

Celestinesca

ISSN 0147 / 3085



STUDIES FOR PETER E. RUSSELL
ON HIS 80th BIRTHDAY

Vol. 17, no. ii

Noviembre 1993

EDITOR

JOSEPH T. SNOW
Michigan State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

MARTIN REYES-DURAN
Michigan State University

CORRESPONSALES

Erna BERNDT-KELLEY	Smith College (USA)
Ivy CORFIS	Penn State Univ. (USA)
Manuel CRIADO DE VAL	C.S.I.C.-Madrid (SPAIN)
Alan DEYERMOND	Queen Mary-Westfield Col.-of London (UK)
Mario FERRECCIO PODESTA	Univ. de Santiago (CHILE)
Michel GARCIA	La Sorbonne (FRAN)
Jacques JOSET	Univ. de Liège (BEL)
Kathleen V. KISH	Univ. of N.C.-Greensboro (USA)
Katalin KULIN	Univ. Budapest (HUN)
Adrienne S. MANDEL	Cal. St. Univ.-Northridge (USA)
Walter METTMANN	Univ. Münster (GER)
Jerry R. RANK	St. Mary's College (USA)
Christof RODIEK	Bonn (GER)
Dorothy SEVERIN	Liverpool University (UK)
Emma SCOLES	Univ. di Roma (ITAL)
George SHIPLEY	Univ. of Washington (USA)

Subscriptions in the U.K.

Geoffrey West
Dept. of Printed Bks. (Hispanic)
The British Library
Great Russell St.
London WC1B 3DG ENGLAND

CELESTINESCA

ISSN 0147-3085

VOL 17, NO 2

CONTENIDO

Noviembre de 1993

STUDIES FOR PETER E. RUSSELL ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

PRESENTATION, Julian Weiss	1-7
ARTICULOS	
Dorothy Sherman Severin, <i>Celestina</i> and the Magical Empowerment of Women	9-28
Louise Fothergill-Payne, <i>Celestina</i> "As a Funny Book": A Bakhtinian Reading	29-51
David Hook, Transilluminating Tristan	53-84
Jeremy N.H. Lawrance, <i>The Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea</i> and its 'Moralitie'	85-110
James F.Burke, <i>The Mal de la Madre</i> and the Failure of Maternal Influence in <i>Celestina</i>	111-128
Keith Whinnom, <i>The Form of Celestina: Dramatic Antecedents</i>	129-146
RESEÑAS	
Estelle Irizarry, "Tres autores en ' <i>La Celestina</i> ': Aplicación de la informática a los estudios literarios", Granada: Colección Romania	147-150
George D. Greenia, "Fernando de Rojas and <i>Celestina</i> : Approaching the Fifth Century", Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies	151-158
PREGONERO	159-173
ILUSTRACIONES	8, 26, 28, 52, 78, 104, 126, 158, 173

CELESTINESCA

ISSN 0147-3085

Vol. 17, no. 2 Noviembre de 1993

© J. T. Snow

**This journal is a member of CELJ
The Conference of Editors of Learned Journals**

**This issue has been produced with support from
Michigan State University's
College of Arts and Letters, and
the Department of Romance & Classical Languages**

STUDIES IN HONOUR OF PETER E. RUSSELL
ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

Presentation

Julian Weiss
University of Virginia

"omnia secundum litem fiunt"

The essays gathered here from Peter Russell's friends, colleagues, and former students pay tribute to a man who has made a substantial contribution to scholarship on one of the key texts of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. That contribution to *Celestina* studies has not taken the form of a major monograph (though the preface to his recent edition is of monographic length), but has been made in other modes: in a series of responses to major books--review articles on the seminal works by Bataillon, Lida de Malkiel, and Gilman; in half-a-dozen or so pioneering articles on Rojas's play, its cultural milieu and reception; in his fine 1991 Castalia edition; and in his inspirational teaching, both in England and the United States.

This is not the occasion for either summary or developed account of all Peter Russell's publications on *Celestina*: their relation to his other articles and books on the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, their historicist methods and goals, or how his work might intersect with future research. But--for me, as a former student--one of the many memorable qualities of his scholarly writing on *Celestina* has been and continues to be its deeply critical stance. A critical spirit suffuses his chosen forms of publication: reviews and articles where new and clearly defined questions can be framed, and where contemporary readings and received opinions can be engaged. To read his essays over the past thirty or so years is to get a sense of

participating in the process of research and debate--so it is apt that this tribute should be in *Celestinesca*, whose pages record the continuing discussion on Rojas's book.

And the questions Peter Russell poses are central ones, of continuous relevance. As one whose research has been divided equally between history and literature, his writings have often brought to the fore the difficult relationship between the approach of the historian and that of the literary critic. The grounds of that relationship have evolved considerably since his reviews of the books by Lida de Malkiel (1978b [1964]) and Gilman (1978e [1975]), where, inspired by a skeptical empiricism, and supported by a sure yet unobtrusive command of historical documentation, he most trenchantly stakes a claim for social history. But the methodological issue that underpins his response to those scholars is still a pressing one, to which students of medieval and Renaissance Spain should urgently return in view of the various 'new historicisms' of literary scholars, and the changing practice of history itself.

On another level, many of Peter's most suggestive questions have emerged through his scrupulous attention to the detail of the literary work. Most recently (1989), spurred on by a textual incongruence, he asks "why did Celestina move house?" And this query leads on to speculation about the real urban setting of Rojas's world, where the author did so much to cover his historical tracks. Conversely, the starting point is often a larger socio-cultural problem, which then feeds back into our understanding of textual detail. Perhaps the most famous instance of this is his article on witchcraft, in which the historical documentation not only sheds light upon the early modern obsession with magic but also makes us think in a different way about how Rojas's text might actually work. There is another line of inquiry running through Peter's historicist readings of literature (and it is one to which my own research owes a special debt): this is his interest in the reception of *Celestina* in the century and a half that followed its composition. His study of James Mabbe's English translation (1953a), together with a broader overview of seventeenth-century interest in Spanish literature (1953b), should encourage us to explore further the social and political conditions that shaped the way other countries responded to the literature of the first European imperial power. Although these two studies were written before the development of reception theory, they connect with it in important and fruitful ways. I for one am sorry that they were not

given a wider audience by being republished in *Temas de 'La Celestina'*, especially in view of his prefatory (and characteristically challenging) remark that the subject "es capaz de proporcionarnos, de vez en cuando, datos que nos hacen dudar de la validez de algunas teorías generales sobre la literatura española de dicha época bastante divulgadas en la crítica peninsular" (1978: 7).

The articles that have had most impact on subsequent research are, perhaps, those on magic (1978a [1965]) and law (1978c [1976] and 1978d). Dorothy Severin's article in the present volume attests to the increasing importance attached nowadays to the theme of magic in *Celestina* (an interest inspired in part by recent rethinking about the cultural homogeneity of the Golden Age). Similarly, the current research by Ivy Corfis and others shows the continued value of Peter Russell's groundbreaking essays on the *Celestina comentada* and the legal studies of Fernando de Rojas. Magic and law: how well these two phenomena symbolize the tensions of a work caught between the opposing and complementary forces of chaos and order! And how well their presence in the text captures the ambiguity that Peter places at the heart of Rojas's book. For although these studies into magic and law were undertaken in part to show how contemporary or near contemporary readers could have responded to *Celestina*, the complexities and potential meanings of the literary work are never entirely reduced to those historical responses. It is wholly characteristic of Peter's approach that the introduction to his edition closes with an emphasis upon that deep-rooted ambiguity which resists any single totalizing interpretation:

Puede concluirse que la crítica celestinesca debe resignarse a que, en el plano ideológico, no puede haber soluciones definitivas, sólo posibilidades. ¿Será que el gran descubrimiento de los autores de *LC*, herederos de una cultura dogmática, fue que el escepticismo no sólo era postura intelectual factible sino que también era capaz de desvelar nuevas y fecundas perspectivas y formas literarias?

And it is characteristic too that this conclusion should be phrased as a question: this is a sure sign of the scholar's belief in the creative power of doubt, just as the following sentence shows his sensitivity to the interplay between past and present, as well as his reluctance to conflate them:

Una edad en que se puede asertar, con Roland Barthes, que la literatura es, por definición, ambigua, verá, desde luego, en la compleja ambigüedad de *LC* una explicación a lo menos parcial de su genialidad, no una señal de un fallo artístico ni una serie de enigmas que es deber del crítico resolver de modo definitivo.

It will be clear from statements such as these that readers will not find in his recent edition an attempt to use it as an obvious platform for a personal summation of the work's meaning (which may dismay some). Rather it has a propaedeutic function, being produced to encourage and facilitate further critical thinking about *Celestina*, regardless of the personal approaches and interests which individual readers might bring to bear. Acknowledging his own debt to undergraduate and graduate students (1991: 178), the principal goal of his copious annotation is to elucidate the literal level of the text. Thus, his notes do not engage polemically with conflicting interpretations of specific passages. However, just as his emphasis on the text's ambiguity does not collapse into bland relativism, so he never pretends that complete neutrality is either achievable or desirable: his philological scholarship is at the service of interpretation (1991: 14).

By bringing out the richness of the play's verbal texture, Peter Russell puts us in a position to continue exploring the ways in which the work interweaves the language of official authority with a range of other, more subversive voices. (It reminds us that he himself is not interested just in history written from above, but also in life on the margins: in addition to his research into witchcraft, there is, among many others, his study on the *poesía negra* of Rodrigo de Reinosa (1978f); and it is significant that he called attention as far back as 1964 to the involvement of the Catholic Monarchs in prostitution (1978b: 288-89), a topic which is now receiving increased attention.)

The paradox, for him, was that "el empuje inicial de esta apertura hacia las clases bajas o marginadas venía del estudio de la comedia latina y del ambiente universitario en general" (1991: 152). And in the present volume, Louise Fothergill-Payne pursues this paradox by showing how Rojas participated in what Bakhtin called "la joyeuse littérature récréative des écoliers." Her wide-ranging study examines the various modulations and effects of that liberating

laughter of the carnivalesque described by the Russian critic. And it opens the way for further research into the limits of that liberation, and its historical determinants.

For his part, David Hook demonstrates how historical documents can 'transilluminate' the details of a literary text, but in doing so they can complicate issues rather than simply resolve them. Continuing his research into Arthurian onomastics, he takes up the suggestion of Russell and others that Tristán may be one of play's "nombres hablantes" (1991: 96). However, Hook's archival research shows that Tristán was one of the commonest literary names at this time, and this fact raises questions about the extent of its literary overtones in *Celestina*: do we read it through the prism of Arthurian legend, or was the name something more akin to a dead metaphor? This question concludes a study whose value lies in part in the way characterization is shown to be a textual process, in part in the way Tristán is fully integrated into the thematic and structural web of the work.

Jeremy Lawrance elucidates the meaning of the authorial claims for didactic intent. He does so by invoking contemporary critical practice and theory, particularly the *incipits* of the work's most important generic model, the humanist comedy, and the medieval *accessus* to Terence. The fact that these critical prologues were concerned not with Christian but with secular ethics, and more particularly with civic order and public morality, lays the basis for a compelling reading of specific episodes. But his study moves beyond its initial premisses, and forces us to consider the much more profound problem of how class relationships are depicted by Rojas, and where the author's sympathies might lie.

Social readings of a different order are offered by James Burke and Dorothy Severin. In an overview of the work's relation to European witchcraft of the time, the latter develops Peter Russell's observation that *Celestina* is a sorceress, not a witch. But she reformulates the problem of definition by asking where the empowered female characters stand in relation to a patriarchal social order. Severin finds that Rojas's attitude is ambivalent: on the one hand, she attributes to the author a "perverse pleasure in his alternative society" of women; on the other, she shows how the alleged empowerment fails, and how female liberation has limited results.

James Burke arrives via a different route at a similar conclusion in his study on the failure of maternal influence (in so doing, he is developing his recent work on patriarchal structures in *Celestina*). A starting point for some fascinating and far-reaching conclusions is found in a seemingly small detail relating to a secondary character (Areúsa's wandering womb in Act VII). Drawing upon a wide range of cultural and anthropological evidence, as well as psychoanalytic theory, he argues that the *mal de la madre* stands for the inversion of a symbol of stability and productive generation. Like the previous piece, this article does not foreclose the problem of how gender relations are established and put under pressure in the text, but rather it provokes us to examine the issue further.

As Alan Deyermond explains, the late Keith Whinnom's essay derives from unfinished work from the 1960s (and is a poignant reminder of a mind constantly in motion). It engages with scholarship that still exerts an influence upon contemporary readings (e.g. Lida de Malkiel, Castro Guisasola, and Gilman), and addresses an issue that in spite of intervening work of the past twenty-five years is still worth pursuing (as Lawrance's contribution attests): namely, *Celestina's* debt to humanist comedy, and to Terence. Keith Whinnom's critical summary of what the work owes to its generic antecedents endorses the conclusions of Lida de Malkiel, even as it modifies them. For Whinnom's conclusion is that Rojas's debt was probably assumed via the *Margarita poetica* of Albrecht von Eyb, a point which helps us nuance our understanding of the process of literary transmission.

Quite apart, therefore, from the significance of their different approaches and conclusions, the tribute paid to Peter Russell by the present writers is that they share his critical stance toward the task of literary scholarship. With one obvious exception, their essays are part of ongoing research projects, and develop ideas on which they have recently published elsewhere. Also, like Peter himself, the contributors display a keen eye for the mutually illuminating textual detail and the historical moment. This shared spirit of inquiry and creative doubt should endure amidst the current fruitful proliferation of theoretical methods, and indeed should sustain it.

