

Trinity University

Digital Commons @ Trinity

Modern Languages and Literatures Faculty
Research

Modern Languages and Literatures Department

1991

"¿Y Sois Hombre o Sois Mujer?": Sex and Gender in Tirso's *Don Gil de las Calzas Verdes*

Matthew D. Stroud

Trinity University, mstroud@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/ml_l_faculty



Part of the [Modern Languages Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Stroud, M. D. (1991). '¿Y sois hombre o sois mujer?': Sex and gender in Tirso's *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. In A. K. Stoll & D. L. Smith (Ed.), *The perception of women in Spanish theater of the golden age* (pp. 67-82). Bucknell University Press.

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Modern Languages and Literatures Department at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Languages and Literatures Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

“¿Y sois hombre o sois mujer?”: Sex
and Gender in Tirso’s *Don Gil de las
calzas verdes*

MATTHEW STROUD

When Henry Sullivan opened the question of the insight that the writings of Jacques Lacan could bring to the *comedia*, he came somewhat early on to Tirso’s magisterial *comedia de enredo* [comedy of intrigue and deception], *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. As with most things Lacanian, his paper, “The Sexual Ambiguities of Tirso de Molina’s *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*,” is not easily accessible, having been published in the *Proceedings of the Third Annual Golden Age Drama Symposium* in El Paso, Texas. It is an important contribution to Tirsian studies, however, and he identifies three themes that bring Lacan to bear on the text: “1) the fictionality of identity, 2) the role of desire in the subversion of convention, and 3) the arbitrariness of secondary gender distinctions between the sexes.”¹ It is the first and third assertions that are of interest here, especially as they relate to Juana’s identities and the reactions of other characters to her.

The primary motivation for the play comes from disturbances in the Imaginary registers of both Martín and Juana.² Martín fell in love with Juana and, in order to have sex with her, promised to marry her. Believing him, she said yes, but he was unwilling to submit his desire to the mediation of marriage (the Symbolic) by actually giving her the word he promised her. Her reaction to his egoistic treatment of her is to become his rival and seek revenge against him (*Don Gil* 1767).³ By insisting on the satisfaction of her egoistic demands for Martín to honor his promise to her, she is partaking of the fundamental rivalry, the fight to the death, that constitutes the human world.⁴ The fact that she does not end up killing him but marrying him does not alter the comic dénouement in the Imaginary. Both love and revenge are manifestations of *moi* [ego] illusions of unity and fulfillment (unlike Hesse and McCrary’s

early assertion that they are in some way opposite motivations⁵). Indeed, this rivalry is made manifest in that both become suitors of Inés, rivals for her affection.

A close relationship exists between Juana's motivation in the Imaginary (either destruction of her rival or fulfillment of her love) and her goal in the Symbolic (marriage). Of course, the Imaginary and the Symbolic are never completely separated, and sexuality, in particular, takes place on both slopes. While the Symbolic appears to totalize the system of the world, sexual relations always imply the capture of the image of the other in the Imaginary.⁶ At the same time, one's sexuality is always tied to the Symbolic process: a sexual position is achieved only through the symbolization of the man or the woman.⁷ For Ragland-Sullivan, there is an important difference in the importance of each to the different sexes: "man takes his sexual pleasure in woman principally on the Imaginary slope, while she finds hers in him on the Symbolic plane,"⁸ an assertion that has particular relevance to Martín (who looks for satisfaction in the *jouissance* [pleasure] offered by sex and money) and Juana (who seeks hers in marriage).

Masculinity and femininity, then, are functions of the Symbolic; they are one's response to the Law, the Name-of-the-Father. There is, quite simply, no necessary link between one's anatomical sex and one's object choice or sexual identification.⁹ Sexuality is strictly an ordering, a legislative contract that all human beings are required to enter into if they are to become participating members of human society. The choosing of the phallic function is not dependent on anatomy—there are phallic women and feminine men, and the secondary characteristics associated with each sex are completely arbitrary.¹⁰ While it is a commonplace to say that men are not always masculine and women are not always feminine, in the *comedia* this disjunction between sex and gender produces an amazing fluidity, especially in the identity of women. Without the Symbolic one is amorphous, or rather, polymorphous, which recalls Juana's amazing ability to change who she is.

