



CALDERÓN AND THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION:
A VIEW FROM THE AUTOS SACRAMENTALES

ALTHOUGH there is little reason to suppose that Reformed Christianity had any significant defenders in the Spain of Calderón, some critics argue that one of his primary purposes in writing the Autos was to refute Protestant heresy, using the uniquely Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist as a point of departure.¹ One of the clearest voices in this respect is that of Sister M. Francis McGarry who wrote in 1937:

As the spirit of Protestantism invaded more and more the countries of Europe, the Eucharistic character of the Autos became more and more pronounced. The Auto Sacramental in the strict meaning of the word as understood by Calderón did not exist in earlier times because in Spain there was no need of defending the dogma of the Real Presence until this belief was denied and attacked by the so-called Reformers.²

Later in the same study she states that "the people of Spain . . . used the sacramental play as a means of showing

¹ Several well-known studies bear this point out. See for example Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (Madrid, 1963), iv. For a more recent study, see John E. Longhurst, *Luther's Ghost in Spain* (Lawrence, 1969).

² M. Francis McGarry, *The Allegorical and Metaphorical Language in the Autos Sacramentales of Calderón* (Washington D.C., 1937), p. 15. Ángel Valbuena Prat also speaks of "los motivos básicos en la disputa entre católicos y protestantes de su tiempo" found in the Autos, but like McGarry he never really explores the idea. See his prologues in P. Calderón de la Barca, *Autos Sacramentales*, ed. Ángel Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1942), p. xxix, and in P. Calderón de la Barca, *Obras completas*, ed. Ángel Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1952), iii, 14-15.

their indignation against the errors of the so-called Reformers and the dishonor they paid the Eucharist."³ In recent years Sister McGarry's thesis, which is shared by other scholars, has fallen into disfavor. Marcel Bataillon argues that in the early Autos "la explicación antiprottestante . . . tropieza con graves objeciones," among which he includes the absence of corroborative testimony from contemporary observers and "la rareza de las alusiones a la herejía" in the Autos themselves.⁴ Bruce Wardropper supports this opinion, affirming that "los autos no surgieron como respuesta a la reforma protestante ni como arma de combate de la Contrarreforma."⁵ He then defers comment on Calderón's Autos to A. A. Parker⁶ whose able analyses illuminate the Thomistic premises of the Autos as well as their liturgical function in the festival of Corpus,⁷ but nowhere does he speak of their relationship to the Reformation.

To increase our understanding of Calderón's relationship to the Reformation, my primary goal in this study is to analyze his understanding of Protestant doctrine, the nature of his refutations of the same and his awareness of individual Reformers and their teachings. Although my principal aim is a comparative, theological analysis, I will supply in passing ample evidence which demonstrates that refuting Protestantism was certainly one of Calderón's purposes, but unlike Sister McGarry, I will not claim the Eucharistic character of the Autos became more pronounced as Protestantism grew (though this may in fact be true), nor will I accept M. Bataillon's challenge to search out "testimonios de los contemporáneos."⁸ Rather, I will base my remarks on the frequent and specific references Calderón makes to the Reformation in the Autos themselves.⁹

³ McGarry, p. 17.

⁴ Marcel Bataillon, "Ensayo de explicación del 'Auto Sacramental,'" in *Calderón: Antología de la crítica*, ed. M. Durán and R. González Echevarría (Madrid, 1976), II, 458.

⁵ Bruce Wardropper, *Introducción al teatro religioso del siglo de oro* (Madrid, 1967), p. 335.

⁶ Wardropper, p. 333.

⁷ A. A. Parker, *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón* (Oxford, 1943), pp. 60-66.

⁸ Bataillon, p. 458.

⁹ My views do not necessarily vary from those of Bataillon and Wardropper since these writers are specifically concerned with the century preceding Calderón. Nonetheless, since they never clarify that Calderón's motives may have differed from those of his predecessors, we at least disagree by implication.