WORKS CITED

- Russell, Peter E. (1953a) "A Stuart Hispanist: James Mabbe." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 30: 78-84
- (1953b) "English Seventeenth-Century Interpretations of Spanish Literature." *Atlante*, 1: 65-77
- (1978) *Temas de 'La Celestina' y otros estudios. Del 'Cid' al 'Quijote'*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel
- (1978a [1965]) "La magia, tema integral de *La Celestina*." *Temas*, 241-76
- (1978b [1964]) "Tradición literaria y realidad social en *La Celestina*". *Temas*, 277-91
- (1978c [1976]) "El primer comentario crítico de *La Celestina*: cómo un legista del siglo XVI interpretaba la *Tragicomedia*." *Temas*, 293-321
- (1978d) "*La Celestina* y los estudios jurídicos de Fernando de Rojas." *Temas*, 323-40
- (1978e [1975]) "Un crítico en busca de un autor: reflexiones en torno a un reciente libro sobre Fernando de Rojas." *Temas*, 341-75
- (1978f [1973]) "La 'poesía negra' de Rodrigo de Reinosa." *Temas*, 377-406
- (1989) "Why Did Celestina Move House?" *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom*. Ed. Alan Deyermond and Ian Macpherson. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 151-61
- (ed). (1991) *Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Madrid: Castalia

セレスティーナ

欲望の悲喜劇



フェルナンド・デ・ロハス

岡村 一 訳

中川書店

Portada de la traducción japonesa
de Hajime Okamura, 1990.

CELESTINA AND THE MAGICAL EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN

Dorothy Sherman Severin
The University of Liverpool

I. Celestina's Witchcraft in its European Context

Celestina was written shortly after the *Malleus Malificarum* (*Hammer of the Witches*, 1484) which was to inspire a series of important sixteenth- and seventeenth-century witch persecutions. Although the importance of sorcery in the work has been recognized since Peter Russell's seminal article of 1963,¹ in which he pointed out that *Celestina* performed *philocaptio* upon Melibea, the full implications of this theme are only just beginning to be examined.

Witchcraft was not a particularly hot topic in Spain at the end of the fifteenth century. The Inquisition, however, was, and the persecution concentrated not on witches for their imagined sins or real practices, but on the *conversos* for their Judaizing, again sometimes real and sometimes imagined. Rojas paints a very ambivalent picture of *Celestina*, and she seems, at times, both hero and villain of the piece. Her sorcery or witchcraft is also ambivalent and difficult to judge. On the one hand she deals in love magic or white magic, but on the other she summons demonic forces to help her when she casts a spell. Because witchcraft was not the object of official persecution, it is possible to infer from all of this an extended metaphor for the Jewish persecutions, and some of the specific

references to the Inquisitional tribune of Celestina's mentor, Claudina, bear this out (see below). Indeed, one might even suggest that Celestina herself is a symbolic figure representing *conversos* since she appears to be genuinely making a pact with the Devil and summoning up evil. However, I do not propose to examine this point, but rather follow a different track, namely that the alternative anti-paternalistic society of empowered women and weak men which she creates is at the same time seductive and destructive.

Christine Lerner's definitions of witchcraft and sorcery can be of use when trying to determine Celestina's status as a witch or sorceress.² According to Lerner, 'compact witchcraft' or a pact with Satan, blurs the distinction between black (harming) and white (healing) witchcraft. Sorcery (incantation and the manipulation of objects) is frequently harmless, while its use for *malificium* is witchcraft. The latter was usually punishable by death in the Middle Ages.

Celestina's spell includes the calling up of Satan and an apparent pact with the Devil, thereby straying from the realms of sorcery into that of witchcraft. This is an obviously vital distinction. The characters are careful to always call Celestina 'hechicera' or sorceress (they would not relish the accusations of consorting with a witch or 'bruja'). While Celestina discusses in detail the one time that her mentor Claudina was accused of being a witch, because she was caught gathering earth at a crossroad, Celestina's description of Claudina's torture and the priest's consolation ('Blessed are those who suffer persecution for righteousness sake')³ is followed by a silence about Claudina's fate (see below). Celestina herself was publicly punished with Claudina for sorcery on one occasion and Claudina herself was arrested three more times for sorcery and once for witchcraft.

Although Celestina has escaped being tried as a witch, the other characters are decidedly ambivalent about her status. Sempronio crosses himself when he sees her (103), Pármene maligns her to Calisto in Act I, and even Lucrecia is unable to speak her name (88-89).⁴ More than once they refer to her scarface, the sign of the Devil. They may call her 'hechicera' but they treat her as 'bruja'.

Curiously, *Celestina* appears in a hiatus in the witchcraft trial activity in Europe,⁵ although the *Malleus* had appeared shortly before

the probable date of composition of the anonymous first act of *Celestina*, with its descriptions of Celestina's laboratory. Moreover, Spain was never a focal point of witchcraft trials because of the Inquisitional concentration on the *conversos*, but there were significant trials in the Basque country in the seventeenth century which mirrored the more frenzied activities elsewhere in Europe in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The increasing importance of witchcraft persecutions seems to have gone hand in glove with religious reform, and certainly had as its target women who had power in their communities, as healers, midwives, cosmeticians, bawds, and at times sorceresses and witches (although we now rightly question the efficacy of the latter). As there were no objective proofs of this efficacy, witchcraft was a *crimen exceptum* for which torture and trials by ordeal were acceptable.

The main lines of critical argument have been drawn between those who believe that Celestina has real power which operates in the work and those who think that her psychological manipulation of the other characters can explain all her success and that the witchcraft is mere ego-boosting.⁶ The late fifteenth century was demonstrably both religious and superstitious, and although some doubt has been cast on Rojas' traditional Christian values, at least at the time when he wrote *Celestina*, he is unlikely to have been totally immune to the beliefs of his age. Certainly, it is difficult to explain the opportune departure of Melibea's mother Alisa to tend a sick relative and the memory lapse about Celestina's identity which delivers Melibea into the bawd's hands in Act IV, except by invoking the long arm of coincidence. It is demonstrable that Celestina thinks that the Devil has created these opportunities, and Rojas even augments her asides to the Devil in *Tragicomedia* interpolations, just in case the reader has missed the point. Peter Russell was the first to delve into this theme seriously and to point out the *role of philocaptio*. He mentions that Celestina is a sorceress not a witch and elaborates upon this opinion in his recent edition of the work.⁷ Pármeno's statement 'y todo era burla y mentira' at the end of his description of the laboratory has been variously explained by Russell, who also points out that it was written by the first author. Julio Caro Baroja has stated in a recent article⁸ that while the power of witches was thought to be real, the Devil was considered a deceiver, so that despite the real power of the Devil through the witches, this was at the same time a deception.

Alan Deyermond's work on witchcraft in the text of *Celestina*⁹ is particularly fruitful. He examines how the Devil enters the skein of thread when Celestina casts her spell, and then moves on to Melibea's girdle which Celestina procures for Calisto and her own witchcraft purposes, and then on to the gold chain with which Calisto rewards Celestina. In the process the Devil infects everyone who touches these items and creates the final tragedy. An excellent summary of the witchcraft theme in *Celestina* is available in Patrizia Botta's recent article.

There are two main points to be made about witchcraft in *Celestina*. The first has been noted by Russell, Deyermond and others. Celestina unleashes a force of evil with her diabolic pact which is stronger than she suspects and which leads not just to love but to death. Love, which Calisto makes his God at the beginning of the work, by the end of the work is the Enemy who has destroyed all whom s/he touched.

The second point has only been noted in passing by some critics.¹⁰ Witchcraft, sorcery, and bawdry empower Celestina in her society and make her the dominant character not just in the work but in her social milieu. This world-upside-down means that Celestina threatens the patriarchal order represented by Pleberio and finally destroys it.

Rojas as a man and a believer (even if not a wholehearted Christian) condemns this usurpation of male prerogatives; he could have done so under the influence of Mosaic law which expressly forbids witchcraft:

Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them. I am the Lord your God. (Lev. 20.51)

And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits and after wizards, to go awhoring after them, I will ever set my force against that soul, and will cast him off from among his people. (Lev. 21.6)

Or even more boldly: 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live' (Exodus 22.18).

So whether or not Rojas was a 'good' Christian, he would have been aware of the force of these interdictions, so recently reinforced by *Malleus Malificarum*. However although he shows what happens if the social order is challenged by women, as a marginalized figure himself he also paints a curiously seductive view of this new world order, and adds some new material to the expanded *Tragicomedia* so that the reader or listener can appreciate the emergence of Melibea, Areúsa and Elicia after Celestina's death. In the figure of Celestina he creates the most important female witch of the late Middle Ages.

II. A Textual Overview

When Pármemo describes Celestina to Calisto in Act I, he lists her trades variously as seamstress, perfumer and cosmetician, restorer of virgins and bawd, and occasionally sorceress. To these one can add folk-healer and midwife, and possibly witch. There is no doubt that she is an enchantress or 'hechicera' but she also seems to make a pact with the Devil on at least one occasion which would make her a witch according to contemporary definitions of witchcraft. She admits that her old mentor, Claudina, Pármemo's mother, was accused of witchcraft because she was found gathering dust from a crossroads--a typical liminal witches' venue where they were said to gather to meet spirits. Claudina had definitely been caught and publicly shamed on various occasions for her sorcery; if the accusation of witchcraft was upheld at a trial it would have been a capital crime. However the death is left unexplained:

CEL. -Hijo, digo que sin aquélla, prendieron cuatro veces a tu madre, que Dios haya, sola. Y aun la una le levantaron que era bruja, porque la hallaron de noche con unas candelillas, cogiendo tierra de una encrucijada, y la tuvieron medio día en una escalera en la plaza puesta, uno como rocadero pintado en la cabeza ...

PARM. -Verdad es lo que dices; pero eso no fue por justicia.

CEL. -... Poco sabes de achaque de iglesia y cuánto es mejor por mano de justicia que de otra manera. Sabíalo mejor el cura, que Dios haya, que viniéndola a consolar, dijo que la santa Escritura tenía que bienaventurados eran los que padecían

persecución por la justicia, y que aquéllos poseerían el reino de los cielos. Mira si es mucho pasar algo en este mundo por gozar de la gloria del otro. Y más que, según todos decían, a tuerto y [a] sinrazón y con falsos testigos y recios tormentos la hicieron aquella vez confesar lo que no era ... Así que todo esto paso tu buena madre acá, debemos creer que le dará Dios buen pago allá, si es verdad lo que nuestro cura nos dijo y con esto me consuelo.

Although Celestina enthusiastically regales Pármeno with descriptions of her own training and the exploits of the two sorceresses, she is silent on the topic of witchcraft, as well she might be, for the sake of her own safety.

In the first scene of the work Calisto has encountered Melibea in her garden in pursuit of his hawk and has been rebuffed by her. He returns to his own house in an ill-temper, first to upbraid Sempronio and then to praise Melibea to the skies, declaring that he is not a Christian but a Melibeian who worships the lady:

CAL. -¿Yo? Melibeo soy y a Melibea adoro y en Melibea creo y a Melibea amo. (50)

CAL. -¿Que me repruebas?

SEMP. -Que sometes la dignidad del hombre a la imperfección de la flaca mujer.

CAL. -¿Mujer? ¡Oh grosero! ¡Dios, dios!

SEMP. -¿Y así lo crees? ¿O burlas?

CAL. -¿Que burlo? Por dios la creo, por dios la confieso y no creo que hay otro soberano en el cielo; aunque entre nosotros mora.

SEMP. -(¡Ha, ha, ha! ¿Oístes qué blasfemia? ¿Vistes qué ceguedad?) (51)

This heresy leaves Calisto open to the Devil's work when Sempronio immediately seizes upon a plan to make himself a good profit from Calisto's lust. The Celestina whom Sempronio approaches with his proposal to supply Calisto with Melibea at considerable cost is an aged crone with a scar on her face--the mark of the Devil. But bad luck awaits her at Calisto's house since she will be seen at the door by her old charge Pármeno, who knows her schemes better than

anyone, and who regales Calisto with a description of Celestina's laboratory and witchcraft paraphernalia:

PÁRM. - ¡Sí, santo Dios! Y remediaba por caridad muchas huérfanas y criadas que se encomendaban a ella; y en otro apartado tenía para remediar amores y para se querer bien. Tenía huesos de corazón de ciervo, lengua de víbora, cabezas de codornices, sesos de asno, tela de caballo, mantillo de niño, haba morisca, guija marina, soga de ahorcado, flor de yedra, espina de erizo, pie de tejón, granos de helecho, la piedra del nido del águila, y otras mil cosas. Venían a ella muchos hombres y mujeres y a unos demandaba el pan do mordían; a otros, de su ropa; a otros de sus cabellos; a otros, pintaba en la palma letras con azafrán; a otros, con bermellón; a otros, daba unos corazones de cera, llenos de agujas quebradas y otras cosas en barro y en plomo hechas muy espantables al ver. Pintaba figuras, decía palabras en tierra. ¿Quién te podrá decir lo que esta vieja hacía? Y todo era burla y mentira. (62)

Although Pármeno proves easy to corrupt with the promise of Areúsa, Melibea will be another story. Celestina decides that this is a task for her magical powers, and she pulls out all the stops for this occasion. Back in her own house she has Elicia fetch some magic items, namely a skein of thread, some snake oil, some papers from an ark written on in bat's blood and some goat's blood with a few of its whiskers. Although the exact use of all these is not known, since we must always infer the action from the dialogue and there are no descriptive passages, Celestina seems to draw a magic circle. These generally are used either to contain or exclude the Devil. Presumably in this case she protects herself by standing within the circle. She then invokes the Devil with the classical epithet 'triste Plutón', and threatening him with revenge if he does not obey her will and subject Melibea to her power, she concludes: 'Y otra y otra vez te conjuro; [y] así confiando en mi mucho poder, me parto para allá con mi hilado, donde creo te llevo ya envuelto' (85-86).