Juana has three personifications: Don Gil (dressed as a man as we first see her in act 1); Doña Elvira (dressed as a woman—even in the clothes of Doña Inés); and Doña Juana (also dressed as a woman). She shifts among these identities with great ease (see, for example, 1135–37). As testimony to the power of the Symbolic, the only indication that the other characters seem to have regarding her identity is her clothing. Except for Caramanchel and Martín, all those around her accept at face value her apparent sexuality (Juana

or Gil) and her personal identity (Juana, Gil, or Elvira). On some level, she is not just Juana in disguise; she is Gil and Elvira as well (1930).

At first glance, it is surprising that the other characters, both men and women, seem not to know that Juana dressed up as Gil is a woman in disguise (see 254, 792–93, 911–12, 2015). Two reasons appear to obtain: the fluid nature of pre-Symbolic sexual identity in general, and the importance of *engaño a los ojos* [deception to the eyes]. Although much of the *enredo* [intrigue] of the play is the result of deliberate disguise on the parts of Juana, Martín, and others, it should also be noted that the very foundation of interpersonal discourse is misunderstanding.¹¹ The enormous fluidity of identity and sexuality demonstrated by Juana complements the others’ inability to distinguish between appearance and reality. If reality itself is unstable, then what hope can one ever have of reaching a kind of totalized truth? It is no wonder that Inés calls this new suitor, “Don Gil el falso” [Don Gil the false] (2403); he is false in his not being the right Gil, in not being Gil at all, and in not even being a man, in addition to the further accusation that he is false in his inconstancy in love.

Caramanchel, as the *gracioso* who fits least easily within the boundaries of the Symbolic stage society that rules Juana, Inés, and Martín, has suspicions about his new master, but they are clearly not of the either-or type. Sullivan says that Caramanchel is never completely fooled by Juana, but that implies that he “knows” the truth.¹² I would rather characterize his reaction as one in which he is perfectly willing to accept that there is more than one kind of male or female. Because Juana doesn’t have a beard (2224) and has a *voz tiplada* [soprano voice] (536), he makes a number of puns on *capón* (*¿capón y con cosquillas?* [a ticklish capon?] 743; also, 2868). When Juana-Gil says he/she is in love with Juana-Elvira, Caramanchel asks if (s)he has the teeth to eat her (1692–93). Unlike Martín, who at least created the surname “de Albornoz,” Juana as Don Gil is castrated as to his/her name because (s)he has no patronym, no Name-of-the-Father, as Caramanchel links the two concepts:

Capón sois hasta en el nombre;
 pues si en ello se repara
 las barbas son en la cara
 lo mismo que el sobrenombre.

(519–22)

[You are a capon even in your name;
for if one looks into it
a beard on the face
is the same as a surname (name-of-the-father).]

Even when he finally sees Juana in feminine clothing, despite his previous suspicion, Caramanchel at first doesn't believe his eyes. Yet, he doesn't force her into either role ("¿De día Gil, de noche Gila?" [Gil by day, Gila by night?] 2689). Although Juana is unwilling to reveal to him just yet that she is also Gil, he calls her *hembrimacho* [a combination of *hembra*, female, and *macho*, male] (1699), *amo o ama* [master or mistress] (2701), *amo hermafrodita* [hermaphrodite master] (724, 2707), saying that it is forbidden to have fish and meat together (another eating metaphor, 2708–9). This Juana as Gil is a *capón*, a castrated man, but she is also a phallic woman. She is not yet enrolled in a fixed way in either category of the Symbolic (man or woman) because Martín has abandoned her, left her to suffer in the Imaginary without benefit of the mediation of the Symbolic. As a result, however, she possesses remarkable fluidity in her identity. She can be man, woman, not-man (but not woman), not-woman (but not man), or even not a person (but a soul, as we shall see).¹³

In a recent collection of essays, Everett Hesse includes the relationship between Juana and Inés under the heading, "El amor homosexual."¹⁴ While he notes that Juana does not want a homosexual relationship with Inés, the fact that he would see homosexuality in this scene indicates that he is taking the situation on the level of the anatomical body: Juana is a woman, so any love interest between her and Inés is *de facto* homosexual.¹⁵ In fact, if there is any homosexuality in this play, it is that of Inés or Clara.¹⁶ Transvestism does not change one's sexual orientation; Juana never experiences passion for a woman. But Inés does, at least on one level:

Ya por el don Gil me muero;
que es un brinquillo el don Gil.