But before discussing Calderón's views on Protestantism, we must first examine his concept of apostasy in general. Although the allegorical characters Herejía and Apostasía appear frequently in Calderón's Autos, I know of no case where they solely represent Reformed Christianity; rather, in Calderón's lexicon, "heresy" and "apostasy" (which I and seemingly Calderón use interchangeably) refer to all non-Catholic doctrine. For example, in *No hay instante sin milagro*, Fe identifies Apostasía not only as "un falso apóstata" but "aun toda la apostasía," thus indicating that apostasy assumes many guises.¹⁰ In several of the Autos Calderón refers to the Greek origin of the word "heresy" as "contrariedad de opiniones," an idea that Herejía develops in *La protesta de la fe*:

Soy, aunque gima y llore,
aquella truncada hidra
sobre quien mortal veneno
en copa dorada brinda
la herejía a los mortales. (p. 740)

The image of the hydra, the multifaced monster present in various forms throughout Church history, could also characterize Apostasía in *Psiquis y Cupido* where he is the father of three heretical daughters: Gentilidad (paganism), Judaísmo and the unnamed but clearly described Reformers. When forced to identify himself he says:

Yo lo diré, pues que ya
en vano encubrirme intento.
Yo, Mundo, rey poderoso;
yo, gentil, ilustre Imperio;
yo, gallarda idolatría;
yo, gran Judaísmo hebreo;
yo, confusa Sinagoga,
Soy (rómpese mi secreto)
la Apostasía; en el Norte
mi patria y mi silla tengo. (p. 349)¹¹

¹⁰ P. Calderón de la Barca, *Obras completas*, ed. Ángel Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1952), III, 1343. All quotations from the Autos are taken from this edition; hereafter, documentation from the Autos themselves will be included in the text with the page number and the name of the Auto.

¹¹ The notion that the Devil lives in the North is a common motif in medieval literature and is based on Is. 15:12-14. In this particular quotation Calderón is

Calderón's understanding of apostasy harks back to the Christian definition of evil itself which is not considered a force independent of good, but rather the absence of good. That is to say, evil does not exist as an independent power battling against good, but enters the world because men through their free will do not choose good and thus allow evil a place. In strict terms, it would be more accurate to speak of good and non-good than good and evil; if we apply this concept to dogma, it is possible to argue that there is no such thing as independent anti-truth but only non-truth, that anything less than true religion is in fact heresy. In this sense, Apostasía is a cover term for paganism, Judaism, Islam or any other non-Catholic religion, and not merely the abandonment of truth once embraced. Furthermore, in Calderón's concept of apostasy, temporal relationships lose all significance, and for this reason Calderón can consider Judaism and paganism to be forms of apostasy, although both predate Catholicism. Given such a broad definition of apostasy, I have tried to limit my examples from the Autos to only the most obvious references to the Reformation. A more liberal interpretation could perhaps strengthen my arguments.

Although today's historians often concentrate on the sociopolitical forces underlying the Reformation, for both Calderón and the Reformers, the basic reasons for schism were doctrinal and not political, and for this reason it was not Luther's famous ninety-five theses rebuking corruption which caused the irreparable breach, but rather his radical reinterpretation of sacramental religion formulated in *The Babylonian Captivity* three years later.¹² The pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church as the one and only true church depend not so much upon her doctrinal positions, which a non-Catholic could in theory imitate to the letter, as upon the claims that only her clergy, by virtue of apos-

undoubtedly referring to the Reformers, but he may have had the verse in Isaiah in mind also.

¹² Hans J. Hillerbrand divides the Reformation into three basic movements: the spiritual, or a concern for daily religious life through prayer, meditation, etc.; the theological, which is concerned with doctrinal clarification, and the political, where he shows how the other two movements contributed to political processes. The concerns of the Autos fall mainly into the second category. See Hans J. Hillerbrand, *The World of the Reformation* (New York, 1973), pp. 30-31.

tolitic succession, are authorized to administer the Sacraments, which are in turn necessary channels of God's grace to man and therefore indispensable for salvation.¹³ The Reformers attacked Catholicism at its very heart by claiming that God's saving grace may be obtained through other channels, and thus undercut sacramentalism, sacerdotalism and ultimately the necessity of a single, visible church.

As a son of post-Trent Catholicism, Calderón was well aware of the central thrust of Protestant arguments, and precisely for that reason his refutations of Protestantism usually appeal to the exclusive validity of the Catholic sacraments. For example, in *La protestación de la fe* he portrays the Church as a beautiful building supported by seven columns representing the seven Sacraments, and has Herejía describe his demonic mission as an effort to steal "las auxiliares riquezas, / que a la católica curia / envía la Providencia." Herejía later declares:

Arrancaré de su centro
las siete columnas bellas,
porque todo el edificio
desplomando al suelo venga. (p. 733)

Calderón then attributes these words to the "Rey del Norte . . . / donde hoy coronada reina / de Lutero reformada / religión" (pp. 733-34). Thus the real threat of Protestantism is not found in its disputations about corruption or minor doctrinal matters, but rather in its attack on Catholicism's vital center: the necessity of the Sacraments themselves.