She proceeds to dip the skein of thread in the snake oil and to cast a *philocaptio* spell by which Melibea's love will be captured

when she buys this skein from Celestina, according to Peter Russell (1963). Celestina then seems to pledge herself to the Devil which she had conjured up--if he does this then he can ask what he will of her. If not, she curses him. She then proceeds to Melibea's house, and along the way perceives that her auguries are good--three of the men in the street are called John, two of them are cuckolds, and no black birds in sight:

Todos los agüeros se aderezan favorables o yo no sé nada de esta arte. Cuatro hombres, que he topado, a los tres llaman Juanes y los dos son cornudos. La primera palabra que oí por la calle, fue de achaque de amores. Nunca he tropezado como otras veces. *Las piedras parece que se apartan y me hacen lugar que pase. Ni me estorban las haldas ni siento cansancio en andar. Todos me saludan.* Ni perro me ha ladrado ni ave negra he visto, tordo ni cuervo ni otras nocturnas. Y lo mejor de todo es que veo a Lucrecia a la puerta de Melibea. Prima es de Elicia; no me será contraria.
(87)

Sure enough, when she arrives not only does Melibea's mother Alisa completely forget who she is, although they used to live in the same neighbourhood (Celestina having now gone down in the world and Alisa up), but Alisa even is called away to attend a sick relative and she leaves Melibea unattended in Celestina's care. However, Celestina doesn't in fact make very much headway at first with Melibea who seems bloody minded when Calisto's name is mentioned. But Celestina calls to the Devil in an aside:

MEL. ... ¡Jesú, Jesú! ¡Quítamela, Lucrecia, de delante, que me fino, que no me ha dejado gota de sangre en el cuerpo! Bien se lo merece esto y más, quien a estas tales da oídos. Por cierto, si no mirase a mi honestidad y por no publicar su osadía de ese atrevido, yo te hiciera, malvada, que tu razón y vida acabaran en un tiempo.

CEL. - (¡En hora mala acá vine, si me falta mi conjuro! ¡Ea pues! Bien sé a quién digo. ¡Ce, hermano, que se va todo a perder!) (95)

Celestina retrieves the situation by insisting that all she wants is for Melibea to write her a prayer to Saint Appolonia in order to help cure Calisto of a toothache—a typical courtly lover's malady¹¹--and of course she asks for a piece of clothing, Melibea's sash or girdle, her *cordón*, as an amulet:

CEL. - Una oración, señora, que le dijeron que sabías de Santa Apolonia para el dolor de las muelas. Asimismo tu cordón, que es fama que ha tocado [todas] las reliquias que hay en Roma y Jersualén. Aquel caballero, que dije, pena y muere de ellas. Ésta fue mi venida. Pero, pues en mi dicha estaba tu airada respuesta, padézcase él su dolor, en pago de buscar tan desdichada mensajera. Que, pues en tu mucha virtud me faltó piedad, también me faltará agua, si a la mar me enviara. *Pero ya sabes que el deleite de la venganza dura un momento y el de la misericordia para siempre.* (97)

When Melibea buys the skein of thread and surrenders her sash, the enchantment begins to take effect. The Devil moves from the skein to the girdle and when Calisto fondles it in Act VI, he too will be infected by the Devil, according to Alan Deyermond.

I however wish to suggest that something even more extraordinary is going to happen. Celestina's profession has always *empowered* her in her own society. She is fiercely proud of her past importance, although it is now on the wane. On more than one occasion she regales us with a portrait of herself when she was in her prime:

CEL. -¿El primero, hijo? Pocas vírgenes, a Dios gracias, has tú visto en esta ciudad que hayan abierto tienda a vender, de quien yo no haya sido corredora de su primer hilado. En naciendo la mochacha, la hago escribir en mi registro, *y esto para que yo sepa* cuántas se me salen de la red. ¿Qué pensabas, *Sempronio*? ¿Habíame de mantener del viento? ¿Heredé otra herencia? ¿Tengo otra casa o viña? ¿Conócesme otra hacienda, más de este oficio? ¿De qué como y bebo? ¿De qué visto y calzo? En esta ciudad nacida, en ella criada, manteniendo honra como todo el mundo sabe, ¿conocida pues, no soy?

Quien no supiere mi nombre y mi casa, tenle por extranjero. (81)

She sees herself 'maintaining honour' in the town and describes how she ran an extensive prostitution ring and bawdy house for the entire community, especially for the clergy, including the nuns. The communion bread would even end up in her house along with many other gifts from the clergy, and if she entered a church all eyes would be on her. Finally, anyone who didn't know her would be ashamed to admit it:

... Pues servidores, ¿no tenía por su causa de ellas? Caballeros viejos [y] mozos, abades de todas dignidades, desde obispos hasta sacristanes. En entrando por la iglesia, veía derrocar bonetes en mi honor, como si yo fuera una duquesa. El que menos había de negociar conmigo, por más ruin se tenía. De media legua que me viesen, dejaban las Horas. Uno a uno [y] dos a dos, venían a donde yo estaba, a ver si mandaba algo, a preguntarme cada uno por la suya. [Que hombre había, que estando diciendo misa], en viéndome entrar, se turbaban, que no hacían, ni decían cosa derechas. Unos me llamaban señora, otros tía, otros enamorada, otros vieja honrada. Allí se concertaban sus venidas a mi casa, allí las idas a la suya, allí se me ofrecían dineros, allí promesas, allí otras dádivas, besando el cabo de mi manto y aun algunos en la cara, por me tener más contenta. Agora hame traído la fortuna a tal estado, que me digas: "¡Buena pro hagan las zapatas!" (151)

In short, Celestina was the lord of misrule in her own town. She was empowered by her many professions but especially by her traffic in sex. Again a pact with the Devil is inferred from the circumstances. Celestina exchanges her female powerlessness for a power based on magic and lust, but her power has begun to slip badly; she has only a shadow of her former importance now. Calisto represents a way for her to make a lot of money and to reassert her importance as a go-between.¹² But it all goes fatally wrong. After her second interview with Melibea, when she is called to aid the now love-sick girl in her capacity as folk-doctor, and when she arranges an interview between Calisto and Melibea at the garden gate. Celestina

starts to make a fatal mistake. When she reports her successes to Calisto and rushes away with her booty, a gold chain, she loses all sense of discretion and tries to cut Sempronio and Pármeno out of the deal.

According to Deyermond this is because the Devil has now entered Calisto's gold chain and affects Celestina's good sense. After the rather chaste first interview between Calisto and Melibea at the garden gate, Sempronio and Pármeno go to Celestina's house and kill her for the booty: their blind avarice and violence suggest that too seem to have been infected by the Devil in the chain. But I do not believe that the power of the Devil stops here.

When Celestina visits Melibea for the second time Melibea is being eaten alive by the poisonous snake of desire. Celestina's death is followed by two nights of love making between Calisto and Melibea and an apparent empowering of Melibea, who has previously behaved as a typically over-protected daughter of the wealthy merchant class. In their first garden encounter when Calisto brings along a ladder to gain access to the garden, Calisto virtually rapes Melibea who tries to keep him from forcing himself upon her. Despite her lament at the loss of virginity she seems keen to arrange further assignations which allegedly take place over a month, although we will only witness the last of these. But in between assignations there is an extraordinary scene in which Melibea overhears her father Pleberio and mother Alisa discussing a possible marriage for her. Melibea enraged, declares her freedom from the bonds of convention:

... En pensar en él me alegro, en verlo me gozo, en oírlo me glorifico. Haga y ordene de mí a su voluntad. Si pasar quisiere la mar, con él iré; si rodear el mundo, lléveme consigo; si venderme en tierra de enemigos, no rehuiré su querer. Déjenme mis padres gozar de él, si ellos quieren gozar de mí. No piensen en estas vanidades ni en estos casamientos; que más vale ser buena amiga que mala casada. Déjenme gozar mi mocedad alegre, si quieren gozar su vejez cansada; si no, presto podrán aparejar mi perdición y su sepultura. No tengo otra lástima sino por el tiempo que perdí de no gozarlo, de no conocerlo, después que a mí me sé conocer. No

quiero marido, no quiero ensuciar los ñudos del matrimonio, ni las maritales pisadas de ajeno hombre repisar, como muchas hallo en los antiguos libros que leí o que hicieron más discretas que yo, más subidas en estado y linaje. (206)

¡Afuera, afuera la ingratitud, afuera las lisonjas y el engaño con tan verdadero amor, que ni quiero marido ni quiero padre ni parientes! Faltándome Calisto, me falte la vida, la cual, porque él de mí goce, me aplace. (207)

She does not wish to step in the marital footsteps of another man, as Calisto is her soul and her life. If he wishes to cross the sea she will go with him, or will even let him sell her into bondage in Moorish lands. These more fanciful fates show the influence of popular songs and ballads in Melibea's imagination. But her declaration of independence from the fate chosen by her parents shows something else--that Melibea too has been empowered by the demonic forces of lust that have entered her. She becomes the dominant partner in the love affair. Celestina's power has passed to her.

What then of Calisto? After the death of his servants he shows the craven side of his nature and rather than face public mockery--since his dealings with Celestina have become public knowledge--he goes into hiding in his own house and pretends to be away while really carrying on with Melibea at night. It is Melibea's turn, particularly in the second garden scene, to invest her lover with imagined angelic qualities and to make him her god:

MELIB. -¡Oh sabrosa traición, oh dulce sobresalto! ¿Es mi señor de mi alma? ¿Es él? No lo puedo creer. ¿Dónde estabas, luciente sol? ¿Dónde me tenías tu claridad escondida? ¿Había rato que escuchabas? ¿Por qué me dejabas echar palabras sin seso al aire, con mi ronca voz de cisne? Todo se goza este huerto con tu venida. Mira la luna cuán clara se nos muestra, mira las nubes cómo huyen. ¡Oye la corriente agua de esta fontecica, cuánto más suave murmurio y zurrío [y ruzio] lleva por entre las frescas hierbas! Escucha los altos cipreses, cómo se dan paz unos ramos con otros por intercesión de un

templadico viento que los mena. Mira sus quietas sombras, cuán oscuras están y aparejadas para encubir nuestro deleite. (222)

CAL. - Jamás querría, señora, que amaneciese, según la gloria y descanso que mi sentido recibe de la noble conversación de tus delicados miembros.

MELIB. - Señor, yo soy la que gozo, yo la que gano; tú, señor, el que me haces con tu visitación incomparable merced. (223)

Elicia and Areúsa are not quiet either. They have already shown their extraordinary ill will and envy of Melibea in Act IX, the servants banquet, and now vow to take their revenge on her, whom they blame for the deaths of their lovers Sempronio and Pármeno. Elicia has never been much good as a sorceress' apprentice and feels her loss of revenue particularly strongly. She curses the lovers and their garden--Celestina's power seems to have passed to Melibea:

... ¡Oh Calisto y Melibea, causadores de tantas muertes! ¡Mal fin hayan vuestros amores, en mal sabor se conviertan vuestros dulces placeres! Tórnese lloro vuestra gloria, trabajo vuestro descanso. Las hierbas deleitosas, donde tomáis los hurtados solaces, se conviertan en culebras, los cantares se os tornen lloro, los sombreros árboles del huerto se sequen con vuestra vista, sus flores olorosas se tornen de negra color. (201)

Just in case the curse doesn't work, Areúsa from spite enlists the help of her pimp Centurio, a braggart warrior figure, who vows to sort out Calisto and his stable lads Tristán and Sosia in the street. In the event, he's not brave enough even for this and he bribes a friend to give the lads a fight. However the Devil once unleashed by Celestina's spell and Elicia's curse will not sit still. Calisto, in an uncharacteristic act of bravura, hears the altercation outside the garden walls and in his haste to help the lads, he falls to his death from his ladder. His ignominious death would have been hushed up had Melibea been able to endure her fate. But again she decides to act as a free agent and choose her own death by throwing herself from the tower of her father's house, after explaining the situation to Pleberio. Pleberio is left alone over the lifeless body of his daughter

and the senseless body of his wife, lamenting his fate and cursing the power of love:

... Dulce nombre te dieron; amargos hechos haces. No das iguales galardones. Inicua es la ley que a todos igual no es. Alegra tu sonido; entristece tu trato. Bienaventurados los que no conociste o de los que no te curaste. Dios te llamaron otros, no sé con qué error de su sentido traídos. Cata que Dios mata los que crió; tú matas los que te siguen. Enemigo de toda razón, a los que menos te sirven das mayores dones, hasta tenerlos metidos en tu congojosa danza. Enemigo de amigos, amigo de enemigos, ¿por qué te riges sin orden ni concierto? Ciego te pintan, pobre y mozo. Pónente un arco en la mano, con que tires a tiento; más ciegos son tus ministros, que jamás sienten ni ven el desabrido galardón que sacan de tu servicio. Tu fuego es de ardiente rayo, que jamás hace señal do llega. La leña que gasta tu llama, son almas y vidas de humanas criaturas, las cuales son tantas, que de quien comenzar pueda, apenas me ocurre. No sólo de cristianos, mas de gentiles y judíos y todo en pago de buenos servicios. (235-36)

Love becomes the Enemy (or the Devil) and leads the world in its own Dance of Love and Death to an Inferno of lovers. The Devil's power has not necessarily disappeared. It may now simply have reverted to Elicia, the witch's apprentice. If she had lost the Devil's power she will regain it after the deaths in the garden.