(862–63)

[Now I am dying for Don Gil;
Don Gil is a sweetie.]

Clara also falls for Juana-Gil (911–12), and the two women even have a half-hearted argument over which one gets to marry "him" (1000–7). Yet, this happens only when the woman (Juana) is

dressed as a man. It is not the anatomy with which they fall in love; indeed, as Sullivan has pointed out,¹⁷ biological sexual experience is simply not visible in the *comedia*—it takes place before or after the action or off-stage. Instead, they are captivated in the Imaginary by the trappings of masculinity which are defined as such in the Symbolic. Inés is not in love with Juana as a man or a body. She is not blind to Juana-Gil’s lack of beard, but neither does it cause her concern; she calls it an *encanto* [enchantment] (2407), recognizing in the process the fictional nature of both Juana’s identity and gender characteristics in general. Instead, Inés is in love with Juana’s clothes. When confronted with Martín-Gil, she says that she is not in love with him, but with the one in the green breeches, to which Pedro responds, “Amor de calzas, ¿quién le ha visto?” [Who ever heard of being in love with breeches?] and Martín says he will start wearing green from then on (1011–14).

As a woman, Inés is both like Juana (seeking Imaginary satisfaction through the Symbolic mediation of marriage, although she does not have sex with her suitors out of wedlock) and quite different. She is extraordinarily fickle; at various times she declares her love for Juan (644–45) and for Juana as Gil (862–63), and she finally agrees to marry Martín (2531–34). In her own words, “quiero / ser mudable” [I want to be fickle] (1177–78). Her father’s reaction is interesting:

Mucho me espanto
de que des palabra ya
de casarte. ¿Tiempo tanto
has que dilato el ponerte
en estado?

(653–58)

[I am alarmed
that you should give your word
to marry. Have I tarried
so long in placing you
in a proper state?]

As her father, it is his responsibility to impose himself on her Imaginary desires, to lead her into the fold of human community, to mediate her desire. At the same time, money is not insignificant to this plot. Pedro wants to marry Inés to Martín-Gil because he believes that the young man is rich (538ff., 680–83). Likewise, Martín wants to marry Inés because of the promise of money. Inés, in a much more direct way than Juana, is depicted as woman-as-

exchange-object, interesting only for her use-value in increasing the estate of the men who control her.

Early on, Juana, upon seeing Inés, remarks that she is quite beautiful (with Caramanchel chiming in that Juana-Gil is more beautiful, 774–75), stating, “por ella estoy perdido” [I am lost for her] (776). There are at least three ways to take this sentence. The first reading is Gil’s, the superficial reading that he has “lost” himself in love for Inés. Not only is this a well-worn topos of the *comedia*, but it also reflects the Lacanian notion, already mentioned, that love involves the capture of one’s Imaginary by the other (thus losing even the appearance of self-control—which one never had in any case). The second is from Juana’s point of view. It is because of Inés that Martín is now in Madrid rather than in Valladolid doing his duty by marrying Juana. Juana is “lost” (as a woman and as a man) as long as Martín does not provide her with the empowering mediation she can get only from the Symbolic.

The third reading is ours, and it comes from the discrepancy between the masculine *perdido* [lost] and the fact that Juana (and the actress who played her) were female. The use of gender-specific language is quintessentially Symbolic; this assignment of a masculine or feminine adjective ending is reminiscent of Lacan’s example of the two doors, one marked “Ladies” and one marked “Gentlemen” to underscore the importance of language (the letter) for identity and sex difference.¹⁸ Whether a woman considers herself a man or a woman, she is completely engaged in the question of her Symbolic signification.¹⁹ Of course, much of the humor of the play comes from the fact that we know that Juana-Gil should not be using the masculine form while the other characters are unaware. Because this is fiction, because we *know* what is going on, we are willing to allow the slip. Still, we must be cautious because we never *know* what is going on at all, there is no necessary link between sex and gender, and at some level the Symbolic of everyday life is as fictional as the events in this play. As Mitchell points out, language is itself indicative of the misunderstanding of human existence.²⁰ In this play (and maybe in life?), Juana can be *perdido* or *perdida*, but she is always and in every case “lost.”

