

Overreaching Flesh and Soul: The Theme of Damnation in Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Tirso de Molina's *Don Juan*

Miguel Martínez López
UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA

The purpose of this essay is to explore some characteristic and interrelated themes of the drama of the Counter Reformation in Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* and Tirso de Molina's *El Burlador de Sevilla y Convidado de Piedra*: among them, special attention is paid to freedom, predestination, reprobation, abnormal sexuality and love, within the context of the subject of damnation.¹ The results of this comparative analysis have confirmed my initial hypothesis: Renaissance and Baroque drama, regardless of national differences, attended the spiritual needs that the tragedy of the religious schism of the sixteenth century had generated. Both, Marlowe in the England of Queen Elizabeth's Protestant restoration and Tirso in Catholic Spain, like Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, Lope de Vega and Calderón, addressed, in quite sophisticated ways, the major moral preoccupations and the feelings of confusion of their age.

In the case of *Dr. Faustus* and *Don Juan*, we immediately perceive both the distance with respect to Lutheran or Calvinist apology of predestination and the links to non-monolithic Catholic tenets. Above all, we encounter a most serious attack on the part of two baroque writers against two typically Renaissance heroes, who are also agonists. Their fall and their damnation constitute an important testimony and warning about the drama of the so-called "modern man", the aspiring overreacher of the Renaissance age. Indeed, the stories of Faustus and Don Juan portray a typically Renaissance world view; its love for transgression, its egocentrism (though not its sheer energy) are objects of severe criticism on the part of the two authors, which is the more puzzling since they come from opposite religious backgrounds.

Dr. Faustus and Don Juan are both blasphemous and sinful, but not atheists. Both are hedonists and represent hedonism, and their heteronomous patterns of behaviour make them overreachers and outsiders in a society they struggle to please and whose admiration they lust after. Both, Faustus and Don Juan, in short, epitomize an overreaching strife against two rather uncongenial sides of the human being, the sensual and the intellectual, while they try to make this world eternal and count on a late and merely nominal repentance to prevent damnation.

These two agonists, very much like Hamlet, are also inveterate procrastinators. Half way between the tragic and the comic, both characters are supposed to have been sent to hell by their respective authors, while both remain foundations of two parallel myths of overreaching that have captivated all audiences and readers ever since their creation.

The comparison of the character Dr. Faustus,² as it is depicted by Ch. Marlowe to that of the first Don

Juan,³ the creation of a Spanish monk, Gabriel Téllez, the outstanding dramatist of the Spanish literary “golden age”, who is known to the world by the pen-name of Tirso de Molina, shows truly outstanding parallels; these also help us identify the real interests of the playwrights and the audiences of the Europe of the late Renaissance.

On the other hand, the appropriateness of the choice of the above versions is backed up at least by two considerations: first, the number of the literary versions of both myths are counted by the tens⁴ and, therefore, the comparison of just two of the versions facilitates the narrowing down of the focus as well as the limitation of the material to a manageable amount; secondly, both plays represent the first extant dramatization of the two myths, and they were written in a time-span of some thirty years: *Dr. Faustus* around 1592, though published posthumously in 1604, and *El Burlador de Sevilla* around 1620, though published later, in 1630).⁵

I. CH. MARLOWE'S *DR. FAUSTUS* AND T. DE MOLINA'S *DON JUAN*: A COMPARATIVE VIEW.

The coupling of these two works may seem striking at first. We tend to picture Dr. Faustus gloomily sitting in his study, certainly not flirting around, but, upon close scrutiny, the Doctor of Wittenberg and Don Juan share more than just tragic ends; all in all, *Doctor Faustus* and *Don Juan* are, from the point of view of genre, tragedies with numerous comic elements, loosely attached in the former while perfectly integrated in the latter: thus the common consideration of *El Burlador de Sevilla* as a “tragicomedy”. Also at the thematic and rhetorical levels, the two characters are connected with each other. Let us briefly explore first these common grounds.