I see in all this Rojas' creation of a subversive society, a world upside-down where women are empowered and men are weak. The Devil empowers his client Celestina who runs a society which consists initially of herself and Elicia but then reaches out in concentric circles to include first Areúsa, then Pármemo and Sempronio and Calisto himself, from Calisto's household, then Lucrecia and Melibea from Pleberio's household. Thus the natural order of patriarchy, God-Pleberio-Areúsa-Melibea-Lucrecia, is absorbed into the world of women's misrule. Despite his many complaints of orthodoxy in the introductory material of the work, the *converso* Rojas seems to take a

perverse pleasure in his alternative society of witchcraft, lust and greed run riot.

III. Conclusion: A World of Women

As Gilman intuited in his introduction to my Alianza edition of the text, *Celestina* is a work about urban domesticity which largely takes place within the walls of people's houses--or their walled gardens, the urban version of the *locus amoenus*. He finds the domesticity of Celestina and Elicia one of the few compensations for Rojas' bleak view of life, love and death. But inner space is women's space, as the author makes quite clear. Celestina's house, once flourishing in the red light district, now moved and much diminished,¹³ is at the same time a bawdy house, a factory for perfumes and cosmetics, and a symbol of the misrule of a woman empowered by her illegal professions of sorceress, witch and bawd. Celestina's space encroaches on the patriarchal space of the other characters as she increasingly dominates their houses as well. She visits Calisto's house; he becomes increasingly reclusive until by the end of the work he is trapped in his house, unable to leave except by night when he visits Melibea in her garden. Celestina visits Pleberio's house; Alisa is driven away by witchcraft and the bawd becomes 'madre Celestina'.¹⁴ Melibea takes possession of her own space outside Pleberio's house, the garden which he had planted, which becomes her secret kingdom and a bridgehead for her declaration of freedom from the constraints of patriarchal domination. She seizes and scales the phallic tower of the garden and symbolically takes her own life by jumping from it.

Areúsa too, the other liberated woman of the work, has her own space from which she manages to eject her pimp Centurio. 'En mi pequeña casa, exenta y señora', 'me vivo sobre mí, desde que me sé conocer' (150, 149) she claims proudly in the banquet scene of Act IX, a line echoed by Melibea in Act XVI when she declares her independence from her parents' plans for her future--'No tengo otra lástima sino por el tiempo que perdí de no gozarlo, de no conocerlo, después que a mí me sé conocer' (206).

Yet this world of liberated women is a world of misrule. It has been caused by the actions of one man, Calisto, who declared himself a heretic whose god was his lady Melibea. The Devil, overhearing Calisto's impieties, goes to work through Sempronio.

Celestina, once involved in the plot, conjured up the Devil whose name in this story becomes both the Enemy and Love: 'enemigo de toda razón... Enemigo de amigos, amigo de enemigos, ¿por qué te riges sin orden ni concierto?' (236-37). Lust, greed and even shame about the past in Pármeno's case, all continue to unleash a series of deaths which leave only Pleberio, Elicia and Areúsa as surviving major characters (Lucrecia, Centurio, Tristán and Sosia being bit players). Pleberio by his own admission is finished, but by leaving Elicia and Areúsa alive as Celestina's heirs, Rojas has furnished ammunition for the Celestinesque genre to follow, as well as the female picaresque novel in the line of *La Lozana Andaluza*, *La pícaro Justina*, and finally the English picaresque tradition.

Rojas' basic intuition and the brilliance of the work lie in the fact that Evil can be very attractive, even when personified by an ugly old bawd. Celestina is the evil genius of the work, but her spirit of anarchy seeps into all of the liberated women of the work. Melibea and Areúsa are tremendously attractive in their desire to be free from the chains that bind them to patriarchal society. Although I have always firmly set my face against any notion that there is a secret message about *conversos* concealed in the work and that any single character is secretly a *converso*, a more convincing argument can be made for a marginalized Rojas identifying with these female characters who wish to overthrow the oppressive patriarchy of their society. Within the bounds of what seems to be a rigid orthodoxy, in which only an acute pessimism and the lack of any mention of the afterlife could seem to suggest the influence of his Jewish ancestry, Rojas creates an attractive alternate society of female industry and female sexual liberation. Sex and money mean freedom and power to Celestina and her female acolytes, and that money far exceeds its intrinsic value for her. And although Melibea seems to be giving sex away for free, she too harbours the illusion that Calisto will liberate her from her captivity and run away with her to Moorish lands if necessary.

Of course these are all illusions. The female characters are all beggared by circumstance. Celestina has lost much of her importance and livelihood because of a change in the laws regarding prostitution in late fifteenth-century Spain (see Lacarra above). Elicia is frank about her dependence on Celestina. Areúsa is prey to pimps like Centurio, although she represents the new face of free-lance prostitution. And Melibea deludes herself; Calisto, a coward if ever

there was one, is not even interested in asking for her hand in marriage, much less in abandoning his status as a local *señorito* for her benefit.

At the end of the day, the female characters basically must fall back on one another for comfort and companionship, Elicia on Celestina and Areúsa, Melibea on Lucrecia. Elicia is the least deluded in this respect; she recognizes her dependence on Celestina and knows that she isn't much use as a sorceress' apprentice. She feels the loss of Celestina most keenly, both as 'madre' and breadwinner, and when she sees that her mourning is driving away the goodwill factor that attaches to Celestina's old dwelling, she is quick to shed it. A naturally dependent character, she turns to Areúsa for comfort and protection. It is the self-styled independent woman Areúsa who will proclaim that her art is different from that of Celestina. A new-style prostitute, she'll set up shop alone—a category of free enterprise that was still tolerated after the local city governments took over the public houses of prostitution (Lacarra).

These two are the survivors of Celestina—presumably, along with Lucrecia their cousin, who one imagines would be shown the door by Pleberio after his daughter's death. The two main female protagonists do not survive to the end of the tale. Celestina has been killed by her own courage which degenerated into foolhardiness, not presumably simply because of greed but because the spell she cast had taken possession of her. Melibea's prophecy that her life would end with Calisto's has been self-fulfilling. Like Calisto she made Love her God and he proved to be the Devil. She is the true victim in the work as her prayers have failed to protect her and her Christian charity was turned against her. This I find the most unorthodox aspect of the text. Surely her devotion should have been a protection against the Devil but she seems to succumb rapidly to the Devil in the skein--and to Celestina and Calisto's blandishments. By the end of the work, apparently bereft of orthodox Christian faith despite a last prayer to God, Melibea commits suicide and condemns herself to the flames of Hell, where presumably she hopes to find Calisto ('Espera, que tras ti voy'). As Deyermond has pointed out,¹⁵ she may well not find him there since he called for confession before his death.

Celestina's rebellion has failed. Empowered by the Devil to do his dirty work in the name of Love, she has had a fair amount of success and importance in her life, but in the end it kills her. The

women she touches also become empowered—only briefly in the case of Melibea, but perhaps more lastingly in the cases of Elicia and Areúsa. Elicia basically hates Celestina's black arts--'Yo tengo odio a este oficio, la mueres tras ello' she says, referring not only to the mending of virgins but to the whole profession. Some of Celestina's prestige may remain with Elicia if she plies her trade in prostitution, but the sorcery and witchcraft seem to die with her. Elicia's effective curse on Melibea's garden is her only hint that Celestina's black arts may find a new practitioner.



Valencia 1514. Grabado del 21^o aucto.

NOTES

¹ Peter E. Russell, 'La magia como tema integral de *La Celestina*', *Studia Philologica: Homenaje a Dámaso Alonso* (Madrid: Gredos, 1963), III, 337-54; 2nd ed. in Russell, *Temas de 'La Celestina' y otros estudios, del 'Cid' al 'Quijote'* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1978), 243-76.

² Christine Lerner, *Witchcraft and Religion: The Politics of Popular Belief* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).

³ Stephen Gilman, 'Matthew 5.10 in Castilian Jest and Earnest', in *Studia Hispanica a honorem R. Lapesa* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1972), I, 257-65.

⁴ All references are to my Alianza edition, Madrid, 1969 etc.

⁵ Richard Kieckhefer, *European Witch Trials: Their Foundations in Popular and Learned Culture: 1300-1500* (London: Routledge, 1976); also *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989).

⁶ See Patrizia Botta, 'La magia en *La Celestina*: status quaestiones', in *Magia, alquimia y astrología en la Edad Media. Actas de los Cursos de Verano de la Universidad Complutense, Almería, 29 de julio-2 de agosto, 1991*, ed. Nicasio Salvador Miguel (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, forthcoming).

⁷ (Madrid: Castalia, 1991), 67-76.

⁸ Julio Caro Baroja, 'Witchcraft and Catholic Theology' in *Early Modern European Witchcraft*, ed. B. Ankerloo and G. Henningsen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 17-43.

⁹ Alan Deyermond, "'Hilado-cordón-cadena": Symbolic Equivalence in *La Celestina*', *Celestinesca*, 1.1 (Mayo 1977), 6-12.

¹⁰ For example, Stephen Gilman, *The Spain of Fernando de Rojas: The Intellectual and Social Landscape of 'La Celestina'* (Princeton: University Press, 1972), 357-93.

¹¹ Geoffrey West, 'The Unseemliness of Calisto's Toothache', *Celestinesca*, 3.1 (Mayo 1979), 3-10.

¹² Francisco Márquez Villanueva, *Orígenes y sociología del tema celestinesco* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1993).

¹³ See María Eugenia Lacarra, *Cómo leer 'La Celestina'* (Madrid: Júcar, 1990), 23-29. See also the same author's 'La evolución de la prostitución en la Castilla del siglo XV y la mancebía de Salamanca en tiempos de Fernando de Rojas,' in *Fernando de Rojas and 'Celestina': Approaching the Fifth Centenary*, ed. Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow (Madison: HSMS, 1993), 33-78. Also see Peter Russell, 'Why did Celestina Move House?', in *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516. Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), 155-61.

¹⁴ Jane Hawking, 'Madre Celestina', *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, Sezione Romanza*, 2 (1967), 177-90.

¹⁵ Alan D. Deyermond, "'¡Muerta soy! ¡Confesión!': Celestina y el arrepentimiento a la última hora', in *De los romances villancicos a la poesía de Claudia Rodríguez... homenaje a Gustav Siebenmann*, ed. J.M. López de Abiada and A. Lopez Berna Soech (Madrid: J.E. Estiban, 1984), 129-40.



Valencia 1514. Grabado del 19^o aucto (1).

**CELESTINA "AS A FUNNY BOOK":
A BAKHTINIAN READING**

**Louise Fothergill-Payne
University of Calgary**

Literary criticism is no laughing matter. On the contrary, the more "classical" the text, the more serious the treatment it seems to deserve. This has of course been the case with most Medieval and Renaissance works, from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* to Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel* and Cervantes' *Don Quijote*. Thankfully, within the serious business of literary criticism, Peter Russell's plea to read "*Don Quixote* as a Funny Book" (1969) came as a refreshing reminder that laughter and literature are not mutually exclusive. The result is not to trivialize Cervantes' masterpiece nor, in Peter Russell's words, to deny it "either profundity as a work of art, or its own kind of seriousness." It is in this spirit that I have adapted the title of Peter Russell's article to head this essay.

Serious play, as Huizinga proposed as early as 1933 in his *Homo ludens* lectures, underlies all creative activity. Although Huizinga's analysis of the play elements in culture pays little attention to the specifically comic, it nevertheless fits in with a number of studies that, in the first half of this century, attempted to define the lighter side in life and letters. Sigmund Freud's classical study on *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious* (1905) attempted to analyze the technique, motives and purpose of wordplay, double

entendre and "the species of the comic." In 1924, Bergson tackled the elusive question of what makes us laugh in his still valuable book *Le Rire*, concentrating on high and low comedy. Last but not least, Mikhail Bakhtin brought the world of play into the realm of carnival and liberating laughter in his 1941 doctoral thesis on Rabelais and popular culture. His study was not published until 1965, but the lateness of its arrival was made up for by the enormous popularity of its vision concerning the carnivalesque in literature.¹ Bakhtin has had a considerable influence in literary criticism, creating a network of followers who, more often than not, use Bakhtin's words as a platform for their own ideas. A certain skepticism is therefore called for when invoking Bakhtin in order to "prove" that *Celestina* is a funny book. But still, some of his ideas concerning language and communication are eminently applicable to the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*.