Martín is an important member of these doubled and redoubled love triangles, and he is interesting for two primary reasons apart from his jilting of Juana as the prime motivation of the plot. First is his use of the disguise of Don Gil (although at first he does not wear *calzas verdes* [green breeches]), an invention of his father, Andrés de Guzmán (538ff.). It was his creation of false signification that was usurped so easily by Juana. Second is Martín’s suspicion about

Juana’s identity. After all, the man had sex with her; we might expect him to be better able to identify her. Sometime between acts 1 and 2, Juana has learned that Martín suspects the truth, that the other Gil is she (1146–50). His doubts do not solve the mystery, but lead one instead to a consideration of the use of letters in the play.

Martín-Gil presents a letter to Pedro in order to begin his suit of Inés (and he receives another letter from home in act 2, 1621). When Juana suspects that Martín suspects that she as Gil is truly Juana, she has another false letter sent to him saying that she is pregnant in a convent in Valladolid (1146–66; 1444–61; 1625–28). While Martín gave Juana his word that he would marry her (1304), at least according to Juana-Elvira, Juana uses letters to make his word mean something. Just as we saw above with gender-specificity (*perdido*), language is again the tool of the Symbolic. By giving her his word he goes beyond the Imaginary (unsatisfied lust or love) to the promise of fulfillment through mediated desire.²¹ Act 2 comes to a head when Juana uses the letters sent to Martín from Valladolid that Caramanchel found but did not return (1707–11). She uses these (purloined) letters to steal money promised to Martín and to convince Inés and her father that her story is true (1865–68), in the process giving Martín a new name, Miguel (1294ff., 1780ff., 1963ff.). So important is the possession of the letter that Pedro approves of Juana-Gil’s story based on a lie supported by the purloined letter and gives his blessing to the marriage while accusing Martín, whom he now calls Miguel, of being the thief (1966–72). Curiously, Inés, in relating this to her father, changes “Miguel”’s last name from Ribera to Cisneros, thus underscoring the fluidity in his identity (as “Don Gil de Albornoz,” as Martín de Guzmán, as Miguel de Ribera, as Miguel de Cisneros). Thus the man who promised Juana his name (and in the process of doing the same for Inés) is at once Gil, Martín, and Miguel—which name does he promise?

Juana-Gil writes another letter, this time to Elvira, saying that Inés disgusts “him,” and declaring his love for Elvira (2270–79). Caramanchel shows the letter to Inés (for some strange reason), and Inés realizes her role as exchange object:

¡Válgame Dios! ¿Ya empalago?
 ¿Manjar soy que satisfago
 antes que me pruebe el gusto?
 ¿Tan bueno es el de su Elvira
 que su apetito provoca?

(2285–89)

[May God help me! Am I boring him?
Am I something to eat that satisfies
before he even tastes me?
Is Elvira so good
that she whets his appetite?]

Not only does this continue the food and eating metaphors, but it also brings up the question of satisfaction. The satisfaction of a demand by an appetizer only increases the hunger for the fulfillment of one's desires.²² Inés is quite right that she cannot satisfy Gil (for many reasons), but she is wrong in thinking that Elvira can (for even more reasons). Her reaction is to tell Juan to kill Gil for having jilted her.

As the action is approaching its climax, Diego confronts Martín with Quintana's accusation (by means of another letter in Juana's handwriting) that Martín killed Juana in Alcorcón. When Martín protests, Diego reproaches him for defending himself:

Diego. ¿Qué importa, tirano aleve,
que niegues lo que esta carta
afirma de tus traiciones?

Martín. La letra es de doña Juana.

(3131–34)

[Diego. What does it matter, perfidious tyrant
that you deny what this letter
affirms about your treason?

Martin. The letter (the handwriting) is Doña Juana's.].

When Martín asks how he could have killed her since she was in San Quirce, Diego replies:

Porque finges letras falsas
del modo que el nombre finges.

(3148–49)

[Because you counterfeit false letters
the same way you counterfeit your name.]