Although Lutherans and Anglicans preserved much of the sacramental system, generally speaking, the Protestant alternative to the Sacraments is salvation by faith, that is to say the grace of God's revelation of himself is automatically dispensed to the believing sinner who trusts in God regardless of any sacra-

¹³ The central importance of the Sacraments in Catholic doctrine was affirmed as dogma in the Council of Trent, largely in response to Luther's attacks on the Catholic sacramental system. Moreover, it has frequently been observed that Calderón draws heavily from Trent in his doctrinal expositions. The Catholic position on the Sacraments is well explained, both in its contemporary and historical dimensions, in *Sacramentum Mundi*, ed. Karl Rahner, S. J. (New York, 1970), v, 379-81. In addition, Father Rahner's work is an excellent first source of bibliographical information on Catholic doctrine generally.

mental intervention. Apostasía says as much in *El verdadero Dios Pan*:

Pero yo aquí
Alma sólo la creí
del mundo, deste trofeo
a ninguno atribuiré
la victoria, sino a ella,
que un alma divina y bella
vence mucho con la fe;

creeré yo que vencería
Alma y no más. (p. 1250)

Calderón directly refutes this notion by claiming that since faith is a gift of God, it is impossible to have true faith in anything but the truth. Consequently, the Protestant belief in salvation through means other than the Sacraments is not faith at all. We find a dramatic illustration of this concept in *Psiquis y Cupido*, where Apostasía claims there is no need to search for God in the Sacraments:

Yo le traigo [a Dios] en el pecho,
que si no es éste, no hay otro
Dios de amor ni yo le creo
debajo de otros disfraces. (p. 348)

But when Apostasía tries to persuade Fe to support his position, Fe answers, "Primero / me daré muerte." In Calderón's mind it is through faith that God's grace in the Sacraments is revealed; once we accept the notion that the Sacraments are necessary channels of God's grace, it is impossible for faith, as a gift of God, to bypass them somehow. Fe's answer also recalls St. James's famous dictum that faith without works is dead (James 2:14-26); Catholic commentaries frequently interpret such works to be man's voluntary acceptance of the Sacraments. Calderón reinforces his point that faith is more than belief by having Apostasía demand that his own free will, Albedrío, persuade Fe to support his cause. Albedrío answers: "Es en vano cuanto intento / si ella quiere resistirme; / que yo inclino mas no fuerzo" (p. 349). The message is clear: although man accepts God's gift of himself, faith is not a product of human will, nor can it be equated to sincere

belief. As a product of will, Protestant belief, no matter how sincere, cannot be called faith because the object of that belief is false. Faith is granted to those who believe the truth, and only such belief can receive God's gift of faith.¹⁴ What Protestants believe to be true is false; therefore they cannot have faith, and it is nonsense for them to claim salvation through faith for they have no faith. The underlying tautology in this argument—truth is what is defined to be true—will never convince a skeptic, nor would it convince a Protestant who would merely define truth differently from the outset.

Associated with Calderón's denial of Protestant faith is his insistence that the Reformers based their arguments on reason. In *Psiquis y Cupido* Apostasía's opening speech includes:

Caballo desbocado,
el Espíritu Santo me ha llamado
en la Sabiduría
a mí, que soy la docta Apostasía.

Los piélagos del Norte,
mi imperio son, allí tengo mi corte,
y entre las varias leyes,
que políticos guardan tantos reyes,
como hoy contiene el mundo,
supremo Emperador, yo solo fundo
en razón mi razón, pues los abismos
de todos venzo con mis silogismos. (pp. 346-47)¹⁵

In reality, the Reformation rebelled against the humanistic focus of Renaissance Catholicism much as did the Counterreformation. Indeed, one authority claims that, although Protestantism broke the political domination of the Roman Church, it was at the same time "the last upsurging of the religion of the Middle

¹⁴ That faith is a gift of God which comes only to those who assent to God's revelation is a constant of both biblical and traditional Church teachings. See *Sacramentum Mundi*, II, 314-17.