Celestina studies have been comparatively slow to consider the lighter side of the *Tragicomedia* when we take into account the many excellent studies on the ludicu that have appeared in the first half of this century. Interestingly enough, it was again Peter Russell who, in 1957, called our attention to humour and laughter in *Celestina*. This was closely followed by Alan Deyermond's unmasking of the opening scene as a parody of courtly love (1961). Ten years later, June Hall Martin included Calisto in her book on *The Parody of the Courtly Lover* (1972), but only in the last few years has there been an overall revision in *Celestina* studies concerning the comic. This new direction was spearheaded by Dorothy Severin's papers and essays on irony, parody and satire now brought together under the heading of *Novelistic Discourse* (1989). The most recent plea to see the consistent humour in *Celestina* has, however, come from María Eugenia Lacarra

¹ The first translation of this book appeared in English under the title *Rabelais and His World* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1968). The French version, from which I cite, came out in 1970 entitled *L'oeuvre de François Rabelais et la culture populaire au Moyen Age et sous la Renaissance*, Paris: Gallimard. The Spanish translation *La cultura popular en la Edad Media y en el Renacimiento* followed in 1974, Barcelona: Seix Barral.

who, in her book *Cómo leer la Celestina*, urges us to consider the "laughing matter" of the story as a whole.²

In spite of these sporadic efforts, the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* still stands as more a tragic than a comic testimony to the darker side of life and sex. This should not surprise us, considering that Proaza, the "corrector" of the *Comedia* in more senses than one expressly tells readers to bemoan "el trágico fin que todos hobieron." Most critic-readers have followed his advice and have constructed a whole world around Fernando de Rojas that reflects a pessimistic existentialism or a philosophy of life reminiscent of Unamuno's *sentido trágico de la vida*.

Defying the notion that laughter equates with trivialization, I would like here to amplify a conclusion I reached late in the writing of *Seneca and Celestina*, namely that the *Tragicomedia*, far from being a "Stoic" book, is in fact a parody of two cult-figures, Seneca and Petrarch. To extend my argument I include here the cult of courtly love and other venerable institutions and suggest that the parody of cults should be taken in a much wider context than that of texts alone. The target is not only the written word but also the society that created, practised and believed in the validity of such institutions and values.

At the end of a long process of stifling scholasticism, moralistic truisms and the conventions of courtly love, the *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* made its disturbing appearance. In fact, its irreverent references to religion, philosophy and the concept of love, make the book difficult to place. At the risk of seeming simplistic or, worse, of flattening the text, I would like to situate this work in what Bakhtin describes as "la joyeuse littérature récréative des écoliers" (158). After all, genius can be found in youth and students have been judged to be brilliant. Most importantly, being as yet on the margins of society, students can risk a laugh at its hallowed institutions with impunity.

According to Bakhtin, the "rise of laughter," still more or less spontaneous in the Middle Ages, had become an art ("conscience

² In "Complicitous Laughter: Hilarity and Seduction in *Celestina*," Michael Gerli examines how the characters themselves find certain remarks and circumstances surprisingly laughable (*Hispanic Review*, in press).

artistique," 81) in the Renaissance and was in fact essential to achieve both the destruction and renewal of old forms and contexts. But, as Bakhtin is quick to point out, this laughter did not have the biting edge of satire nor the elitist double entendre of irony. Carnavalesque laughter is a "rire de fête," a shared joke and universal in that it mocks the whole world and its institutions.

Thus, *Celestina* comes to represent that "other life" in the world of letters, a world to which Bakhtin refers when he reminds us that, in parallel with serious cults of religion and scholarship, there existed in Medieval society a whole "world upside down" that parodied the same divinities so venerated in everyday life.³ There are the *joca monachorum* of clerics, the goliardic poetry of students, the parody of the sacred embedded in literature of which the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Libro de buen amor* are such striking examples. In the sixteenth century, Bakhtin cites Erasmus' *Laus Stultitiae*, Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel* and Cervantes' *Don Quijote*, to which we should add the whole picaresque genre, as typical examples of playful mockery and liberating laughter.

Outside literature, that is to say in daily life, there also existed a time and a place where a sustained mockery of the established order was accepted and these, Bakhtin believes, are to be found in the festive ambiance of carnival time: "la fête devenait en l'occurrence la forme que revêtait la seconde vie du peuple qui pénétrait temporairement dans le royaume utopique de l'universalité, de la liberté, de l'égalité et de l'abondance" (17).

Mindful of the fact that, on his own admission, Fernando de Rojas wrote the *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* during his holidays when a student at Salamanca, I would like to trace a parallel between student life and carnival time. There is no need here to apply a literalist interpretation of the circumstances surrounding the genesis of *Celestina*. What is important is the tone or, perhaps, the excuse adopted in the prefatory letter which places the *Comedia* in the doubly

³ Carlos Varo refers briefly to *Celestina* in his introduction to the *Carajicomedia* (1981): "A modo de anticipación declaramos que la *Carajicomedia* al igual que la *Celestina* ... pertenece a un cierto tipo de literatura protestataria, libertaria quizá, en sordo inconformismo con los valores sociales y éticos prevalectantes" (9-10). In a footnote he refers to "un futuro desarrollo en forma de libro" of an idea that is worth developing.

extraordinary span of student life and holiday time. Both signify a period in which restrictions of social hierarchy and dominant ideologies are temporarily suspended and where solidarity and mocking laughter reign supreme. In this ambiance of student pranks and freedom, until recently a hallmark of the more traditional universities, youth's rebellion against age and authority is accepted, albeit only temporarily.

Laughter and solidarity, whether in the extraordinary circumstance of carnival time or that of student life, give rise to an equally extraordinary type of communication. That is to say, what seems serious on the outside may well be comic on the inside and thus bring about a complete change that is comprehensible only to the initiated. For the purpose of this essay I will call attention only to three salient features of what Bakhtin calls "carnavalesque communication," a type of discourse that also seems to characterize the Celestinesque dialogue.

* * *

Perhaps the most constant feature that carnivalesque communication and student discourse have in common is a certain mockery that comes to the surface as a smile, a wink, a grin or even a plain guffaw. This laughter brings all that is generally considered elevated, spiritual or abstract down to a material, corporal and concrete level. In turn, what is sacred or venerated becomes an object of mockery thus creating a parody of cults.

By far the most difficult component to analyze is laughter itself. For Peter Russell (1957), "laughter is one of the ways in which a man may self-consciously defy the attempt of circumstances, or fate, to crush him." There is no doubt about it, a pessimistic note hovers over his vision of humour in *Celestina*, as is evident from his remark that "a capacity to appreciate what is comical about human behaviour and utterance is not, of course, incompatible with a very pessimistic understanding of the ultimate human condition." This darker side of laughter has been the mood in most studies on irony in *Celestina* (Ayllón 1970, 1984; Severin 1989). However, like laughter, irony has two faces, one negative, the other positive, "depending on your taste, habits, training, politics, or whatever," as Linda Hutcheon (1992) puts it. In this article she contrasts some positive and negative functions of irony that might well be applicable to laughter as well. On an ever

increasing scale between the positive and the negative of the critical edge, she contrasts complex (positive) as against ambiguous (negative), playful (positive) as against trivializing (negative), corrective and transgressive (positive) as against offensive and defensive (negative) and, at the widest end of the gap between positive and negative positions, she puts inclusionary (positive) as opposed to exclusionary (negative). I would like to consider laughter in *Celestina* in this positive, inclusionary ambient, where the complex game of allusions and references is played out in a group and where the transgression of boundaries is permitted by student mores.

In an attempt to highlight the comic in *The Canterbury Tales*, Laura Kendrick (1988) considers laughter as "a metalinguistic sign," a framing "no" that reverses the meaning of the signs within its bounds. In its assertion that "this is not real," laughter is related to play of all sorts, including literary play or fiction, which denies everyday reality in order to replace it with "a deliberately distorting mimesis" (1). Her debt to Huizinga and Bakhtin is apparent in these words; but she goes further in stressing the necessity of laughter in life where "the strain of ordinary physical and mental labor needed to be relieved or balanced by relaxing pursuits, one of which might be the pleasure of listening to fictions" (41).⁴

Rojas' admission that writing fiction was "tan extraña labor y tan agena de mi facultad" (203) clearly puts his literary pursuits on a different level from his legal studies.⁵ In fact, his choice of the words "extraña labor" brings to mind the otherness of legal studies where language is constrained by "the letter of the law," and speech is encoded in formulaic argumentation. In contrast to the world of fiction, jurisprudence requires proof that is demonstrated by evidence and substantiated by legal authorities in clear and unambiguous terms. To the student of law, the world of fiction must appear a "world upside down," where statements can be made without proof,

⁴ Her book deconstructs "a long tradition of censorship in Chaucer criticism [that] involves ignoring anything that does not seem sufficiently serious in Chaucer's writing, while demonstratively praising that which does" (22). It seems to me that *Celestina* studies still fall in that very critical tradition she is reassessing.

⁵ All quotations are taken from Peter Russell's edition, Madrid: Castalia, 1991. References to his notes and introduction are shown as *Edición*.

relevance to the issue at hand is unnecessary, and where the goal is not Justice, but more often than not, indeterminacy.⁶ In the Celestinesque world, reasoning is chaotic, facts are distorted, language is ambiguous, the *non sequitur* abounds, and authorities are abused. Compared to the practice of law, language and communication in the fictitious world of *Celestina* seem a relief from constrained speech and, as such, a relaxation of tensions in an ambiance of liberating laughter and fun.

But neither the language of law nor that of fiction is "realistic" as both follow certain rules of the game. These, in the Celestinesque dialogue, are similar to what Bakhtin calls "grotesque realism." This is how he designates the process by which all that is held in high esteem is "downed" to the level of the body.⁷ Images of eating and drinking, bodily needs and sexual drives are all expressed in a festive grammar ("grammaire joyeuse") of exclusively physical and erotic categories. The life cycle of conception, pregnancy, birth, growing body, illness, old age, decrepitude and death constitute grotesque contrasts with the classical canon of human beauty and harmony. This festive grammar of body language was, according to Bakhtin, very much the hallmark of the world of scholars in the Middle Ages and lives on to this day in the oral tradition of schools and colleges.

Celestina offers countless examples of this "festive grammar." It should, however, be noted that the grotesque in the *Tragicomedia* is far less pronounced than in the stories of Gargantua and Pantagruel. In Spain, the caricaturesque celebration of the distasteful effects of overeating and other "unmentionable" body functions will have to wait until the advent of the picaresque and its greatest celebrant, Quevedo. The festive grammar in *Celestina* is more in the style of

⁶ I would like to thank Simon Fothergill for clarifying for me a few points concerning the language and practice of Civil Law. See Peter E. Russell, "La *Celestina* y los estudios jurídicos de Fernando de Rojas" (*Temas*, 323-340) and his discussion of Rojas as a student at Salamanca, first in the Facultad de Artes and then in the Facultad de Derecho where he studied mainly Civil or Roman Law (*Edición*, 32-34).

⁷ In "Bakhtin's Grotesque Realism and the Thematic Unity of *Celestina*, Act I," Ricardo Castells analyzes how Act I "progresses from the immaterial space of ideas and images to the physical space of the lower body and the senses"; but he omits any consideration of how humorous this might be.

"wink, wink, ... say no more," such as in Celestina's comparison of Pármeno's "punta de barriga" with the sting of the scorpion, which results in Pármeno's laughter (I, 253). In turn, the laughter during Pármeno's initiation into the delights of lovemaking in Act VII is ours. His polite greetings at the door of Areúsa's bedroom are a superb mimicry of the codified forms in use by the upper classes. But then, Pármeno's courteous "Señora, Dios salve tu graciosa presencia," countered by Areúsa's "Gentilhombre, buena sea tu venida," is rudely interrupted by Celestina's "¡Llégate acá, asno!" (VII, 378). Pármeno's appropriation of polite discourse is again deflated by Celestina when his offer to accompany her home triggers the sexual innuendo "Sería quitar a un sancto por poner en otro"⁸ followed by the explicit "no he temor que me fuerçen en la calle" (VII, 381).

By constantly bringing down the conversation to a corporal and concrete level, Celestina is the true carnivalesque counterpart of polite discourse. She also provides the cheerful background for the encounter with her appreciation of Areúsa's body, touching and tickling her and making her giggle: "¡Passo, madre! No llegues a mí, que me fazes coxquillas y provócasme a reyr, y la risa acreciéntame el dolor" (VII, 372). With the mention of aches and pains we enter that other part of grotesque realism that highlights illness and dubious cures. Areúsa suffers from "la madre," a topic of conversation that triggers a long discussion on how to cure such an inconvenience. This, in turn, leads to the double entendre of Areúsa's wish to talk to Pármeno about it: "hablemos en mi mal" (VIII, 386), meaning to continue the lovemaking the following morning.⁹ Here, Celestina plays a capital role in preparing the scene, from her praise of Areúsa's body to her enthusiasm for Pármeno's sexuality: "un putillo, galillo, barbiponiente, entiendo que en tres noches no se le demude la cresta" (VII, 379). Perhaps our Victorian inheritance is still too strong to enable us to laugh at the body but, "bien mirado," bodies are funny things when seen with a certain detachment. Even Erasmus who, like Rojas, took time off from serious work to write his *Laus Stultitiae*,

⁸ The obscure meaning of this proverb is that "Celestina insinúa irónicamente que, al acompañarla Pármeno, podría ella reemplazar a Areúsa como blanco de los deseos sexuales del joven (*Edición*, 381, n.100).