Here we have a concrete example of the power of the letter, the signifier, over the signified, and the linking of the letter, the name, and (false) identity. Don Martín is who he is only because he has that name, carries that letter. Certainly that was the case with his disguise as Gil early on. Juana was able to usurp his role with Inés because she, too, could produce *letras falsas* [false letters] that

would result in a *nombre fingido* [counterfeit name]. Is she not, in this sense, somewhat like an analyst who substitutes one signifier for another in the chain of repetition (Martín-Juan, Martín-Inés), arriving finally at the cure?²³

Elvira, too, participates in a love triangle with Juana and Inés is jealous of Elvira. Juana, as Elvira, explains that she purposefully imitated “Gil” (1391–92), even though no one seems to notice this resemblance, except perhaps Martín. The two ironies of this situation are, of course, that Elvira is Gil is Juana, and that Inés doesn’t seem to care anyway. She is not in the least concerned by the physical similarities among the three. Elvira does not love Gil, she says, but she would have if she hadn’t loved someone who loved badly (1399–1405). The interview with Inés ends with the egoistic gloating of Juana and her ability to fool these others:

Ya esta boba está en la trampa.
Ya soy hombre, ya mujer,
ya don Gil, ya doña Elvira;
mas si amo, ¿qué no seré?

(1438–41)

[Now the fool is in the trap.
I am now a man, now a woman,
now Don Gil, now Doña Elvira;
but if I love, what will I not be?]

Juana (as Gil) tells Caramanchel that she is in love with Elvira:

Yo he estado
todo este tiempo escondido
en una casa que ha sido
mi cielo, porque he alcanzado
la mejor mujer en ella
de Madrid.

(1686–91)

[I have been
hidden this entire time
in a house that has been
my heaven, because I have been with
the best woman in Madrid
in it.]

She obviously means herself, but it is quite curious that Juana-Gil should love Juana-Elvira but that Juana-Elvira does not love “him”

back (2215–18). In trying to reconcile the Imaginary and the Symbolic, Juana has created concrete manifestations of the alienation within herself as subject. A final fiction adds to the complication by questioning whether she is dead or alive. Juana, so the first story goes, died from complications with her pregnancy. Her father, when he read (in a letter) about Martín's actions, swore revenge (2066–74). Martín's reaction is not to accept that Gil is someone else, but to believe that this other Gil is the *alma en pena* [soul in purgatory] of Juana (2098–2105). This is not merely the overactive imagination of a superstitious mind, but another indication of the function of placeholder that the woman can be. Her exchange value continues whether she is there alive and in person or not. In some ways, Juana-dead can be compared to Jakobson's "zero phoneme" in that she signifies even when she does not exist. On another level, the link between death and identity (and sexuality) is the result of the fact that one must always pass through the defiles of the signifier, make a choice, leave something behind. The more choices one makes, the more one leaves behind, resulting in a fading of the subject [*aphanisis*].²⁴ For Juana's original goal to be achieved, she will have to give up much of what she has become in its pursuit.

The reconciliation of the Imaginary and the Symbolic comes in the most complex and remarkable final scene. It is set up when, in order to forestall Inés's renewed interest in Martín, she tells her that she is Elvira (2554ff.). Of course, Inés doesn't believe her and won't until she puts on a dress:

Ansí se ha de hacer:
 vestirte en tu traje puedes;
 que con él podremos ver
 como te entalla y te inclina.
 Ven y pondráste un vestido
 de los míos; que imagina
 mi amor en ése fingido
 que eres hombre y no vecina.

(2603–10)

(Aparte.) ¡Qué varonil
 mujer! Por más que repara
 mi amor, dice que es don Gil
 en la voz, presencia y cara.

(2612–15)

[Thus it must be:
 you can put on your dress;
 for with it we will see

how it fits you and shapes you.
Come and put on one
of my dresses; for my love
imagines that in that outfit
you are a man and not my neighbor.

(Aside) What a masculine
woman! However much my love
inspects him, it says that he is Don Gil
in voice, presence, and face.]

Even after she realizes that Juana is a woman, she still wishes she were Gil, “que yo adorara tu engaño” [that I might adore your deception] (2666). Isn’t it, of course, the *engaño* [deception] with which one always falls in love?

Nearing the climax, Quintana tells Juana that she is “losing her name,” her identity as Gil (3033), because Juan, Martín, and Clara also appear dressed as *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. The timid Clara is empowered when she appears in men’s clothes, threatening to take revenge on Gil (3031), but Martín is utterly confused because he believes that Juan (dressed as Gil), who is a live man, is a dead woman (Juana). Caramanchel, who thought his master was only a hermaphrodite, now believes he is lackey to an *alma en pena* [soul in purgatory] (2935–36), although Juana herself says that she appears not as an “alma sin cuerpo” [a soul without a body] but rather “en cuerpo y sin alma” [a body without a soul] (2950) as long as her mission is not yet accomplished. Just as Quintana accuses Martín of having stabbed his wife to death (the second version of Juana’s death, 3120–26) and the authorities come to take him away, Juana enters, dressed once again as Gil (to which her own father asks, “¿Quién sois?” [Who are you?] 3206). The fathers (Diego and Pedro) are finally able to impose their names on the situation (Juana now has a paternal last name, not just the one she gave herself, *de las calzas verdes* [of the green breeches]). Caramanchel asks Juana the pivotal question of the play, “¿Y sois hombre o sois mujer?” [Are you a man or are you a woman?], to which Juana replies, “Mujer soy” [I am a woman] (3261–62), and the play ends in an apotheosis of marriage (Juana-Martín, Inés-Juan, Clara-Antonio). All are now assigned “proper” identities, and the play ends happily, or so we are led to believe.