¹⁵ That the apprehension of sacramental truth defies the senses is a frequent theme in the Autos. A good and lengthy example of Calderón's ideas in this regard is found in *Amar y ser amado y divina Filotea* where four of the senses perceive only bread in the Eucharist; only Oído knows differently for it responds to the word of faith as taught by St. Paul in Romans 10:17. See Calderón de la Barca, *Obras completas*, III, 1791-93.

ages."¹⁶ Nonetheless, Calderón must maintain that the Reformers argued on the basis of reason and human understanding for as we saw earlier he could not accept that their position was based on faith. As *Apostasía* states in *La iglesia sitiada*:

Pero yo vivo obstinado,
porque es mi grave tormento
error del entendimiento
y no estoy desengañado. (p. 55)

Although the Reformers redefined the function of the sacraments, practices involving confirmation, penance, blessing the sick and other such traditions survived to a varying degree in all Protestant bodies. Nonetheless, Calderón recognizes the validity only of Protestant baptism. We read in *La protestación de la fe*:

el hereje es un nervio
cancerado, que se aparta
porque el cuerpo no inficione;
pero no porque no haya
recibido en el Bautismo
el Sacramento. (p. 746)

Calderón accepts Protestant baptism for two reasons. On the one hand, Roman Catholicism has always allowed that anyone, not necessarily a priest, can baptize under extreme circumstances. On the other, the major Reformers, Calvin, Luther, Zwingli and the Anglicans, agreed essentially with the Catholic view of baptism. Only the so-called left wing of the Reformation, particularly the Anabaptists, departed radically from the Catholic position in claiming that baptism was a matter of choice and should therefore be performed only for adults aware of its significance, but this is a problem Calderón never examines.

Occasionally Calderón correctly identifies a particular Protestant doctrine only to misattribute it to a specific Reformer.¹⁷ One such case concerns the sacraments Luther retained. In *La iglesia*

¹⁶ Ronald H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston, 1952), pp. 3–5 and 50–51.

¹⁷ Perhaps Calderón's apparent confusion on this matter can be attributed to the general tendency throughout the Spain of his time to use "Protestante" and "Luterano" interchangeably. See Longhurst, p. 32.

sitiada Herejía is accused of being neither Moor nor Christian:

Vi que a la Iglesia tu Dios
los sacramentos promete:
ella dice que son siete
y tú dices que son dos.
Peor eres que el demonio,
pues así tu lengua miente,
y confiesas solamente
el Bautismo y Matrimonio. (p. 51)

The heretic so accused is clearly Luther for it was he who reduced the sacraments from seven to two, but the two he retained were Baptism and Holy Communion, not Baptism and Matrimony. He maintained that the true sacraments must be based on the central fact of Christianity: the sacrifice and recurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus himself in the Words of Institution identifies Holy Communion with his atonement, and St. Paul explains that in Baptism the Christian is buried to sin and resurrected to a new life (Rom. 6:3–6). But at no time did Luther consider Matrimony a sacrament as Calderón implies in the preceding quotation.

Calderón's contention in *La iglesia sitiada* that Matrimony was one of the sacraments Luther retained is doubly curious since in *La cisma de Inglaterra* he suggests that Luther encouraged Henry VIII's divorce, and this after correctly identifying Luther's major statement on the sacramental religion, *The Babylonian Captivity* mentioned earlier.¹⁸ In reality, Luther rigidly supported Jesus' condemnation of divorce and remarriage (Mt. 5:31–32); indeed, one of the most embarrassing episodes of Luther's life was his recommendation to Phillip of Hesse that bigamy, because of Old Testament precedents, was preferable to divorce as a solution to his marital problems.¹⁹

The focal point of the sacramental conflict is the nature of the Eucharist itself, and indeed many scholars would accept Valbuena Prat's affirmation that "la presencia real definida exactamente en Trento es el punto central del drama eucarístico."²⁰ Calderón apparently believed that all Reformers denied the doc-

¹⁸ P. Calderón de la Barca, *Obras completas*, ed. Ángel Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1966), I, 145, 161 and 172.

¹⁹ Ronald H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville, 1950), pp. 373–75.

²⁰ Valbuena Prat, *Prólogo, Calderón, Obras completas*, III, 15.

trine of Real Presence, the notion that the body and blood of Christ are "truly and really present" in the elements of Holy Communion. In *El mayor de los días* Apostasía accepts the bread and wine only as symbols, claiming that the Host is not the "refacción del Cuerpo, pero del Alma" (p. 1650). In *El gran mercado del mundo* Calderón presents Herejía as a seller of books by "grandes ingenios, herejes sacramentarios . . . Calvino y Lutero" (pp. 238-39). When asked what these authors say Herejía responds:

Este
afirma que todo cuerpo
ocupar debe lugar,
y que no es posible aquello
de que esté el Cuerpo de Dios
en el blanco Pan, supuesto
que en él no ocupa lugar. (p. 239)

About the other he adds:

Este
dice que justos preceptos
deban comer carne humana,
por ser terrible y cruento
manjar para el hombre. (p. 239)