⁹ Peter Russell clarifies that "el 'mal' persistente de la muchacha es eufemismo por deseo sexual" (*Edición*, 386, n.1). On the nature and implications of this mal see also James Burke's article in this volume.

makes Folly remind us right at the opening of her long speech, that what begets god or men is not "the head nor the face, nor breast, hand or ear, all thought of as respectable parts of the body," but "that part which is so foolish and absurd that it can't be named without raising a laugh" (76).¹⁰

The meal that Pármeno and Sempronio plan the day after the night before could well be termed the apotheosis of the body in that it combines abundance of food with uninhibited sex. Traditionally, a banquet has always been a joyous occasion to celebrate a victory or some other important event. In fact, Bakhtin dedicates a whole chapter of his book on Rabelais to this type of feast arguing that "Le banquet est une pièce nécessaire à toute réjouissance populaire. Aucun acte comique essentiel ne peut se passer de lui" (277). After all, what is here being celebrated is not the daily business of eating and drinking, but togetherness, abundance of food and wine and shared joy. In turn, images of food are intimately linked with the body's growth, its fertility and reproduction and are thus a jubilant confirmation of life. Victory, an essential element in the celebration of a banquet, is, in its broadest sense, a triumph of life over death and, in a more specific way, celebrates the victory over an enemy, the sealing of a pact or the return to peace.

Ironically, the banquet in the *Tragicomedia*, at roughly the midpoint of the story, signals not life but death, in that at its end, Lucrecia comes in with the message that Melibea has capitulated. In other respects though, the meal enjoyed in Celestina's house has all the characteristics of the feast analyzed by Bakhtin. It celebrates not only Pármeno's sexual victory but also the reconciliation between the two servants, to judge by Sempronio's words "no dudo ya tu confederación con nosotros ser la que deve ... y así paz para todo el año ... Comamos y holguemos, que nuestro amo ayunará por todos" (VIII, 392-93). A new alignment has taken place as, moments before entering Areúsa's bed, Pármeno was made to promise "de aquí adelante ser muy amigo de Sempronio y venir en todo lo que quisiere contra su amo en un negocio que traemos entre manos" (VII, 379). Thus, the Celestinesque banquet fits perfectly into Bakhtin's definition

¹⁰ I quote from *Praise of Folly*, translated by Betty Radice with an introduction and notes by A. H. T. Levi (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971).

of an "encadrement adéquat de toute une série d'événements capitaux" (282).

But there is the reversal of the medallion, one that shows the carnivalesque face of laughter turning hallowed institutions and values upside down. In Celestina's house, a banquet traditionally celebrated by the upper classes is enjoyed by servants and prostitutes. The occasion for it is not a peace treaty at the highest political level but "un negocio que traemos entre manos." Conversation is not marked by polite discourse but by flaring tempers and silly jealousies concerning the female body. In fact, Areúsa's grotesque realism in the description of Melibea's physical flaws are a clear counterpoint to Calisto's high-sounding praise of her perfections in Act I. To Areúsa, Melibea's nipples look "como si tres vezes hoviesse parido: no parecen sino dos grandes calabças" and "El vientre, no se le [he] visto, pero juzgando por lo otro, creo que le tiene tan floxo como vieja de cincuenta años" (IX, 408). This is a conscious reverse of Calisto's lengthy, but no less exaggerated, praise of Melibea's bodily excellence. He too mentions her nipples: "la redondeza y forma de las pequeñas tetas, ¿quién te las podrá figurar? ¿que se despereza el hombre quando las mira!" He too refers to the hidden parts of her body: "Aquella proporción que veer yo no pude, sin duda, por el bulto de fuera, juzgo incomparablemente ser mejor que la que París juzgó entre las tres deesas" (I, 231-32). In the end, Celestina manages to redirect their attention with the words "Gozá vuestras frescas mocedades" (IX, 413), and as usual, she supplies the sexual background with her explicit comments on the guests' table manners: "Bendígaos Dios ¡cómo lo reys y holgáys, putillos, loquillos, traviesos! ... ¡Mirá no derribés la mesa!" (IX, 414). Finally, the banquet ends with Sempronio's impatient exhortation, "Alcese la mesa. Yrnos hemos a holgar," which is a clear indication of how food, wine and sex are interrelated needs of the body.

In this respect, it is not entirely out of the question that Rojas might have had a parodic allusion to Plato's *Symposium* in mind, a banquet where love and beauty are discussed in terms of philosophy and aesthetics. Indeed Nicholas Round (1993) has briefly considered such a possibility but rejected the parallel on the grounds that it would have been remarkable that Rojas could have read the *Symposium* before 1500 and even more so that his readers would have recognized the spoof (106).

Where we might be on safer ground would be in taking a closer look at the banquet's space and the characters' occupations. The place is a bawdy house, the interlocutors are servants and prostitutes—we have entered the core of the world of prostitution. To understand the tensions and conflicts surrounding this institution María Eugenia Lacarra (1993) has rendered us an invaluable service with her study on the laws and ordinances regulating prostitution in Salamanca at the time of *Celestina's* appearance.

At exactly that time, prostitution and its revenues came under the control of the Concejo de Salamanca which put an end to the free enterprise that had previously been so profitable for Celestina. At the banquet, Celestina reminisces nostalgically about her private bawdy house when she had nine girls between 14 and 18 years of age and a clientele that comprised "cavalleros, viejos y moços, abades de todas dignidades, desde obispos hasta sacristanes" (IX, 419). Best of all, while the girls worked hard, the profit fell to her: "mío era el provecho, suyo el afán." However, financial and administrative control exercised by the Municipality put an end to all that easy profit. But instead of eradicating the now illegal practice of prostitution, it fostered a network of clandestine operations represented by Celestina, Elicia, and especially Areúsa.

In this light, Areúsa's impassioned speech against servitude is as much a Stoic confirmation of self control and freedom as an accusation against the powers that be. Thus, her final words, "Por esto, madre, he querido más vivir en mi pequeña casa, esenta y señora, que no en sus ricos palacios, sojuzgada y cativa" (IX, 416-17) can be read on more than one level. The irony is that Areúsa's conclusion comes straight from Seneca's *De Vita Beata*, a reference that might not have escaped readers and listeners of the *Tragicomedia*. That in itself is already a comic contrast coming as it does from the mouth of a prostitute. But when we then link the "vita beata" to the happy life of illegal prostitution, the joke is on us. Who does not enjoy an anti-government poke or like to side with the victims of state control?

In Act IX, the official world is turned upside down, Church and State are unmasked as great partners in the world of prostitution, and the upper classes, part of that very network, are derided for their oppression and cruelty to those that serve them. The banquet, that venerated institution of officialdom and propriety, is deflated to its crudest form of abundant food and wine, sex and corruption. With its

denunciation of the powers that be, the hidden meaning of this parody might be that at least the prostitutes' trade is more frank and straightforward than the official world. Moreover, the representatives of the unofficial world in *Celestina* are full of a *joie de vivre* sadly lacking in Pleberio's world.¹¹

The bringing down of all that is held in high esteem to a corporal and concrete level is apparent in every turn of phrase in the Celestinesque discourse. All interlocutors, including the impatient lovers, deflate spiritual values by giving them a concrete, corporal meaning. We see such a transference of meaning in Sempronio's quotation of the Aristotelian maxim "Assí como la materia apetece a la forma, así la muger al varón" (I, 232), to which Calisto immediately gives a literal twist when he sighs "Y cuándo veré yo eso entre mí y Melibea." When he is finally about to experience "eso," he uses the metaphor "el que quiere comer el ave, quita primero las plumas" (XIX, 571), a remark that puts an end to the romantic prelude of sweet songs which greeted his arrival. Throughout the novel, metaphor regains its literal level: such as in the proverb "quien torpemente sube a lo alto, más aína cae que subió," a Senecan *sententia* quoted by both the male servants (Act I and V) and which comes literally true when both fall to their deaths. The abstract meaning of the *sententia* of course also applies to Calisto who, in his hasty retreat from Melibea's garden, falls off the ladder and literally loses his head, judging by Tristán's comment, "Coge, Sosia, esos sesos de essoè cantos; júntalos con la cabeça del desdichado amo nuestro" (XIX, 575).

As many critics have noted how proverb and metaphor literally come true as the story develops, there is no need to elaborate this point here. However, there is one example not touched on before, that corresponds particularly well to the change of direction from abstract to concrete: and that is the concept of *seso*.¹² "Perder el seso," "estar en" or "fuera de seso" are frequently used metaphors to denote a state of mind which is then brought down to a "state of the body." Interestingly, Areúsa is the only one not to end up losing her head in a figurative and literal sense thanks to her "Stoic" decision

¹¹ See Deyermond (1993) where he makes the same contrast between Sempronio's male macro-society and *Celestina*'s female micro-society (10).

¹² I have dealt with this concept in its Stoic connotation in *Seneca and Celestina* (51, 72, 86, 104, 114, 141).

to go independent, a detachment that merits Celestina's comment "En tu seso has estado. Bien sabes lo que hazes" (IX, 416-17).

By contrast, Pármeno's sexual victory immediately puts him among the ranks of doomed lovers; as Sempronio puts it: "¿Ya todos amamos? ¡El mundo se va a perder! Calisto a Melibea, yo a Elicia; tú, de embidia, has buscado con quien perder esse poco de seso que tienes" (VIII, 388). But Sempronio does not keep his head either, as moments before his death he comes to Celestina's house in a rage and bursts out "Por Dios, sin seso vengo, desesperado" (XII, 477). Calisto's sudden infatuation with Melibea had already been described by Sempronio in Act I as "tan contrario acontecimiento que assí tan presto robó el alegría deste hombre, y lo que peor es, junto con ella el seso" (I, 216). This state of mind is matched by Melibea's, for she is frequently described as being "fuera de seso," as when Celestina mentions the name Calisto, which on Melibea's own admission "era bastante para me sacar de seso" (IV, 321). Finally, as we hear from Lucrecia, she loses all her senses during Celestina's second visit: "El seso tiene perdido mi señora. Gran mal es éste" (X, 432). Like Calisto, Sempronio and Pármeno, Melibea ends up "hecha pedaços" (XXI, 595).

* * *

So much for "el trágico fin que todos hubieron" and Calisto and Melibea's stumbling appropriation of the outmoded code of courtly love.¹³ But the cult of love is only one of many that is deflated with a liberating laughter in the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Another cult to come tumbling down from Olympus is the reverence rendered to Seneca and Petrarch, and through these "auctoritates" to that whole literature of moralizing anthologies, *sententiae* and proverbs that characterizes the taste of the fifteenth-century "new reader."

Interestingly, the discourse of all interlocutors in *Celestina* reflects and imitates the content of these short-cuts to learning that I like to call the *Readers' Digest* of the age. The student authors of the

¹³ Proaza's pessimistic admonition contained in the strophe "Toco cómo se devía la obra llamar tragicomedia y no comedia" seems to have been an afterthought as it appears for the first time in the Valencia 1514 edition of the *Tragicomedia* (Edición, 615, n. 19).

Tragicomedia clearly liked to poke fun at precisely that pseudo-knowledge of the fifteenth-century *Readers' Digest* consumer whose wisdom was based on spouting maxims and famous sayings. Thus, the nouveau-riche of learning comes to be an ideal target for parody with his or her excessive quoting (and misquoting) of *auctoritates*, *non-sequitur* in discourse, and ill-remembered maxims, which cause those in the know to exchange a conspiratorial wink.

Celestina is full of such commonplaces drawn in the main from the Index to Petrarch's works or the pseudo-Senecan *Proverbs*. For example, during her first visit to Melibea Celestina stacks up four *sententiae* culled from the Index: "no es vencido sino el que se cree serlo" (IV, 316), "ninguna tempestad mucho dura" (IV, 317), "la verdad no es necesario abundar de muchas colores" (IV, 318), and "a la firme verdad el viento del vulgo no la empece" (IV, 320). All these truisms are paired with the most common proverbs and Senecan *sententiae*, a "coincidence" that shows how much of a commonplace some of these sayings were at the time. More interestingly though, it also shows what company Seneca and Petrarch were keeping when it came to wisdom and philosophy. The most pedestrian *sententiae* are, however, to be found in Act X during Celestina's second visit to Melibea. We find these Petrarchan quotations drawn from the Index: "Lo duro con duro se ablanda más eficazmente," "nunca peligro sin peligro se vence," and "pocas veces lo molesto sin molestia se cura y un clavo con otro se espele" (X, 434). Part of the humour resides, to be sure, in the quick succession of these platitudes proffered in one and the same breath.

In contrast to these pedestrian commonplaces, the interlocutors also indulge in extreme flights of fancy in their speech. Their verbal affectation consists not only in verbosity and excessive use of *sententiae* but also in a certain artificiality or plain nonsense.¹⁴ Calisto especially is prone to this verbal excess, as when he is the proud possessor of Melibea's sash. Overcome by emotion he cites in quick succession the *exemplum* of Adelecta (VI, 345), a prophetess from Petrarch's *De rebus memorandis*, the mal à propos of Alcibiades "que se veyá embuelto en el manto de su amiga, y otro día

¹⁴ For the relation between affectation and the Stoic concept of *affectus* see my "Afecto, afeción y afectación en *Celestina*," *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos*, 15 (1990-91), 401-10.

matáronle" (VI, 348), of classical and mythological figures such as Dido and Aeneas, Venus, Helen of Troy, Polixena, one of Achilles girlfriends, and so on. Again, the quick succession of these *exempla* coupled with the sheer pedantry of the catalogue would add to the general merriment.