Juana’s adventure clearly allegorizes one’s search for sexual identity. Because men and women in society are only signifiers and, as such, susceptible to shifting meanings,²⁵ she is able to alternate between them before the final fixing of her identity. For the play to

end well, however, Juana must choose one role or the other, and by choosing that of wife, a position defined by the men to whom she subordinates herself, she must give up much of the independence and power she has shown.²⁶ In Irigaray's terminology, a woman "borrows the disguise which she is required to assume. She mimes the role imposed upon her."²⁷ Juana uses the masquerade that characterizes sexuality and femininity²⁸ in order to achieve her goal of bringing Martín under the rule of Law. Apparently, more important than love (or, ultimately, even revenge) is the order and tranquility promised by the Symbolic. Reichenberger's formula of "order disturbed to order restored," at least in this *comedia*, is the appearance of a successful working through of the passage from the Imaginary (love and revenge) into the Symbolic (of marriage and society). Of course, the happy ending is yet another Imaginary fiction given importance by the structure of the genre itself. We are, after all, dealing with literature here, not life. If Juana and Martín were people rather than characters, we would see that their problems do not evaporate, that marriage will not necessarily make him love her more or treat her better, that the Imaginary is never supplanted by the Symbolic, and that the Symbolic never completely delivers on its promise of harmony.

Notes

1. "The Sexual Ambiguities of Tirso de Molina's *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*." *Proceedings of the Third Annual Golden Age Spanish Drama Symposium. El Paso, 1983*, ed. Richard Ford (El Paso: University of Texas at El Paso, n.d.), 109.

2. This article cannot provide a comprehensive introduction to the work of Jacques Lacan. Moreover, the definition of Lacanian terms is a mercurial enterprise that can easily confuse more than it illuminates. Because of the importance of the Imaginary and the Symbolic to this study, however, the following definitions (incomplete and overly reductionistic as they are) may provide some aid to those unfamiliar with his highly nuanced use of language. The Imaginary and the Symbolic are idiosyncratic terms in the psychoanalytic writings of Lacan. Central to the Imaginary is the "mirror stage" occurring between six months and eighteen months of age. During this period the infant identifies with an image of integral individuality while at the same time coming to grips with the inevitable otherness of the image, the mother, the object of desire, and the like, with the resultant frustration of desire caused by the alterity of the object itself and the subject's necessary relationship with other subjects (intersubjectivity). The Imaginary is marked by the essentially narcissistic relation of subject to the ego, and by aggressivity and rivalry toward a counterpart. Indeed, the creation of the ego is a function of the Imaginary in the mirror stage. For Lacan, all Imaginary behavior and relations are always deceptive and will never fulfill their promise of satisfaction. The Symbolic is the external structure in which the subject must define himself or herself, and it includes language, social customs, and the law. Especially important here are the community's prescriptions for proper attire and behavior for

each gender. It should be noted, however, that the subject always functions in more than one register at a time. For further discussion of these terms, as well as brief definitions of such terms as desire, *jouissance*, and the Name-of-the-Father, see Alan Sheridan's translator's note to Lacan's *Écrits: A Selection* (New York: Norton, 1977), vii–xii; and J. Laplanche and J.-B. Pontalis, *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (New York: Norton, 1973). For a more general and thorough discussion of Lacan's theories, see Ragland-Sullivan's impressive *Jacques Lacan and the Philosophy of Psychoanalysis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987). For work on Lacan in relation to the *comedia* see Henry Sullivan, "The Problematic of Tragedy in Calderón's *El médico de su honra*," *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 5 (1981): 355–71; "Love, Matrimony and Desire in the Theatre of Tirso de Molina," *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 37 (1985): 93–95; and "Sexual" (109–11), with one correction—the locus of the unconscious is in the Other). I would like to thank Ellie Ragland-Sullivan, Henry Sullivan, and Alan Astro for their comments and suggestions during the preparation of this study.