In point of fact, both Luther's and Calvin's position on the doctrine of Real Presence is more complicated than Calderón allows. Both denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, but neither doubted Real Presence, nor did they question the notion that The Lord's Supper was in fact a channel of grace from and communion with God. Luther did, however, challenge the doctrine of sacrifice in the Mass on three counts: first, he felt no man could command God and thereby "resacrifice" Christ. Second, he argued that the efficacy of Communion depended on the faith of the communicant and not on the authority of the celebrant; that is to say he denied the validity of the sacrament in and of itself *ex opere operato*.²¹ And finally he interpreted literally the biblical notion that Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was at once universal and eternally sufficient with no need for repetitions in the Mass (Heb. 9:26-28).²² But this same Luther adamantly rejected a purely

²¹ Bainton, *The Reformation*, p. 47.

²² Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exe-*

symbolic interpretation of Christ's words, "This is my body," and insisted repeatedly that Christ's body and blood were literally present in the elements of communion, though not through transubstantiation.²³ Indeed, it was his stubborn defense of the doctrine of Real Presence which impeded agreement between Lutherans and Zwinglians in the early years of the Reformation.²⁴ Furthermore, Luther denied there could be anything cannibalistic in the Eucharist, as implied in the above quotation, since Christ's body was obviously not human flesh.²⁵ Nor is Calderón right in accusing Calvin of abandoning the doctrine of Real Presence, for Calvin's teachings on the matter coincide almost to the letter with Luther's.²⁶ Calderón shows no awareness of Lutheran or Calvinist beliefs affirming Real Presence, but then again, perhaps for Calderón, any tampering at all with the Catholic position amounted to denial. Oddly, Calderón fails to mention Reformers like the Anabaptists and Zwinglians who held positions similar to those he attacks; we can only conclude that although Calderón was aware of certain heretical doctrines in the northern countries, he did not know which belonged to whom.

Although the Reformers never agreed on the nature of the Eucharist, they all took issue with the Catholic practice of allowing communicants to receive the bread only, a practice which survived despite the Council of Trent's approval of communing in both elements in some areas.²⁷ In the Loa preceding *El cubo de la Almudena*, Herejía states the Protestant position, claiming that since Celo is only allowed to partake of the bread,

Luego ya es fuerza que quedes
defraudado en la mitad
del valor, cuando te nieguen
la Sangre en el Vino. (pp. 562-63)

getical Writings (St. Louis, 1959), pp. 237-54. As a companion volume to *Luther's Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, 54 vols. (St. Louis, 1955-1976), Prof. Pelikan's work is an excellent guide to many of Luther's major doctrinal statements.

²³ Pelikan, pp. 137-38.

²⁴ Bainton, *The Reformation*, p. 42.

²⁵ Pelikan, p. 147.

²⁶ Wilhelm Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin* (Philadelphia, 1956), pp. 211-22. Extensively documented, Prof. Niesel's study, in addition to being a compendium of Calvin's theology, is an excellent guide to the Reformer's writings.

²⁷ "Trent, Council of," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1967 ed.

In defense, Iglesia reiterates the Catholic position that since the Host is "Cuerpo vivo . . . en él es fuerza que lleve / Sangre viva al mismo tiempo" (p. 563).

One might expect Calderón to view heresy as libertinage and Protestants as sinful revellers. In reality, the opposite holds true; Protestants are usually portrayed as men plunged into the most awful gloom of those bereft of the Sacraments and their salvific grace. Calderón repeatedly defends the popular festivities accompanying Corpus Christi just as Herejía and Apostasía attack them for being irreverent. In the Loa preceding *La vacante general Apostasía* asks:

Apostasía: ¿No es ese Grande Misterio,
que celebráis y aplaudís,
viva representación
de la Pasión de Dios?
Todos: Sí.
Apostasía: ¿Pues cómo la celebráis
con música, me decid,
cuando debierais hacerlo
con llorar y con gemir? (p. 470)

Fe answers that in the Sacraments there is reason for joy, that the steep and rocky road of Old Testament law has been replaced "por más clara senda y llana" in the era of grace. In a similar passage in *La protestación de la fe*, Herejía objects to the light demands of Catholic Penance required of the repentant Cristina de Suecia: "¿Cómo sufres verla absuelta / con Penitencia tan blanda?" (p. 745). The intent is clear: without the sacramental auxiliaries, Protestants are condemned to the wrath of God's justice, without recourse to his merciful grace. Or in the words of Caridad in *Amar y ser amado y Divina Filotea to Apostasía* who has again denied sacramental grace: "¡Oh herejía torpe y ciega, / que aún a mí, con ser piedad, / a ser justicia me fuerzas!" (p. 1786). The awful gloom Calderón saw in Protestantism may also have been inspired by the antimusical currents in certain reformist groups such as the Puritans who smashed organs and repudiated the musical liturgy of the Roman and Lutheran Churches as non-biblical.²⁸

²⁸ Bainton, *The Reformation*, p. 86.