Melibea's verbal affectation is equally ridiculous when, for instance, she compares Celestina's power with the words "quando vio en sueños aquel grande Alexandre, rey de Macedonia, en la boca del dragón la saludable rayz con que sanó a su criado Tolomeo del bocado de la bívora" (X, 428-9), or when to justify her suicide she cites *exempla* of those who inflicted pain on their family and relations, and crowns her long list of evil-doers with what almost sounds like an afterthought: "Finalmente, me ocurre aquella gran crueldad de Phrates, rey de los parthos, que, por que no quedasse sucesor después dél, mató a Orode[s], su viejo padre, y a su único hijo y treynta hermanos suyos" (XX, 584).¹⁵ Readers and listeners should by now be in stitches, but curiously enough, critics anticipating Melibea's imminent suicide and mindful of her poor father who has helplessly to endure her long speech before witnessing his only daughter fall to her death, have not been able to spot how ridiculous her speech nor the situation are. But then, how could they? The death of a child, the bereavement of a father, solitude and nothingness are no laughing matter.

* * *

This brings us to Pleberio's lament and, inevitably, the question of whether Pleberio could be a comic figure as well. Of the characters whose revision was long overdue, Melibea and even Celestina have been the latest to be unmasked for what they are: Melibea has had to relinquish her status as tragic victim of circumstances (Lacarra, 1989) and Celestina as a sinister figure endowed with diabolic powers (Severin 1993). When it comes to Pleberio, however, most critics draw the line, hearing in his lament an overwhelmingly sad note which would explain the deep pessimism of the *Tragicomedia* as a whole. But María Eugenia Lacarra (1990) sums up the view of a

¹⁵ For a serious, but not therefore less valid, analysis of Melibea's inappropriate catalogue and other *auctoritates* in *Celestina* see George Shipley, "Authority and Experience in *La Celestina*," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 62 (1985), 95-111.

growing number of critics when she says that Pleberio is hardly the person to explain the world to us and least of all to be the spokesman for universal truths. As she puts it in her inimitable style, "La visión fatalista que presenta es una verdad de perogrullo" (103).

It seems to me that the amount of empathy we bring to our reading is a deciding factor in whether we interpret Pleberio's long speech as tragic or comic. Bakhtin has some very pertinent thoughts on the act of reading, that precarious balancing act of entering into a text while still "maintaining one's own place" outside it. "In empathy," he says, "one tries to merge totally with the suffering other and to experience the world entirely from the other's place. But even if such 'pure in-dwelling' were possible, it would in any case be unproductive because total identification precludes the capacity to contribute something new: 'in someone else's place I am as without meaning as I am in my own place'" (quoted from Morson & Emerson 1989, 95). Later on, he again stresses the importance of creative understanding as against passive understanding or empathy, because the latter "simply reproduces what is already there." Total identification with the grieving father would of course make any lighthearted reading impossible and would almost impose a tragic interpretation. However, contrary to prevailing opinion, I would argue that Pleberio's lament is consistent with the preceding Acts and should in fact make us laugh and not cry.

To produce laughter, Bergson says, three conditions must be met: first, the object must be a human being, as one does not laugh at inanimate objects or animals unless these have somehow been invested with human traits, and second, the object should not evoke our sympathy, insensibility at the time of laughing being crucial: "Le rire n'a pas de plus grand ennemi que l'émotion ... il faudra oublier cette affection, faire taire cette pitié." In fact, he urges us to detach ourselves: "détachez-vous ... assistez à la vie en spectateur indifférent: bien des drames tourneront à la comédie" (5). This is exactly the point made by Alonso López Pinciano, quoted by Peter Russell in his article on "Don Quixote as a Funny Book." Speaking of comedy, Pinciano states in his *Philosophia antiqua poetica*, III, 24 and 26: "aunque en los actores aya turbaciones y quexas, no passan, como he dicho, en los oyentes, sino que de la perturbación del actor se fina el oyente de risa." An important detail here is that Pinciano talks about "oyentes," which points to a group of listeners and not the solitary reader who is free to follow his or her own associations.

And this brings us to Bergson's third condition for producing laughter, and that is the importance of the group: "votre rire est toujours le rire d'un groupe," he says; "le rire cache une arrière-pensée d'entente, je dirais presque de complicité, avec d'autres rieurs, réels ou imaginaires" (7). Laughter thus becomes a social condition: "Le rire doit répondre à certaines exigences de la vie en commun. Le rire doit avoir une signification sociale" (6-8).

Reading in the fifteenth century was indeed a social activity, involving one reader who read aloud to a circle of friends. The importance of hearing rather than reading a text has been illustrated by Dorothy Severin in her paper on "Celestina as a Comic Figure" (1993) which, being read aloud at the *Celestina* Conference where it was given, had all the persuasive intonations to make her audience agree that Celestina is indeed very funny. Similarly, Proaza recommended "mill artes y modos" while reading the *Tragicomedia* to the hearers ("oyentes"), "llorando y riendo en tiempo y sazón" (614). We will never know whether Pleberio's lament constituted "tiempo y sazón" for laughter or tears, but for those who are prepared to see Pleberio as a comic figure there seems ample scope to bring out not the sublime but the ridiculous of his lament.

How to make people look comic has been studied by Freud in *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*. "The principal means," he says, is "to put them in situations in which a person becomes comic as result of human dependence on external events, particularly on social factors, without regard to the personal characteristics of the individual concerned" (199). In the case of Pleberio, we have had very little opportunity to know his "personal characteristics"; in fact he strikes us rather as an automaton who cites on cue the most blatant truisms and fallacies concerning external events such as fortune and the world (Fothergill-Payne 1988, 91-95; 115). This sort of rigidity is what makes one laugh, according to Bergson. In fact, such a person ceases to be a character and becomes "un mécanisme superposé à la vie" (46). The comic, then, as described in *Le rire*, is that aspect of a person that makes him or her resemble a puppet on a string that voices "une imperfection individuelle ou collective qui appelle la correction immédiate. Le rire est cette correction" (88). How to give voice to such a person is of course a matter of acting the role, and mimicry would be the indicated mode.

Mimicry, according to Freud, "gives quite extraordinary pleasure to the hearer and makes its object comic even if it is still far from the exaggeration of a caricature" (200). This middle road between the sublime and the ridiculous achieved by mimicry is indeed the way in which I would like to read Pleberio's lament.

Mimicry is imitation in performances, but not all imitation is successful. What distinguishes a good from a bad imitation is the capacity to add something new. Simply copying the model word for word would amount to "theft" or plagiarism. On the other hand, the model should not be disguised to the extent that it is no longer recognizable (D.A. Russell 1981, 112). Good imitation then should contain an element of novelty while still leaving room to appreciate a skillful *imitatio*, and this I would suggest is the literary invention or as María Lida de Malkiel would call it, the "originality" of the concluding Act. This invention or novelty then engages the readers and listeners in an active play of spotting references rather than "passive" empathy with the speaker.

As critics have pointed out, Pleberio's lament imitates the prescribed rules of the *planctus* but he derives no solace from it. He imitates Stoic philosophy but gets it all wrong; he asks a number of rhetorical questions which, by their very nature, need no answer. Apart from imitating a number of "models" such as Seneca's philosophy on grieving, Petrarchan *exempla* and the *planctus* genre in general, the most recognizable literary model is the *Cárcel de amor*, recently studied in detail by Luis Miguel Vicente (1988) and Dorothy Severin (1989). But while Severin records only the similarities between the speeches in the *Cárcel de amor* and *Celestina*, Vicente brings out the differences. And here to my mind lies the value of source study and intertextuality: it is not just a question of pointing to textual references but rather to bringing out the discrepancies between model and imitation, all the while keeping the source in mind.

As Vicente reminds us, Pleberio contravenes the rules of an authentic lament by omitting half the prescribed elements of the elegiac form: the *laus* and the *consolatio*. But then, how could Pleberio have praised Melibea's virtues as she had just informed him that she was neither innocent nor good? Melibea's only value in Pleberio's eyes is that of heiress to his accumulated goods and companion in his old age. By the very impossibility of adhering to the *laus* and the

consolatio, Rojas may well have wanted to bring out the inappropriateness of the *planctus* model and ridicule its *imitatio*. Another discrepancy between model and imitation is "la causa de morir" of the two deaths. In Vicente's words, Melibea is "una suicida por amor carnal" while "Leriano muere en servicio de la fama de Laureola." Yet another difference brought out in this excellent article is that in *Cárcel de amor* there is no antagonism between God and the World, "sencillamente no hay mundo." By contrast, in Pleberio's lament the World is the great wrongdoer and the formidable enemy which he addresses in person, the unreliable spoilsport of all his expectations. The greatest contrast is, however, the one between the speakers themselves: while the lament in *Cárcel de amor* is pronounced by a woman, Pleberio is a man. What can we deduce of such a crossover? Would the imitation of a well-known female complaint have coloured the "mimicry" of Pleberio's "voice"? And what about Melibea's mother? Could there not also be an implied contrast between Alisa and the grieving mother in *Cárcel de Amor*? As is often the case, the consideration of absences is as important as that of presences in the game of intertextuality. Indeed, the absence of Alisa's voice in Pleberio's lament may well point to "her unspoken complicity in the seduction of Melibea" (Gerli, in press).

Cárcel de amor may have been a model for imitation, but Fernando de Rojas' re-fashioning of the "llanto" is, at first glance, cruel. But then, so is the concept of love in the sentimental romance. As Keith Whinnom points out in his introduction to *Cárcel de amor*, courtly love with its belief in perfect love and the perfect lover was an impossible concept. Values like chastity, eternal love and constancy, self sacrifice for an impossible ideal are not values but fallacies. *Celestina* could well have been a corrective to all the psychological tension and agony presented in the sentimental romance, showing, as it does, the role of sex and the body in this fascinating process we call "falling in love."

In a Bakhtinian sense then, Pleberio's lament brings all that is abstract and spiritual in the sentimental romance down to the concrete and corporal level. Consequently, one could extend the parody in Pleberio's lament to the whole of the *Tragicomedia*, where the cult of courtly chastity and suffering is juxtaposed with a grotesque realism that emphasizes sex and pure joy in the body. Seen this way, laughter in *Celestina* is both destructive and liberating: it destroys the notion of courtly love as a model for courting and

liberates the readers and listeners from believing in a stifling code of behaviour perpetuated by the poets as true and valuable. Poets should, however, not be blamed for presenting these beliefs as moral truths. More likely, the butt of mockery in Rojas' parody were students of literature and more especially those readers of the sentimental romance who were unable to separate fiction from reality. In this respect, Fernando de Rojas was not very different from Cervantes in that he did not so much criticize a genre but rather the readers' "empathy" with its heroes.

* * *

Parody and laughter in *Celestina* can thus be seen as a corrective to a number of literary fallacies that were "doing the rounds" at the end of the fifteenth century. In an excellent article on "Parody, History and Metaparody," Gary Saul Morson speaks of the parodic genre as an "anti-genre which can be identified by the membership of its works in a tradition of similar works and the existence (or readers' assumption of the existence) of a set of conventions governing the interpretation of those works" (75). Parody may not always be apparent to twentieth-century readers because it implies currency; or, in Morson's words, "Parody locates a text in its compromising context, we tend not to engage in parody when that context is either unfamiliar or uninteresting" (75). But students at the University of Salamanca in the last decade of the fifteenth century would have been able to spot this network of allusions and references to the sentimental romances, the works of Petrarch, and the Senecan translations and anthologies, which were *auctoritates* highly valued by students of literature and which, for that very reason, might have provoked the mockery of a student of law. The very excess or inappropriateness of the literary references that colour the *argumento* of the *Tragicomedia* should also alert literary critics to its parodic use. But then, we may have lost some part of what Huizinga calls our "facultas ludendi," that is to say, the ability to see life, literature and art as a game to be played in various ways and on various levels.

When the first readers of the *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* sat together to hear the work, they were actively engaged in a serious form of play, spotting references and allusions in competition with one another, agreeing and disagreeing because of their varying understanding of the book. Indeed, Rojas alludes to this competitive game of reading when he says in the Prologue: "quando diez

personas se juntaren a oyr esta comedia, en quien quepa esta diferencia de condiciones, como suele acaescer, ¿quién negará que aya contienda en cosa que de tantas maneras se entienda?" (201). This element of "contienda" or contest is one of the many aspects of play that Huizinga detects in culture and particularly in the academic milieu. Other elements present in literature are cult, entertainment, artistry, enigma, persuasion, and wisdom (148).

Interestingly, some of these characteristics coincide with Bakhtin's approach to the literary text, particularly where ceremonies, festive occasions, social functions, artistry, and wisdom are concerned. Both also agree that playing means a temporary suspension of the normal world, that play is bound by limitations of time and space but is infinitely repeatable, which is to say each time carnival comes around for Bakhtin, and for Huizinga each time a text is read and re-read. Contest and opposition, the most basic characteristics of play, are as essential for change and renewal as are gentle mockery and liberating laughter. For an understanding of "how to read *Celestina*," it might be wise to combine Huizinga's list of the more serious play elements with Bakhtin's carnivalesque vision of a world upside down.