Both dramas tell the tragedy of a human soul; as their very titles suggest, they are, in essence, biographies: the more or less fictionalized history of John Faust, the Doctor of Wittenberg and that of Don Juan, “el Burlador de España” (the Spanish trickster). They also share sources, approaches and themes. In both protagonists we meet legendary prototypes (the libertine and the magician, overthrown by the power of God), which are themselves substantially older than the texts. Both dramas are supposed to be based on the life of a historical character, Georgius Faust or Johann Fust and the Count Leoncio or Juan de Tassis, Count of Villamediana. Both share also a German connection, since Marlowe borrowed his plot from the German *Faustbuch*, while Tirso possibly drew on the script of a 1615 performance of a play, probably of Italian origin and a very similar plot, held at the Jesuit College of Ingoldstad. Soon, our two heroes became universal myths and they began to be imitated, developed, adapted to new times and places, while keeping the essentials of their revolt and the drama of their fall. From 1630 to 1844, sixteen texts developed the tragedy of Don Juan⁶ and the same applies to Dr. Faustus's.⁷

From a thematic point of view, both plots present, and condemn, the Protestant negation of freedom and its subsidiary theory of predestination, which I will discuss below in some detail. Human freedom exists, under the influence of grace and “though eternal election and eternal reprobation do exist, they do not *propter hoc* destroy this human freedom”⁸. Both heroes are epitomes of overreaching, whereas the attack on the concept of limit is typical of the Renaissance world view. This attack—as Hiram Haydn revealed in his book, suggestively entitled *The Counter-Renaissance*⁹ is rooted in the more general concept of *vanitas*; the vanity that results from indulging in one or more, or all, of the three *libidos*—*libido sciendi*, *libido sentiendi* and *libido dominandi*—is undoubtedly a central issue in Marlowe's and Tirso's drama as it was a central issue in the theological and cultural debate of the sixteenth and seven-

teenth centuries. This repudiation of the concept of limit and self-restraint, so typical of this period, reveals itself in a form of *anxiety*; moreover, this anxiety exhorts to break all rules, to trespass –hopefully unwounded– the farthest boundaries of the medieval god-centered, commonly accepted reality. Geographic, political and personal frontiers are thus invaded from the standpoint of human vanity, subtly uttering, once again, the words of the Evil Angel: *Non serviam*. Both in *Dr. Faustus* and in *Don Juan*, vanity is present in a rather paradoxical way, since their tragic outcome invites us to take it as a fideist admonition against any epistemological system that ignores or denies the impending reality of death as well as as a proclamation of the infinite value of human actions on this earth. Nevertheless, at the same time, these two works document a revolt that frees the conscience of the mortals of its ties in a final affirmation of autonomy and sovereignty.

In *Dr. Faustus*, we can also see the negation of the medieval intellectual game of the *disputationes*: he learns nothing from Mephostophilis that he did not know before the pact, while the pendular movement epitomized by the angels only helped to shape the exact nature of his choices. In *Don Juan*, whose conscience is clearly disembodied and transferred to his servant Catalinón, we can easily grasp how the mediaeval “game of war”, as the mode of expression of manhood, is substituted by the “game of tricking women”, whereas the sword becomes for him, as for many others, a mere ornament.¹⁰ We have suggested that the two plays explicitly portray a moral and are, to a large extent, didactic in purpose; to this, we must add that the two heroes are condemned, not for unbelief (that was the case in Tirso’s *El Condenado por Desconfiado, Condemned for Unbelief*), but, on the contrary, they are condemned for excessive belief.¹¹ Faustus thought he could repent at the very last moment, after his twenty-four years of diabolic worship; in the same manner, Don Juan believed he could count on a last-hour recantation to secure himself a free ride to heaven, while his life was being constantly devoted to evil doings and flamboyant pride. In the very last minute they both try in vain to repent: “I’ll burn my books!” (V, iii, 191), (the external sign of repentance of magicians) are the last words of Faustus. Don Juan’s final demand is “Deja que llame / quien me confiese y absuelva” (III, 2768-9). The didactic nature of both plays is emphasized by the appearance of the Chorus in *Dr. Faustus* and the Singers in *Don Juan*:

“Chorus. Faustus is gone. Regard his hellish fall,
Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise
Only to wonder at unlawful things,
Whose deepness doth entice such forward wits
To practice more than heavenly powers permits.” (V, Epilogue, 5-8).

“Cantan. Adviertan los que de Dios
juzgan los castigos grandes,
que no hay plazo que no llegue,
ni deuda que no se pague. [...]
Mientras en el mundo viva,
no es justo que diga nadie:
¡Qué largo me lo fiáis!,
Siendo tan breve el cobrarse.” (III, 2731-4 & 2739-42).