In addition to the questions concerning the sacraments and the authority to administer them, one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Reformers was their belief in the Bible as preeminent above all other sources of religious truth, a tenet borne out in Luther's motto, *Sola scriptura*. Most Reformers did not abandon Church tradition in its entirety, and indeed several incorporated many of the early statements of belief, the Nicean Creed for example, into the Protestant liturgy. However, in cases of conflict, they gave greater credence to Scripture. In *No hay instante sin milagro*, Apostasía, after being upbraided as "torpemente ciego" and "bárbaramente bruto" for questioning the Sacraments, replies, "No lo soy tanto, que ya / que me arguyes con un texto, / no te responda con otro" (p. 1343), to which Fe replies:

Ahora te he conocido,
que quien con dañado intento
de sacras autoridades
valerse presume, es cierto
ser de aquellos forajidos
que apóstatas de mi gremio,
como ladrones de casa,
capaces de sus secretos,
estudian para ignorarlos
más que otros para saberlos.
He de oírte, porque no
presumas, que de oírte dejo
por el temor de tus dogmas. (p. 1343)

Not only does this remarkable passage set the ground rules for a debate we will examine later; it reveals several of Calderón's attitudes towards the Reformers. First, we are told that Protestants do not study Scripture to learn and assent to God's truth, but rather to ignore that truth present in the Church. Second, Calderón denies that the Reformers were sincere, even if that meant being sincerely wrong; what they do is "con dañado intento"—an attitude which survived in some Catholic sectors at least until Vatican II. Viewed against the backdrop of the Counterreformation, Calderón's position is not narrow, but quite understandable. Reason unblemished by evil intention supposedly led inevitably to Catholicism. Dissenters were therefore misinformed, incapable of reason or deliberately wrong. Since Calvin

and Luther obviously knew Catholic doctrine as well as the best Catholics, and there was little reason to question their rational powers, only the third possibility remained.

In another interesting reference to the use of Scripture among the Reformers, Herejía in *La iglesia sitiada* says of the New Testament:

Los escriptos convenientes
de los sagrados doctores
. . . producen flores
como de varias simientes. (p. 47)

Although Fe responds with a firm "Mientes," Calderón may have been defending the Catholic belief that St. Peter's injunction against "private interpretation" of Scripture (2 Peter 1:9-21) was directed specifically towards people who, like the Reformers, attempted scriptural exegesis untempered by Church tradition and the pronouncements of God's authorized leadership, namely the Popes and Church councils. Catholic apologists point out that while on the one hand the Protestants claim the Bible is a sufficient source of doctrine, on the other that supposed sufficiency has never provided sufficient basis for union, for the many Protestant sects have indeed proliferated like "flores / como de varias simientes."

Another significant challenge to Catholicism from certain sectors of the Reformation concerned the continuing presence of spiritual or charismatic gifts in the Church. Using the Bible as a point of departure, Apostasía in *No hay instante sin milagro*, poses the problem as follows:

Cristo dijo
por Marcos en su Evangelio
que a los que su Fe admitiesen
seguirían los portentos
de que lanzarían demonios,
de que en idiomas diversos
nuevas lenguas hablarían,
que las serpientes venciendo,
no les dañaría beber
los más nocivos venenos;
y, en fin, que darían salud
sus manos sobre el enfermo. (p. 1343)

Apostasía then cites examples, mainly from the Acts of the Apostles, of each miracle, and in so doing underlines a basic argument of the Reformers: that the Reformation merely attempted to return to primitive Christianity, to restore the uncorrupted biblical church. Apostasía then asks:

Pues siendo así, que estos dotes
gozaron los que creyeron,
¿qué se hicieron sus prodigios?
¿Adónde están sus portentos?

. . .

Dios a la Fe prometió
milagros, hoy no los vemos;
luego no hay hoy Fe (en tus fieles,
se entiende), no hay hoy Fe; luego
no hice yo mal en dejar
de andar en su seguimiento. (p. 1343)

As noted in our discussion on Scripture, Apostasía in this scene is clearly identified with the Reformation, yet despite the parenthetical aside, "en tus fieles, se entiende," Calderón does not allow the Protestant to finish his argument, namely that the presence of the charismatic gifts in Reformist sects and their supposed absence in Catholicism demonstrated God's approval of the former and disapproval of the latter.

