.89), he grounds his claim to normative masculinity on his high birth and civility: "I am as gentle as your self, as free born / [...] As much respect ow'd to me / [...] And for Civill [sic], / A great deal more it seems" (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.93–96). More significantly, when threatened by the enraged Alphonso, it is his neighbour's uncivil behaviour that he condemns more severely: "I dare more Sir, / If you dare be uncivill [sic]" (*Pilgrimage*: 2.1.104–105). Despite his adherence to the Renaissance ideology of civil courtesy, Leonardo does not agree to any duel to assert his status as an honourable gentleman in a display of 'manly' courage and fortitude. Instead, after trying and failing to talk reason into Alphonso, he intends to prove his virtue by peaceful means:

[...] and to prevent
 Suspitions [sic] that may nourish dangers Signior,
 (For I have told you how the mad *Alphonso*
 Chafes like a Stag i'th toyl, and bends his fury
 'Gainst all, but his own ignorance;) I'm determin'd
 For peace sake and the preservation
 Of my yet untouch'd honor, and his cure,
 My self to seek him there, and bring him back
 As testimony of an unsought injurie
 By either of our actions; That the world,
 And he if he have reason, may see plainly
 Opinion is no perfect guide; nor all fames
 Founders of truths[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 3.3.38–50; original emphasis)

Leonardo's speech articulates an idea expressed by the opponents of duelling at the time. From their perspective, the practice hinged on a twisted conception of honour whereby a man's reputation depended exclusively on the good opinion of others. As discussed by Peltonen (2003: 115), Jacobean anti-duellists advocated a vertical understanding of honour, which was seen as a reward of virtue untied to the opinions of men.

Sanchio's performance at the end of the play offers a bitterly satirical representation of the conventionalised practice of duelling and the ideology of honour underlying it. Upon learning that the eloped Leocadia is in Philipppo's – not Mark-antonio's – company, he ceremoniously challenges Alphonso to a duel:

Your Son's the ravisher Sir, and here I find him:
 I hope you'l [sic] give me cause to think you noble,
 And do me right, with your sword sir, as becomes
 One gentleman of honor to another[.] (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.157–160)

The tumult is quelled by the Governor, at whose demand Alphonso gives up his sword. Sanchio pronounces a foolish speech where he categorically refuses to part with his weapon, which is taken from him by force. Leocadia's father reacts to the perceived offence confronting the Governor face-to-face:

Sanchio. Stay, heare [sic] me. Hast thou ever read *Caranza*?

Understandst thou honour, Noble Governour?

Governor. For that we'l [sic] have more fit dispute.

Sanchio. Your name sir.

Governor. You shall know that too: But on colder termes,

Your blood and brain are now too hot to take it.

Sanchio. Force my Sword from me? This is an affront.

Governor. Bring 'em away.

Sanchio. You'l [sic] do me reparation. (*Pilgrimage*: 5.4.202–208; original emphasis)

In a display of his characteristic unrestrained fury, Sanchio goes so far as to demand reparation for the perceived affront – and thus challenges the Governor to a duel. This challenge to the established authority articulates a critique often raised by Jacobean anti-duellists, who framed the practice as undermining the King's authority – and hence the rigidly hierarchised patriarchal system at large. His father's son, Philippo also contributes to jeopardising the established order of society; persuaded that Leocadia has fled a second time, he regrets not rebelling against his father and wishes he had drawn his sword against both Sanchio and Alphonso:

I have for ever lost her, and am lost,

And worthily: my tamenesse hath undone me;

She's gone hence, asham'd of me: yet I seek her.

Will she be ever found to me again,

Whom she saw stand so poorly, and dare nothing

In her defence, here, when I should have drawn

This Sword out like a meteor, and have shot it

In both our parents eyes, and left 'em blind

Unto their impotent angers? (*Pilgrimage*: 5.5.1–9)

Since the family was conceived as a microcosm reflecting the order of the state, rebellion against the household's head was seen as detrimental to patriarchal society at large. Significantly unfolding right before Philippo's soliloquy, Sanchio's challenge to the ruling Governor is mirrored in Philippo's regret not to have brutally confronted his father. The extract also conveys, quite powerfully, the anti-duellists' argument that the practice is not a gentlemanly display of civility or politeness, but an atrocious manifestation of barbaric behaviour.

The parody is sharpened in the final scene, where Sanchio and Alphonso are manoeuvred into a bitterly farcical performance concocted by Eugenia. Still intent

on demanding satisfaction for the perceived affront, Sanchio cites the Spaniard Jerónimo de Carranza as an authority in the discipline of duelling. The Governor's wife pretends that she upholds the practice and the underlying values and gets involved in the punctilious organisation of the duel 'Carranza-style'. Carried by his servants on a chair all throughout the play, Sanchio is mockingly portrayed as a mobility-impaired, irritable old man. For Eugenia's comic observation that his rival "has th'advantage [...] in legs" (5.6.72), Alphonso proposes an outrageous solution: "For that, / Make it no question Lady; I will sticke / My feet in earth down by him, where he dare" (*Pilgrimage*: 5.6.74–76).