They both defied hell, and not just once but several times: “Si fueras el mismo infierno la mano te

diera yo” is Don Juan’s answer to Don Gonzalo in his first meeting with the statue in the third act. Also Faustus dares to disdain hell and its pains in front of an irrefutable evidence and trustworthy testimony of its reality: “Dr. Faustus [to Mephostophilis]: Come, I think hell’s a fable. [...] / Tush, these are trifles and mere old wives’ tales. [...] I’ll willingly be damned here.” (II, i, 130; 138 & 142).

Besides, Dr. Faustus –in contrast to what a superficial reading of the text might suggest– is never truly interested in real knowledge. He disposes of the whole corpus of science and arts, from medicine to theology, with a couple of poorly quoted citations in the opening scene of the play and proves to be interested only in gold, guns and girls. Don Juan, in turn, just concentrates on girls, but is unable to give and/or receive the gratifications of sensual love. He never falls in love; his only business is to trick women, to possess them and flee from them in search of more and more *females* to add to his list. Against common assumptions about this issue, women do not fall in love with him either; only Tisbea, out of sympathy and pity for the shipwrecked nobleman, felt the fire of love and passion towards Don Juan: “Por más helado que estáis, / tanto fuego en vos tenéis / que en este mío os ardéis.” (II, 633-635)¹². The rest of the women in the drama are simply abused with forging and marriage vows. While both heroes long for an ideal of womanly perfection, soon after the pact with the devil, Faustus discovers little, if any, sexual gratification and Don Juan is forced to fly from affair to affair as a toy in the hands of women who often are quite like him, if not worse. Faustus admits that he is “wanton and lascivious and cannot live without a wife” (II, i, 144-5). Mephostophilis then brings a succubus, disguised as a whore, since he understands the true nature of the request, beyond the self-contradictory terms used by Faustus. He can have no wife, because he cannot love. He, like the Greeks depicted in Plato’s *Phaidros*, 228, a), demands sexuality without love; he demands maximum pleasure with minimum personal commitment. Eroticism has no place in the universe of Faustus and Don Juan. The only *reasonable* choice for Faustus and Don Juan is the *areté*. Faustus summons the ghost of Helen of Troy, one more succubus readily provided by the devil, in the first place, not because he desires her but rather to please the scholars’ request: “It is not Faustus’ custom to deny / The just request of those that wish him well”: (V, i, 20-1). What he longs for is a sick definition of fame, that all pervading euphemism that lies at the very root of pride and vanity. Eros, alienated from sex, turns Helena into a mere abstract means, whose fame will pass onto Faustus, once he has paid the price, that is, once he has given his soul away. The beauty of the “soul-in-the-kiss” conceit contrasts with the simultaneous annihilation of Faustus through the brutal extirpation of his soul.

As in the case of Dr. Faustus, there seems to be something terribly abnormal in Don Juan’s psyche. They are like adolescents who have failed to grow up. Surely Faustus has been unable to establish any mature relationship with any member of the opposite sex: he needs the devil to procure a wife for him; and he gets little, if anything at all, neither then nor later with Helen of Troy. According to Gregorio Marañón,

“Don Juan lives obsessed by women, and runs from one to the next without ever staying with any of them; and this not because none of them please him...on the contrary, because his rudimentary instinct is satisfied with any of them... princess or fisher-girl.”¹³

Furthermore, in the affairs of Don Juan, critics have often found an “enchancing devilish virtuality inherent to “donjuanism”¹⁴, the difference with the case of Dr. Faustus is just one of explicitness, as the episodes with Tisbea, the fisher-girl, openly manifests.

Truly, there is no sense of joy, either in the Doctor or in the Don. The latter just hunts and destroys women for the sake of fame, i.e., pride and vanity. He is interested neither in sex nor in love: the trick and his reputation as the trickster of Spain is all that counts; so much so, that, when Catalinón indulges in the pleasures that await his master, he can only think of the lie, the successful accomplishment of the trick: "Catalinón: Vamos, / y al fin gozarás su dama. [Doña Ana] Don Juan: Ha de ser burla de fama." (II, 420-2).