None of the mainline Protestant bodies used the arguments advanced by Apostasía, and for that reason the most likely targets of Calderón's rebuttal would be the radical left-wing of the Reformation, the biblical literalists like the Anabaptists whose position on the charismatic gifts embarrassed both Calvin and Luther alike. Since the left-wingers wrote relatively little, disassociated themselves from political movements and avoided forming large organizations, we know surprisingly little about them and even less about Calderón's contact with them.²⁹

More interesting is the nature of Calderón's rebuttal. Apostasía's charge is in reality unfounded since Catholicism never repudiated the Spiritual Gifts, and indeed many Catholic saints were canonized for performing miracles like those men-

²⁹ Bainton, *The Reformation*, p. 95.

tioned by St. Mark. But Calderón makes no attempt to list such occurrences to Apostasía, perhaps because he knew some Protestants would make the same claims. Instead, he again bases his rebuttal on the exclusive validity of the Catholic sacraments, claiming that the gifts in question do indeed occur regularly in true sacramental religion. To illustrate his point, Calderón has Mary Magdalene testify that since "en los pechos de cualquiera / son espíritus inmundos / las culpas," the Sacrament of Penance can cast our devils. Similarly, Dimas claims that Penitencia made him immune to poisons since "los ofensas / son en los pechos de todos / venenos" (p. 1355). Constantine claims that his leprosy of original sin was cured by Baptism, and later Confirmación explains how St. Augustine learned to speak in new tongues:

Y en prueba
de que le había alcanzado,
retractando erradas ciencias,
se confirmó en la Verdad,
cuya Confirmación muestra,
que habla nuevas lenguas; pues
¿qué más hablar lenguas nuevas,
que decir ayer errores
falsos y hoy verdades ciertas? (p. 1355)

And finally, Saul of Tarsus describes how Communion was the antidote to snake bites since he, prior to his conversion, "llevó víboras y letras" in his breast, but now "víboras y letras hoy / arroja al fuego" (p. 1356). The several threads of the Auto finally converge in the Sacrament of Communion, Apostasía recognizes his error, and, in a gesture unusual in the Autos, he approaches the Lord's table and is forgiven. We must not overlook the important fact of Calderón's argument: although he could have reaffirmed the Church's belief in miracles, he chose to base his refutation on the Sacraments.

Aside from the Protestant rebellion against sacerdotalism and sacramentalism, no single issue affected the Reformation more than the question of free will vs. predestination. Perhaps as old as Christianity itself, the problem has roots in the writings of St. Paul and was first studied seriously by St. Augustine. On the one hand the Church claims that man is free to make limited choices which affect his salvation, while on the other it teaches that for salvation man depends totally on the grace of an all-

knowing (can man act contrary to God's knowledge?) and all-powerful God (if all power resides in God, how can man be free to act on his own?). The logical incompatibility of both propositions is considered a mystery, and for that reason the Church allows its theologians great latitude in trying to resolve the conflict. Calderón's several dramatic analyses of the problem most frequently reflect an ongoing debate within Catholicism and are not usually concerned with the Reformers who sided firmly with the advocates of predestination. For that reason I will limit my observations on the matter to a particular Auto, *La protestación de la fe*, which deals specifically with Lutheran's difficulties in understanding the problem before converting to Catholicism.³⁰

In *La protestación de la fe*, Cristina de Suecia becomes convinced that her inherited Lutheran belief cannot explain the problem of free will and predestination. She seeks instruction in St. Augustine's works which, perhaps not coincidentally, led some of the Reformers to support predestination. She feels unhappy

cuando el genio mío
inclinándome a este fin,
encuentra con Agustín
en lo *del libre albedrío*,
adonde en vano porfío
saber la definición
de la predestinación;
pues aunque aquí la defina,
". . . de la voluntad divina
es por Gracia una elección."
Y aquí: ". . . que en conocimiento
está Dios de la futura
beatitud de la criatura
racional." En vano intento
convencer un argumento,
que a mí misma me hago yo.
Si Dios me predestinó,

³⁰ Calderón's treatment of the problem of free will and predestination has been extensively analyzed, although with surprisingly different conclusions, by such able scholars as Eugenio Frutos, A. A. Parker and Balbino Marcos Villanueva. See Eugenio Frutos, *La filosofía de Calderón en sus autos sacramentales* (Zaragoza, 1952); A. A. Parker, particularly chapter iv; and Balbino Marcos Villanueva, S. J., *La ascética de los jesuitas en los Autos Sacramentales* (Bilbao, 1973), pp. 143-64.