3. All references are to Gabriel Téllez (Tirso de Molina), *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, ed. E. W. Hesse and C. J. Moolick (Madrid: Anaya, 1971).

4. Jacques Lacan, *Le Séminaire. Livre III: Les Psychoses, 1954–1955*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller (Paris: Seuil, 1981), 51.

5. Everett W. Hesse and William C. McCary. "La balanza subjetiva-objetiva en el teatro de Tirso: Ensayo sobre contenido y forma barrocos." *Hispanófila*, 1, no. 3 (1958): 3–4.

6. Lacan, *Séminaire* 3, 199.

7. *Ibid.*, 200.

8. Ragland-Sullivan, *Lacan*, 293.

9. Lacan, *Feminine Sexuality*, ed. Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose, trans. Jacqueline Rose (New York: Norton, 1983), 119–20; Ragland-Sullivan, *Lacan* 268–70, 291; cf. Moustapha Safouan, *La Sexualité féminine dans la doctrine freudienne* (Paris: Seuil, 1976), 132.

10. Lacan, *Feminine*, 76, 109, 125, 143; *Le Séminaire. Livre II: Le Moi dans la théorie de Freud et dans la technique de la psychanalyse, 1954–1955* (Paris: Seuil, 1978), 68.

11. Lacan, *Séminaire* 3, 184.

12. Sullivan, "Sexual," 115.

13. The shifting nature of these beliefs brings to mind Freud's permutations through denial: I (man/woman) love/hate you (man/woman), although this time the terms living and dead can also be added to the mix; I (living man/dead man/living woman/dead woman) love/hate you (living man/dead man/living woman/dead woman). See Lacan, *Écrits*, 188; Eugen Bär, "Understanding Lacan," *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Science* 3 (1974): 520.

14. Hesse, *La mujer como víctima en la comedia y otros ensayos* (Barcelona: Puvill, n.d.), 138–39.

15. That the alleged homosexuality serves primarily comic purposes is expressed by Sullivan, "Sexual," 118; Hesse, *La mujer*, 140–41. Sullivan adds that such "homosexuality" is considered more or less normal in the world of the play, unlike the real world. See "Tirso de Molina: Dramaturgo andrógino," *Actas del Quinto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*, ed. Maxime Chevalier *et al* (Bordeaux: Université de Bordeaux, Instituto de Estudios Ibéricos e Iberoamericanos, 1977), 814. It is important here to delineate the difference between the psychoanalysis of women and the implication of psychoanalytic concepts in these characters that are allegories of women. Dramatic characters are not human beings with concrete symptoms; rather they serve to represent or allegorize a concept that has

a certain resonance in psychoanalytic theory. As a result, the application of case studies of and theories about masculine women (as in Safouan 95–116, 129–39) is to reify these characterizations and thereby deny their power as emblems rather than real people. The same can be said about hysterical and obsessional neuroses even though the main questions that preoccupy them, “Am I a man or a woman?” and “Am I dead or alive?”, respectively, are found in the confusions regarding Juana’s identity.

16. Sullivan, “Tirso,” 814.

17. Sullivan, “Love,” 95.

18. Lacan, *Écrits*, 151.

19. Lacan, *Séminaire 2*, 315.

20. Juliet Mitchell, “Introduction—I” in Lacan, *Feminine*, 5, 29.

21. Lacan, *Séminaire 2*, 303.

22. Lacan, *Écrits*, 286–87.

23. Shoshana Felman, “On Reading Poetry: Reflections on the Limits and Possibilities of Psychoanalytical Approaches,” in *The Literary Freud: Mechanisms of Defense and the Poetic Will*, ed. Joseph H. Smith (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 138.