Our protagonists also share their characterization as devilish figures. Elsewhere, I have explored at length the possibility that Marlowe may be reporting a case of diabolic possession in his *Dr. Faustus*¹⁵. Devils become his only companions early in the play. Don Juan too is characterized with devilish traits. He indulges in perjury, making constant marriage vows in the name of God, without any intention to fulfill them. While Faustus swears in the name of Satan and signs a blood-compact with the devil, Don Juan is considered a possessed man, almost himself a devil, by those who are close to him. See, for instance, Catalinón's remarks in II, 1772-3: "Desdichado tú, que has dado / en manos de Lucifer!". Later, when he breaks into Aminta's quarters and she protests because he comes around midnight, the hour of witches, Don Juan answers back: "Estas son las horas mías" (III, 2007). The devil is the Father of all lies and the two texts we are comparing are not exactly scarce as far as falsehood is concerned. They both begin with a lie: a double lie about the true identity of the lover and about his real intentions:

"Isabela: Duque Octavio, por aquí
podrás salir más seguro.

Don Juan: Duquesa, de nuevo os juro
de cumplir el dulce sí." (I, 1-4).

Faustus' first appearance on stage also portrays a lie, about which the reader learns towards the end of the play. Dr. Faustus is reading from the Bible and other books and the devil confesses, at the end of the play, that he turned the leaves so that Faustus could not read about Redemption:

"[...] When thou took'st the book
To view the Scriptures, then I turned the leaves
And led thine eye." (V, ii, 99-101).

Moreover, both, like Hamlet, are inveterate procrastinators. Ever delayed repentance stands as a central motif in both plays, while the excuse remains always the same: "Tan largo me lo fiáis" ("How much time you are granting me"), in the case of Don Juan and, in the case of the Doctor of Wittenberg: "So he will spare him four-and-twenty years / Letting him live in all voluptuousness" (I, iii, 93-4). The twenty-four years of Faustus' pact with the devil quickly pass away and then he asks that "time may cease" (V, ii, 69) or that eternity be temporal: "Impose some end to my incessant pain" (V, ii, 101). Also Don Juan has tragically miscalculated the time for repentance and death has taken him aback. He begs Don Gonzalo to let him call someone to hear him in confession and give him absolution; but the time is now expired.

There is a sense of poetic justice in the death of the two heroes, who bring along with them a symbolic punishment for all the overreachers of their age. Certainly the punishment suits the sin: Don Juan's actions demand his death; he who provoked the fire of love in the women he deceived dies by fire: "¡Que me quemo, que me abraso, muerto soy!" (III, 2771-2); he who asked for so many hands in marriage dies shaking hands with Don Gonzalo, the living statue representing God's wrath, the very same God that looks so fierce on Faustus in the final hour of the tragedy. Human powers, such as the king in *Don Juan* and the

scholars in *Dr. Faustus*, have failed to restore order, so both characters are left to God's justice and to people's censure.

II. JUSTICE, TIME, FREEDOM AND PREDESTINATION: THEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS AND THE INTELLECTUAL MILIEU OF *DR. FAUSTUS* AND *DON JUAN*.

Dr. Faustus's and Don Juan's fate proves that faith does not suffice without good works. Criticism on the former has often taken for granted that Marlowe allied himself with the most extreme representatives of English Calvinism on this and other related issues. However, his plays, and this is particularly evident in *Dr. Faustus*, reject the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. Indeed the tragedy of the doctor of Wittenberg not only demonstrates, in Miss M.M. Mahood's words, "humanism's self-destructive nature",¹⁶ but also upholds Augustinian liberal theology as presented in *De Libero Arbitrio*. One must take into account that Marlowe's Cambridge was the center of an intense debate on free will and its ancillary issues of predestination and reprobation. Peter Baro, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity made himself a lasting reputation for his challenge of the dominant, orthodox Calvinistic doctrines, represented the year Marlowe joined them by Robert Norgate, Master of Corpus Christi College. Marlowe himself, while at Cambridge and later in his life in London, was often accused of Catholicism and *poperie*. It can reasonably be argued that he was a spy, but it is more difficult to know, in the light of his biography,¹⁷ who he worked for, i.e., whether he was just an agent of Queen Elizabeth or a double agent, working for the Catholics. The root of the problem, in England, lies in the interpretation of article XVII in *The Book of Common Prayer* ("Of predestination and election"), where the apparent contradiction of God's omnipotence and omniscience and human free will is solved by the affirmation of the former tenet and the relativization of the latter. Indeed Faustus interprets God's promises in the opening scene "in an ultra-Calvinist manner",¹⁸ but we later learn that this was the only reasonable thing to do, since the devil had turned the leaves and led his eye. He did not read about the importance of grace; this is why all his biblical citations are corrupt and half quotations. Faustus was Marlowe's creation, possibly designed to be punished with death to show the absurdity and despair that the very thought of an enslaved humanity was bound to produce. This was first envisioned, in the context of the Reformation, by Luther in his *De servo arbitrio* (contradicted by Erasmus in his excellent *De libero arbitrio*), but the issue is a universal one, conclusive solution of which is never likely to be found. Anyway, the important point is that Marlowe reached Cambridge at a moment when this issue was being almost infinitely disputed; in the light of Marlowe's reputation, we can picture him closer to Baro than to Master Norgate, who tried to deprive him of his Master degree. Marlowe was indeed heterodox in an intellectual context in which orthodoxy meant Calvinism and Catholicism was the political, military and intellectual foe.