The image evoked by these words is humorously ludicrous. The burlesque depiction of this singular pair is conveyed in the words uttered by Eugenia, whose courteous manners with the duellers offer a sharp contrast to the taunting performance she stage-manages them into:

Why Gentlemen,
 If you'l [sic] proceed according to *Caranza*,
 Me thinks an easier way, were too good chaires;
 So you would be content sir to be bound,
 'Cause he is lame, ile [sic] fit you with like weapons,
 Pistols and Ponyards, and ev'n end it. If
 The difference between you be so mortall [sic],
 It cannot be tane up. (*Pilgrimage*: 5.6.78–85; original emphasis)

This plot is interrupted by a short conversation between Philippo and Mark-antonio that echoes the strife between their parents. Once again, Philippo endorses the notion of honour advocated by Alphonso; bitter that his cowardice may have lost him Leocadia, he seeks to vent his resentment, arguably provoking Mark-antonio to demand instant reparation of honour: He first reproaches the 'unworthy' lover for his treatment of Leocadia and then moves on to extol her virtues above Theodosia's. Nonetheless, like Alphonso himself, Philippo fails to make his potential rival lose control or give him grounds for a duel of honour:

Philippo. I would faine—
Mark-antonio. What brother?
Philippo. Strike you.
Mark-antonio. I shall not beare strokes,
 Though I do these strange words.
Philippo. Will you not kill me?
Mark-antonio. For what good brother?
Philippo. Why, for speaking well
 Of Leocadia.
Mark-antonio. No indeed.
Philippo. Nor ill
 Of *Theodosia*?

Mark-antonio. Neither.

Philippo. Fare you well then[!] (*Pilgrimage*: 5.6.97–104; original emphasis)

Mark-antonio shares his own father's rejection of duelling and the notion of honour sustained by the practice. The butts of a bitter satire all throughout the play, both duelling and the underlying code of honour are further undermined in the last lines. The vision of the cantankerous old men sitting on their respective chairs – one willingly tied and both armed with pistols – eager to fight a ceremonious duel is preposterous. Their intent falters, however, when Theodosia and Leocadia enter silently to place themselves between their parents, following Eugenia's instructions. Unable to jeopardise their daughters' lives, the keen potential combatants choose to give up the duel. As observed by Hicklin (2013: 78), this ending is a remarkable change from *Las dos doncellas*, where it is the men that place themselves between the combatants and manage to stop the joust. Thus, "Beaumont and Fletcher change the story to underline the affection between the fathers and daughters, rather than the young mens' new relationships to their fathers-in-law" (Hicklin 2013: 78). Besides, the representation of duelling undertaken in each work is disparate. The absurd archaism of the scene is conveyed in Cervantes's text, but the event still reads as a nostalgic praise of the values inherent to the chivalric spirit; Beaumont and Fletcher, on the contrary, foster an understanding of duelling as dissociated from the virtues of civility and 'manly' self-restraint.

8 Conclusion

Produced at a time of heightened diplomatic and literary relations between England and Spain, *Love's Pilgrimage* contributes to the widespread practice of representing Cervantes's country, offering a stage adaptation of a novel written by the renowned Spanish author. Not only does the play dramatise a culture that inspired ambivalent feelings of hostility and fascination, but it also (re)locates the source text in Jacobean England, engaging with the target culture's politics and ideology. It can be argued that *Las dos doncellas* articulates an oblique denunciation of Spain's disrupted society and unheroic, self-indulgent power elites. Whilst the implication is made that both male protagonists fail to enact the – nostalgically recalled – ideal of aristocratic masculinity, the damsels seem to effortlessly exhibit 'masculine' traits and pass as men in a nation marked by social, material and gender disorder. The conventional double-marriage ending does not successfully erase the subversive traces embedded within the narrative, whose depiction of public strife powerfully echoes the transgressive identities performed by the characters.

Beaumont and Fletcher offer a bitterly farcical representation of Spain; among the butts of their satire are the Catholic ritual of confession and the Mediterranean code of honour and shame, materialised in the acutely mocked practices of veiling and duelling. Depicted as prototypical Spaniards, Alphonso and Sanchio make a ludicrous exhibition of ‘unmasculine’ fury, irrationality and belligerence. Moreover, despite their eagerness to engage in a ‘manly’ duel to demand reparation of honour, they emerge as the most unheroic pair, absurd and martially inept. The distant, foreign setting allows the playwrights not only to offer a mocking representation of Spaniards, but also to make a piercing, bitter parody of an increasingly common practice in Jacobean England. In fact, *Love’s Pilgrimage* dramatises some of the period’s pressing ideological concerns. Facing the menace of upward social mobility, the Jacobean ruling elite perceived its privileges as being acutely jeopardised. Beaumont and Fletcher capitalise on this anxiety by emphasising the fluidity and theatricality of gender and class subjectivities. The portrayal of human identities as performative is favoured by the genre shift undergone by the adaptation, as the theatre hinges on performativity as its main operational mechanism. Ultimately, the play questions the essentialised identity categories upholding the established social hierarchy, and hence contributes to undermining the Jacobean patriarchal order.