¿cómo estoy tan mal hallada
en la Fe en que fui criada?

. . .

¿cómo ha de tomar de mí
satisfacción de que erré,
si de mi parte guardé
los ritos en que nací?

. . .

"Llamó Dios a los que quiso
con clemencia gratuita."
¿Gracia es? Luego bien se infiere
que en el mérito no esté,
y que a quien quiere la dé,
porque quiere y cuando quiere;
y así, en su piedad espere
que dárme la a mí querrá;
con que dejándole allá,
sin que yo con Dios arguya,
que use de ella, pues es suya,
paso a pensar: ¿qué será
sentir un auxilio cuando
Dios le envía? ¡Oh, si yo fuera
tan feliz que mereciera,
mi discurso iluminando,
ver algún rasgo, mostrando
cómo instruye y cómo advierte!
Pero ¿qué letargo fuerte
me da, cuando ver querría
de qué suerte Dios envía
un auxilio? (p. 736)

In the preceding passage Calderón offers support for both sides of the debate and in the process prepares the ground for his forthcoming refutation of the Protestant concept of predestination. He clearly states that salvation depends not on man's merit but on God's grace, but at the same time he mentions that man must recognize and accept the auxiliaries through which God imparts grace. In other words, man is totally dependent on God's grace for salvation; that is to say, by no act of his own does man somehow "earn" salvation. Nonetheless, man's free agency is not totally absent from the picture, for man must avail himself of the

auxiliaries. Calderón avoids the stickier problem of those who never know of the auxiliaries and the unresolvable matter of God's knowing what decision man will make before he makes it. Predictably, Cristina finds those auxiliaries in the Sacraments and then declares herself,

religiosamente libre,
y libremente espontánea,
a las llaves de la iglesia
sujeta hoy, como vasalla
de su Imperio, la que ayer
era Reina de su Patria. (p. 745)

To which Sabiduría responds:

Ya con esa abjuración,
que entre la oliva y la espada
has hecho, la paz te toque,
pues la justicia se envaina. (p. 745)

In other words, apart from the Sacraments there is no real freedom; free agency has meaning only if one of the options is salvation. Since man of his own efforts cannot merit salvation, his free agency acquires substance only when he chooses to receive the Sacraments. Without the Sacraments man is damned, and Calderón implies that the Protestants, whose religion Cristina has abandoned, have no choice but that damnation demanded by justice. In a word, they are predestined to spiritual death. Both Luther and Calvin felt that God's elect had been chosen, as St. Paul says, since before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:3-12), and clearly both believed certain of the Reformers were among the chosen. Calderón does not argue with Paul; he merely claims that without the Sacraments, there are no elect.

In conclusion, several points should now be clear. First, although refuting Protestantism was not Calderón's primary goal in the Autos, his frequent references to Protestant doctrines and to individual Reformers give considerable support to the anti-Protestant thesis described earlier; those who maintain otherwise ignore overwhelming textual evidence to the contrary, some of which has been cited in this study. Second, Calderón was familiar with the major arguments of the Reformers although it is difficult to determine how much he knew. For example, his failure to recognize Luther's careful distinction between Real

Presence and transubstantiation does not necessarily indicate ignorance or misinformation. A Catholic apologist, Calderón was not about to give Protestantism a "fair hearing" by telling all he knew in the public square. As in his treatment of Satan as a dramatic figure, Calderón allows his heretics to speak but not convince.³¹ Third, Calderón fails to identify the Reformation as a series of religious movements—Lutheran, Calvinist, Zwinglian, Anglican, Anabaptist, etc.—and in the process ends up blaming Luther and Calvin for almost everything; although aware of major doctrinal currents in Protestantism, he knew less of the divisions among the Reformers themselves. And finally, his rebuttals, except in the case of biblical sufficiency, always appeal to the exclusive validity of the Catholic sacraments, even when other arguments (Catholic miracles, for example) would have been more convincing. Even in refuting heresy the *Autos Sacramentales* remain faithful to their name.

NICOLAS SHUMWAY

Yale University

³¹ A. A. Parker, "The Devil in the Drama of Calderón," in *Critical Essays on the Theater of Calderón*, ed. Bruce Wardropper (New York, 1965), pp. 3-5.