Faustus' damnation occurs, according to Marlowe, not because he is a reprobate but because of his actions and inactions throughout his life; repentance, grace and salvation are always at hand, but Faustus is at ease in the realm of sin and will not repent. Death is preceded by what is, from an objective point of view, a mortal sin: despair is the direct consequence of presumption, of vanity, a sin against the Holy Ghost, the only sin that cannot be forgiven, since it shuts the door of redemption by negating its ontological possibility. Faustus seems to believe his sin to be too grave to be forgiven by God and, when his

attempts at repentance come, they look absurd and inconceivable. He has recreated God to his own image, with his own limitations and He is no help at all. The intervention of the Old Man—the only trustworthy human being on stage as well as Faustus' exact opposite—is illuminating in this respect:

“Old Man. Accursèd Faustus, miserable man,
That from thy soul exclud'st the grace of heaven
And fliest the throne of His tribunal seat”. (V, i, 112-4).¹⁹

In the case of Don Juan, the situation is astonishingly similar. The Council of Trent had clearly stated its position against Luther and Calvin. H.W. Sullivan summarizes it in this way:

“There exists a possibility of salvation for all men, based on the salvific will of God. Human freedom exists under the influence of any form of grace, and though eternal election and eternal reprobation do exist, they do not *propter hoc* destroy this human freedom. Predestination to glory occurs without God's foreseeing man's merits (*ante praevisa merita*), although it implies divine foreknowledge of man's cooperation with grace; reprobation occurs after foreseen demerits (*post praevisa demerita*). In any case, no one can have any natural certainty that he is saved or damned”.²⁰

Nevertheless, the question was far from closed and heated debates took place in the last quarter of the sixteenth century and in the first half of the seventeenth, in an attempt to define how grace operated without annihilating human freedom. There were basically two sides in this controversy, as far as Spain is concerned: on the one hand, we have the Molinists, supporters of Luis de Molina and his *Concordia liberi arbitri cum gratiae donis* (1558) and, on the other, the Zumelists, who embraced the followers of the Mercedarian Francisco Zumel and those of the Dominican Domingo Bañez. Crossed accusations before the Holy Inquisition did not solve the problem and, in a few years, the Dominicans began systematic accusations of Pelagian heresy against the Jesuits, while the latter fired back with accusations of Calvinism against the former. Tirso de Molina's theological stance in this debate has been analyzed by Karl Vossler and by Menéndez Pidal²¹. According to these two critics, Tirso followed Francisco Zumel, and thus counted himself among those who had to fight charges of Calvinism. Indeed, Marlowe is supposed to be a Calvinist but, we have learned, he is, at best, an heterodox one, possibly bent towards Catholicism, at least as far as the issue of freedom and predestination is concerned; Tirso, in turn, is a Catholic with, may be, some Calvinist leanings. They probably meet, in this issue, at the centre of the theological spectrum.

Don Juan, like Faustus, is the epitome of the Renaissance man, and it is appropriate that they both die in the hands of two baroque authors, Marlowe and Tirso, because they represent the tragic nature of the modern man. Don Juan's world is a world confined in the chronological present, a present that they (D. Juan and Dr. Faustus) want to make everlasting, in this world. However, the two plays are about death, God and the afterlife, embodied in the statue of Don Gonzalo, “el Convidado de Piedra”. Don Juan, we have seen above, is extremely human, but also a diabolical character. He is first presented to us in a ghostly shape: “Who am I? A man with no name” (I, 15). His uncle too thinks Don Juan is a devil: “pero pienso que el demonio / en él tomó forma humana”. However, Don Juan considers himself invulnerable, in his negation of time, of justice, of eternity. The opposition freedom / determination of Marlowe's Dr. Faustus becomes, in Tirso, the opposition between God's mercy and God's justice. Don Juan is aware of his evildoings; his outer conscience, Catalinón has warned him at the very cli-

max of the drama and he has never contemplated repentance:

“Don Diego: [...] Mira que, aunque al parecer
 Dios te consiente y aguarda,
 su castigo no se tarda,
 y que castigo ha de haber
 para los que profanáis
 su nombre, que es jüez fuerte
 Dios en la muerte.
 Don Juan: ¿En la muerte?
 ¿Tan largo me lo fiáis?
 Hay de aquí alá gran jornada.” (II, 1438-46)

Faustus and Don Juan, facing the end of their days on this earth and the birth of the eternal state of being, fall into doubt and into the contemplation of the essence of horror. They wanted to live as if death did not exist, and they came to discover that was a dreadful choice. Don Juan seems now the product of the metamorphosis of the Doctor of Wittenberg. Faustus' philosophy of death is brilliantly summed up by one of the scholars: “He is not well with being ouersolitary”. The forms of Faustus' fortunes are the forms of Faustus' solitude. In the same way, the forms of Don Juan's fortunes are the ultimate form of his solitude, surrounded by women, and still forever alone...

NOTES

¹ This paper is based on my lecture “The philosophy of life and death in Ch. Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* in relation to the myth of Don Juan”, delivered at the Arts Center, Nazareth College of Rochester, N.Y., U.S.A., January 29th, 1991. I have also explored the Baroque elements in Christopher Marlowe in my Ph.D. dissertation: “Forms of Faustus' solitude: humanist themes and conventions of the Italian Renaissance in Christopher Marlowe's *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*”, Università di Bologna-Reale Collegio di Spagna, 1988. More recently, in 1993, my colleague and friend Prof. Dionisia Tejera presented an excellent paper, entitled “Dr. Faustus and Don Juan: two Baroque heroes” at the Fourth annual Meeting of SEDERI, held at the University of Las Palmas. See: Tejera, D. 1994: Dr. Faustus and Don Juan: two Baroque heroes. *SEDERI* IV: 243-250.

² All quotations are taken from: Bevington, David & Rasmussen, E. eds. 1993: *Christopher Marlowe. Doctor Faustus, A- and B-texts (1604, 1616)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

³ All quotations are taken from: Fernández, Xavier A. ed. 1982: *Tirso de Molina. El Burlador de Sevilla y Convidado de Piedra*. Madrid: Alhambra.

⁴ See: Smeed, J.W. 1975: *Faust in Literature*. London: Oxford U.P. Smeed, J.W. 1990: *Don Juan. Variations on a Theme*. London: Routledge. J.W. Smeed has dealt with this problem of multiplicity of versions in different genres; see the following pages of the latter book: ix-xi, 1-21, & 75-90.

⁵ Their respective dates of composition are difficult to establish, but we can confidently assume that they are no less than seventeen years and no more than thirty-six years apart: *Dr. Faustus* was written either in 1588-9 or just before his death in 1593. *El Burlador de Sevilla y Convidado de Piedra* was written either in 1610-1615 or later in 1620-1624.

⁶ Giacinto Andrea Cicognini, *Il Convitato di Pietra* (before 1630). Dorimon and Villiers, two different versions of "El Convidado de Piedra" (1658-9). Molière, *Don Juan ou Le Festin de Pierre* (1655). Alonso de Córdoba, *La Venganza en el Sepulcro* (1660-1670). Rosimond, *Le Nouveau Festin de Pierre ou l'Atbéé Foudroyé* (1669). Thomas Shadwell, *The Libertine* (1676). Andrea Perrucci, *Il Convitato di Pietra* (1678). Carlo Goldoni, Don Giovanni Tenorio, ossia dissoluto (1736). Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Don Juan ossia dissoluto punito*, opera with a script by the Italian Lorenzo da Ponte (1787). Hoffman, *Don Juan*, (prose), (1812). Lord Byron, *Don Juan* (poem), (1812-1813). A. Dumas, *Don Juan de Marana* (1836). José de Espronceda, *El Estudiante de Salamanca* (1839). José Zorrilla, *Don Juan Tenorio* (1844).

⁷ See vol. I of my above quoted dissertation and Smeed, J.W. *Faust in Literature*, *Op. cit.*

⁸ Cfr. Sullivan, H.W. 1981: *Tirso de Molina and the Drama of the Counter Reformation*. Amsterdam, Rodopi, p. 29.