Works Cited

- Abella Padrón, Dayamí. 2015. “Mujeres Cervantinas Que Reivindican Su Honra: Representación Femenina En *La Fuerza de La Sangre*, *Las Dos Doncellas* y *La Señora Cornelia*”. In: Emmanuel Marigno, Carlos Mata Induráin and Hugo Hernán Ramírez Sierra (eds.). *Cervantes Creador y Cervantes Recreado*. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra. 7–20.
- Aylward, E. T. 1999. *The Crucible Concept: Thematic and Narrative Patterns in Cervantes’s Novelas Ejemplares*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher. 1647/1970. *Love’s Pilgrimage*. Ed. L. A. Beaurline. In: Fredson Bowers (ed.). *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 567–695.
- Britt, Linda. 1988. “Teodosia’s Dark Shadow? A Study of Women’s Roles in Cervantes’s *Las dos doncellas*”. *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 8.1: 39–46.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. 1613/2000. *Las dos doncellas*. In: Harry Sieber (ed.). *Novelas Ejemplares*. Volume 2. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. 1613/2016. *The Novel of the Two Maidens*. In: Roberto González Echevarría (ed.). *Exemplary Novels*. Trans. Edith Grossman. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 291–322.
- Clamurro, William H. 2001. “*Las dos doncellas* de Cervantes: identidad, honor y anacronismo”. In: Alicia Villar Lecumberri (ed.). *Cervantes en Italia: Actas del Décimo Coloquio Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas*. Palma de Mallorca: Asociación de Cervantistas. 65–72.

- Collins, Marsha. 2002. "El poder del discurso confesional en *Las dos doncellas*". *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 22.2: 25–48.
- Fuchs, Barbara. 2010. *Passing for Spain: Cervantes and Fictions of Identity*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Griffin, Eric J. 2009. *English Renaissance Drama and the Specter of Spain: Ethnopoetics and Empire*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grünnagel, Christian. 2013. "Men's Studies y el Siglo de Oro: una lectura ejemplar de *Las dos doncellas*". *Hipogrifo: Revista de Literatura y Cultura Del Siglo de Oro* 1.2: 39–49.
- Guarino, Gabriel. 2019. "'The Antipathy between French and Spaniards': Dress, Gender, and Identity in the Court Society of Early Modern Naples, 1501–1799". In: Cornelia Aust, Denise Klein and Thomas Weller (eds.). *Dress and Cultural Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 13–32.
- Hardman, Josefina. 2017. "Tragicomic Transpositions: The Influence of Spanish Prose Romance on the Development of Early Modern English Tragicomedy". Unpubl. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Hardman, Josephine. 2016. "Undoing Wonder: Beaumont and Fletcher Secularize Cervantes". *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 52.1: 22–42.
- Hicklin, Christopher. 2013. "Girls on the Run: *Love's Pilgrimage*, *The Coxcomb*, and *Double Falsehood*". In: Terri Bourus and Gary Taylor (eds.). *The Creation and Re-Creation of Cardenio: Performing Shakespeare, Transforming Cervantes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 73–82.
- Hirschfeld, Heather. 2014. *The End of Satisfaction: Drama and Repentance in the Age of Shakespeare*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Jardine, Lisa. 1983. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Karim-Cooper, Farah. 2012. *Cosmetics in Shakespearean and Renaissance Drama*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Orgel, Stephen. 1996. *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peltonen, Markku. 2003. *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, Catherine. 2010. "Tragedy, Family and Household". In: Emma Smith and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 17–29.
- Rose, Mary Beth. 2018. *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shepard, Alexandra. 2003. *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stock, Angela and Anne-Julia Zwierlein. 2017. "Introduction: 'Our Scene Is London...'"'. In: Dieter Mehl, Stock and Zwierlein (eds.). *Plotting Early Modern London: New Essays on Jacobean City Comedy*. New York: Routledge. 1–26.
- Taylor, Scott K. 2008. *Honor and Violence in Golden Age Spain*. New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press.
- West, Russell. 2002. *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage: From Shakespeare to Webster*. New York: Palgrave.
- Zimic, Stanislav. 1989. "*Las Dos Doncellas*: Padres e Hijos". *Acta Neophilologica* 22: 23–37.