24. There is no subject without *aphanisis*; as soon as the subject “appears somewhere as meaning, he is manifest elsewhere as fading, as disappearance” (Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan [New York: Norton, 1978], 218; cf. 221. See also Régis Durand, “On *Aphanisis*: A Note on the Dramaturgy of the Subject in Narrative Analysis,” in *Lacan and Narration: The Psychoanalytic Difference in Narrative Theory*, ed. Robert Con Davis (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 863–64. The fading of the subject is related both to castration and (again) the basis of the Symbolic in language. “All that is language is lent from this otherness and this is why the subject is always a fading thing that runs under the chain of signifiers. For the definition of a signifier is that it represents a subject not for another subject but for another signifier” (Lacan, “Of Structure as an Inmixing of an Otherness Prerequisite to Any Subject Whatsoever,” in *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, ed. Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato. [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972], 194).

25. Lacan, *Le Séminaire. Livre XX: Encore, 1972–1973*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller (Paris: Seuil, 1975), 34.

26. Because the Symbolic Order is androcentric in its initial function (Lacan, *Séminaire 2*, 303–5), Juana is subjected to what Ragland-Sullivan calls a “Second Castration” in which the Symbolic, in addition to the deferment of the Imaginary object, institutes in the Law the many myths of inferior women and self-sufficient men (277, 283, 287, 290, 298–301).

27. Luce Irigaray, “When the Goods Get Together,” in *New French Feminisms*, ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron (New York: Schocken Books, 1980), 108.

28. Safouan, *La Sexualité*, 110.

Works Cited

Bär, Eugen, “Understanding Lacan.” *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Science* 3 (1974): 473–544.

- Durand, Régis. “On *Aphanisis*: A Note on the Dramaturgy of the Subject in Narrative Analysis.” In *Lacan and Narration: The Psychoanalytic Difference in Narrative Theory*, edited by Robert Con Davis, 860–70. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Felman, Shoshana. “On Reading Poetry: Reflections on the Limits and Possibilities of Psychoanalytical Approaches.” In *The Literary Freud: Mechanisms of Defense and the Poetic Will*, edited by Joseph H. Smith, 119–48. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Hesse, Everett W. *La mujer como víctima en la comedia y otros ensayos*. Barcelona: Puvill, n.d.
- Hesse, Everett W. and William C. McCrary. “La balanza subjetiva-objetiva en el teatro de Tirso: Ensayo sobre contenido y forma barrocos.” *Hispanófila* 1, no. 3 (1958): 1–11.
- Irigaray, Luce. “When the Goods Get Together.” In *New French Feminisms*, edited by Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron, 107–110. New York: Schocken Books, 1980.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: A Selection*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977.
- . *Feminine Sexuality*. Edited by Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose. Translated by Jacqueline Rose. New York: Norton, 1983.
- . *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1978.
- . “Of Structure as an Inmixing of an Otherness Prerequisite to Any Subject Whatsoever.” In *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, edited by Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato, 186–200. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.
- . *Le Séminaire. Livre II: Le Moi dans la théorie de Freud et dans la technique de la psychanalyse, 1954–1955*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Seuil, 1978.
- . *Le Séminaire. Livre III: Les Psychoses, 1955–1956*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Seuil, 1981.
- . *Le Séminaire. Livre XX: Encore, 1972–1973*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Seuil, 1975.
- Laplanche, J., and J.-B. Pontalis. *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Norton, 1973.
- Mitchell, Juliet. “Introduction—I.” *Feminine Sexuality*, by Jacques Lacan. Edited by Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose, 1–26. New York: Norton, 1983.
- Ragland-Sullivan, Ellie. *Jacques Lacan and the Philosophy of Psychoanalysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1987.
- Safouan, Moustapha. *La Sexualité féminine dans la doctrine freudienne*. Paris: Seuil, 1976.
- Sullivan, Henry W. “Love, Matrimony and Desire in the Theatre of Tirso de Molina.” *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 37 (1985): 83–99.
- . “The Problematic of Tragedy in Calderón’s *El médico de su honra*.” *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 5 (1981): 355–71.
- . “The Sexual Ambiguities of Tirso de Molina’s *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*.” *Proceedings of the Third Annual Golden Age Spanish Drama Symposium*. El Paso, 1983, edited by Richard Ford, 107–21. El Paso: University of Texas at El Paso, n.d.

- . "Tirso de Molina: Dramaturgo andrógino." In *Actas del Quinto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*. Edited by Maxime Chevalier *et al*, 811–18. Bordeaux: Université de Bordeaux Instituto de Estudios Ibéricos e Iberoamericanos, 1977.
- Téllez, Gabriel (Tirso de Molina). *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. Edited by E. W. Hesse and C. J. Moolick. Madrid: Anaya, 1971.