⁹ See Haydn, H. 1961: *The Counter-Renaissance*. New York, Atheneum.

¹⁰ About this, see Mandel, O. 1963: *The Theatre of Don Juan*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, p. 39: "Here is where the Cid makes way for Don Juan. He becomes a glamorous predator. When he robs men of their women, he also robs them of their honor, a feat he had once been forced to perform on the battlefield. When a man can obtain in the boudoir glory, victory, admiration, in addition to erotic pleasure, the times are ripe for Don Juan".

¹¹ See Wilson, W.M. 1969: *Spanish Drama of the Golden Age*. Oxford: Pergamon, p. 116-7.

¹² Don Juan, on his part, as Ramón Pérez de Ayala has rightly suggested, does not love; he is, at best, loved by women: "[...] it is a curious paradox that the most manly of all lovers, entertainer of numerous women, can also be thought to be himself the mistress of innumerable gallants, since they are women that pursue him and fall in love with him, while he never falls in love with them. No one moves his heart or his memory [...]" Cfr. Pérez de Ayala, R. 1964: *Las Máscaras*. Buenos Aires, Espasa-Calpe, p. 751. He is quoted by Kattan Zablah, J. 1972: *Don Juan de Tirso de Molina a José Zorrilla*. San Salvador, Ministerio de Educación, p. 20. For a more detailed analysis of this point, see pp. 11-31. The translations, when not stated to the contrary, are working translations of mine used for my above quoted lecture.

¹³ Marañón, G. 1960: *Don Juan*. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, p. 75.

¹⁴ Cfr. Pérez de Ayala, R. *Op. cit.*, p. 339. See also, Smeed, J.W. *Op. cit.*, p. 80: "With the growing tendency to link Don Juan with Faust, this developed into the more concrete notion of a pact with the Devil, similar in general terms and conditions to Faust's, but altered to fit Don Juan's particular desires. Faust, it will be remembered, is served in a variety of ways: the Devil answers his questions, provides him with wine, women and song [...]. To adapt this agreement to Don Juan's needs, all that is necessary is to concentrate the Devil's services on procuring women and providing means of escape when danger threatens. The basic agreement (eternal soul as payment for temporal services) is common to both models".

¹⁵ Martínez López, M. 1989: Marlowe's Faustus at the crossroads: Medieval elements and diabolical games. Martínez, M. ed. 1989: *Literature, Culture and Society of the Middle Ages*. Barcelona, PPU, p. 2680-2691.

¹⁶ Cfr. Mahood, M.M. 1950: *Poetry and Humanism*. New Haven, CT., Yale U.P., p. 21; quoted by Campbell, Lily B. 1952: Doctor Faustus: a case of conscience. *PMLA* 67: 219-39. About the question of free will, see also: Eriksen, Roy T. 1987: *The Form of Faustus' Fortunes. A Study of the Tragedie of Doctor Faustus (1616)*. Oslo, Solum Forlag-Humanities Press, p. 27-57.

¹⁷ See my book: Martínez López, M. 1995: *Y Seréis Como Dioses. Estudio sobre Christopher Marlowe y Doctor Fausto*. Granada, Universidad, p. 31-75.

¹⁸ Cfr. Eriksen, R.T. *Op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹⁹ Eriksen has put it nicely in his above quoted work: "Marlowe provides an illuminating example of this idea when Mephostophilis confesses his inability to touch the Old Man's soul: "His faith is great, I cannot touch his soule / But what I may afflict his body with, / I will attempt, which is but little worth" [1860-62]. Since this confession follows imme-

diately upon Faustus's "unjust presumption" against Lucifer and the ensuing renewal of the compact (1852-53), Marlowe makes it absolutely clear that Faustus chooses evil by his own free will. He therefore acts according to the code of the world of "experience" when he surrenders his soul to Lucifer in order to escape physical pain, whereas the Old Man, whose faith triumphs over "vile hel" (1383 A), acts in accordance to the knowledge of life". Cfr. Eriksen, T.R. *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

²⁰ Sullivan, H.W. *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

²¹ See Vossler, K. 1965: *Lecciones sobre Tirso de Molina*. Madrid. See also Menéndez Pidal, R. 1929: Sobre los orígenes de "El Convidado de Piedra". *Estudios Literarios*, Madrid, 1920.