Finally, we have only to point to Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*, "the best known work of the greatest of the renaissance humanists" (Levi 7), to realize that laughter does not exclude a moral lesson. Better still, let Erasmus have the final word: "Jokes can be handled in such a way that any reader who is not altogether lacking in discernment can scent something far more rewarding in them than in the crabbed and specious arguments of some people we know" (59).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ayllón, Cándido. *La perspectiva irónica de Fernando de Rojas*. Madrid: Porrúa Turanzas, 1984.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *L'Oeuvre de François Rabelais et la culture au Moyen Age et sous la Renaissance*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970.
- Bergson, Henri. *Le Rire*. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1931. *Carajicomedia*. Edited by Carlos Varo. Madrid: Editorial Playor, 1981.
- Castells, Ricardo. "Bakhtin's Grotesque Realism and the Thematic Unity of *Celestina*, Act I." *Hispanófila* 106 (1992), 9-20.
- Deyermond, Alan. "The Text-Book Mishandled: Andreas Capellanus and the Opening Scene of *La Celestina*." *Neophilologus* 45 (1961), 218-21.
- . "Female Societies in *Celestina*." *Fernando de Rojas and Celestina: Approaching the Fifth Centenary*. Edited by Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow. Madison: The Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1993. 1-31.
- Diego de San Pedro. *Obras Completas II. Cárcel de Amor*. Edited by Keith Whinnom. Madrid: Castalia, 1983.
- Erasmus of Rotterdam. *Praise of Folly; and Letter to Martin Dorp, 1515*. Translated by Betty Radice with an Introduction and Notes by A. H. T. Levi. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Fothergill-Payne, Louise. *Seneca and Celestina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . "Afecto, afección y afectación en *Celestina*." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 15 (1990-91), 401-10.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious*. Translated and edited by James Strachey. New York: The Norton Library, 1963.
- Gerli, E. Michael. "Complicitous laughter: Hilarity and Seduction in *Celestina*." *Hispanic Review*, in press.
- Huizinga, J. *Verzamelde Werken V. Homo ludens*, 26-246. Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink, 1950. English translation: *Homo ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*. New York, 1955.
- Hutcheon, Linda. "The Complex Functions of Irony." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos*, 16 (1992), 219-234.
- Kendrick, Laura. *Chaucerian Play: Comedy and Control in The Canterbury Tales*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Lacarra, María Eugenia. "La parodia de la ficción sentimental en la *Celestina*." *Celestinesca* 13:1 (1989), 11-29.

- . *Cómo leer La Celestina*. Madrid: Ediciones Júcar, 1990.
- . "La evolución de la prostitución en la Castilla del siglo XV y la mancebía de Salamanca en tiempos de Fernando de Rojas." *Fernando de Rojas and Celestina: Approaching the Fifth Centenary*. 33-78.
- Martin, June Hall. *Love's Fools: Aucassin, Troilus, Calisto and the Parody of the Courtly Lover*. London: Tamesis, 1972.
- Morson, Gary Saul. "Parody, History, and Metaparody." *Rethinking Bakhtin. Extensions and Challenges*. Edited by Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1989. 63-86.
- and Caryl Emerson. "Towards and Philosophy of the Act." *Rethinking Bakhtin. Extensions and Challenges*. 5-30.
- Round, Nicholas. "Celestina, Aucto I: A Platonic Echo and its Resonances." *Fernando de Rojas and Celestina: Approaching the Fifth Centenary*. 93-112.
- Russell, Donald Andrew. *Criticism in Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- Russell, Peter E. "The Art of Fernando de Rojas." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 34 (1957), 160-67.
- . "Don Quixote as a Funny Book." *Modern Language Review*, 64 (1969), 312-26. Spanish trans. in *Temas de 'La Celestina' y otros estudios. Del 'Cid' al 'Quijote'*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1978. 407-40'
- . "La Celestina y los estudios jurídicos de Fernando de Rojas." *Temas de 'La Celestina'*, 323-40.
- (ed). *Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Madrid: Castalia, 1991.
- Severin, Dorothy S. *Tragicomedy and Novelistic Discourse in Celestina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "Celestina as a Comic Figure." *Fernando de Rojas and Celestina: Approaching the Fifth Centenary*. 165-180.
- Shipley, George A. "Authority and Experience in *La Celestina*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 62 (1985), 95-111.
- Vicente, Luis Miguel. "El lamento de Pleberio: contraste y parecido con dos lamentos en *Cárcel de amor*." *Celestinesca* 12:1 (1988), 35-43.

THE
SPANISH BAWVD,

REPRESENTED
IN CELESTINA:

OR,
The Tragicke-Comedy of
CALISTO and MELIBEA.

*Wherein is contained, besides the pleasantnesse and sweetenesse
of the stile, many Philosophicall Sentences, and profitable
Instructions necessary for the younger sort :*

*Shewing the deceits and subtilties housed in the bowes of false
seruants, and Cunny-catching Bawds.*



LONDON
Printed by J. B. And are to be sold by
RALPH MABBE. 1631.

TRANSILLUMINATING TRISTAN

David Hook
King's College London

Peter Russell's succinct account of Tristán very effectively covers the main aspects of his role as a character in the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, noting in a dozen lines the possibility of semantic significance in his name, his perspicacity in spite of his youth, his similarities to the early Pármeno, his loyalty to Calisto, and his effectiveness in a crisis.¹ Similar points are made by Peter N. Dunn, who treats Sosia and Tristán together, drawing attention to contrasts between them and their predecessors:

Sosia is a stable-lad with mud on his boots, boyish and awkward [...]. Tristán is more experienced and wiser. Again, a contrasting pair, an older and a younger partner, one ready to advise and another willing to learn. [...] More important than the contrast of complementary traits between Tristán and Sosia, is that between this pair of servants and the former pair. Pármeno, after he lost his innocence and his self-respect, gloried in his readiness to run away [...], and he went wild with joy on inventing some good reason for not exposing himself to risk. [...] Tristán and Sosia, who have, presumably, seen less service and have not until now been personal valets, are sober and reliable.²

Dunn gives a positive evaluation of Sosia and Tristán; commenting on the conversation in the *Tragicomedia* when they discuss Sosia's visit to Areúsa, he observes that 'These are the first honest voices that we have heard in a long time, having nothing to conceal, not on the make, not deluded, not driven by fantasies. In this sense they are to be contrasted with everyone (except the earlier Pármene) and not just with their predecessors. They belong to a world without Celestina and without artificial paradises' (122).

The observations of Russell and Dunn encapsulate the main critical responses to Tristán, commentary on whom is scattered through much other criticism of the work. For Joseph V. Ricapito, for instance, Sosia and Tristán are 'quick-fix supernumeraries'.³ He continues: 'The later use of Sosia and Tristán essentially follows the pattern set by Sempronio and Pármene. They [...] belong to a lower narrative level than Sempronio and Pármene whose actions are fundamental to the action of the work.' As will be seen, this judgement, whilst obviously valid on one level, may be somewhat more debatable from other points of view, particularly in the case of the *Tragicomedia*. The relationship between Sempronio/Pármene and Sosia/Tristán is also examined by Miguel Marciales.⁴ Perceiving a problem with a noble household containing only four servants, he explains this in schematic terms:

Un joven y rico heredero, como Calisto, no podía tener escasamente cuatro servidores: el uno el tipo del criado-confidente corrompido y maleado, el otro lo opuesto, el tipo del criado fiel que va a ser corrompido y maleado, y cuando estos desaparecen y sólo entonces, los reemplazan un mozo de caballos y un page [*sic*]. Pero es que se trata de tipos esquemáticos, en cierto modo heredados de las comedias latinas, elegíacas y humanísticas, pero hechos más estrictos y en correspondencia geométrica.

According to this, Calisto lives 'en una casa esquemática con un simbólico par de servidores que son geoméricamente sustituidos al morir, por otro simbólico par. El criado ya corrompido tiene ya su manceba fija y el criado que va a ser corrompido va también a tener la suya.' In the accompanying diagram, Marciales links Sosia with Sempronio, and Pármene with Tristán, and places these pairs in a relationship with Elicia and Areúsa respectively. There are some

problems here, for Sosia is sexually captivated by Areúsa not Elicia, though the latter indeed knows about him (527), and he knows a suspicious amount about her (516). Tristán may possibly have an established amorous relationship, as we shall see; but it is not with Areúsa, for whom, in the *Tragicomedia*, he professes scorn ('*marcada ramera*', 563; '*malvada hembra*', '*arufianada muger*', 564). A simple equivalence of Sosia/Sempronio and Tristán/Pármemo is not appropriate either, since, as already noted, significant contrasts as well as points of similarity exist between the servants.

This point is well made in what is probably the longest single commentary on Tristán, that by María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, who studies his role and character in the text as a whole in her examination of the servants in *Celestina*. She relates him to Pármemo, but with important reservations: '*Se asemeja a Pármemo en edad y agudeza, pero estas notas, combinadas con las circunstancias en que actúa, determinan reacciones distintas y aun opuestas a las de Pármemo [...] Tiene la agudeza pero no el resentimiento de Pármemo*'.⁵

There are, however, problems with her approach, since it is based on a reading of Tristán's role in the *Tragicomedia* and does not take account of modifications made during the change from the sixteen-act to the twenty-one-act text. It also contains some questionable interpretations; thus she notes that Sosia's admiration inspires Tristán with so much self-confidence that it becomes '*temeridad*' in offering to climb the ladder with Calisto (615), but at this point Sosia has expressed no admiration for Tristán whatsoever, so that this explanation has no textual basis.

A global interpretation of any character on the basis of the final state of the twenty-one-act version is, of course, from one point of view an appropriate critical approach: this, after all, is the basis on which most readers will have proceeded on any but their first reading of the text from the first publication of the *Tragicomedia*. It may prove fruitful, however, in the case of Tristán to follow an alternative approach of examining the emergence of the character as the narration proceeds, and charting any changes which occur in the various phases in the development of *Celestina*. Otherwise, what is offered is a monolithic interpretation in which comments or actions from later in the text or added in a later stage of the work are allowed to establish a set of defining characteristics which do not, perhaps, always accord with evidence from earlier in the sequence of events or from previous states of the text. As Peter Russell reminds

us, the *Comedia* 'es una obra autónoma que tuvo (y todavía tiene) su propia vida de libro' (12).

In the *Comedia*, Tristán is introduced first in Aucto XIII, when Calisto calls for his servants: '¡Tristanico! ¡Moços! ¡Tristanico! ¡Leuanta[te] de ay!'⁶ In the edition by Peter Russell, the text reads '¡Moços! ¡Tristanico! ¡Levantá de ay!' (488), omitting the first 'Tristanico' offered by the earliest editions. If this is regarded as an anticipatory duplication produced in the transmission of the text, then its editorial omission is justifiable, but there remains a literary problem. In the early printed editions, Calisto's first word calls an entirely new character; in Russell's text, he appears to first call his servants, without being much concerned which of them responds, and only then calls Tristán. Even here, Tristán is still, of course, a wholly new introduction, and since Calisto does not appear to have got out of bed, it is difficult to assume that he has simply stumbled across Tristán while looking for a servant. That Calisto should now call a character never previously mentioned has been considered an artistic weakness by James R. Stamm.⁷ The technique of introducing a new character with his being called by name by Calisto is, however, the one previously used for Sempronio (213) and Pármeno (239). More important, perhaps, is the fact that, since he is addressed with a diminutive by his master, the first reference to Tristán in the text is also the first evaluation of him; but its significance is not immediately clear, for, despite María Rosa Lida de Malkiel's confident statement that 'entra en escena con el diminutivo que indica su edad' (614), the implications of that diminutive could be affective, physical, or status-related as well as chronological, and at this stage the reader is given no further information with which to interpret it.

The question of Tristán's being held in special affection by Calisto need not, I think, detain us overlong; Calisto's egocentricity and general lack of regard for others rapidly enable us to treat this possibility as unlikely: a judgement later confirmed by his rough rejection of Tristán's offer to climb the ladder, 'Quedaos, locos' (499). (Possible motives for his sudden onset of apparent concern for Tristán and Sosia outside the garden later are considered below). The greater likelihood of an age-related, rather than any other, explanation of Tristán's diminutive appears to be supported by another reference later in the *Comedia* to his relative youth: while listening to Calisto and Melibea making love in the garden, he calls himself a *mochacho* (502). It is interesting, however, that the diminutive is used only by

his master (488, 495), while Sosia, on the other hand, consistently addresses him with the simplex 'Tristán' (499, 502),⁸ as does Lucrecia (576). This raises the question of whether his youth is the only factor to be taken into account, or whether the situation is complicated by his status in the household. In the absence of a full study of contemporary onomastic practice, it is difficult to offer much specific evidence, but there are indications from other fifteenth-century Spanish sources that diminutives were routinely applied to servants. An extreme literary manifestation of this is provided by the *Arcipreste de Talavera's* hysterical woman, who utters diminutives and curses almost simultaneously to her household:

¡Moças, fijas de putas, venid acá! ¿Dónde estades, moças? ¡Mal dolor vos fiera! ¿Non podes rresponder 'Señora'? ¡Ha, agora, landre que te fiera! Y ¿dónde estauas? [...] Pues, corre en vn punto, *Juanilla*, ve a casa de mi comadre, dile sy vieron una gallyna rruvia de una calça bermeja. *Marica*, anda, ve a casa de mi vezina, verás si pasó allá mi gallina rruvia. *Perico*, ve en un salto al vicario del arçobispo [...] *Alo[n]sillo*, ven aca [...] Llámame, *Juanillo*, al pregonero que m[e] la pregone por toda esta vezindad!⁹

Evidence from literary texts is, of course, subject to various reservations, and a preferable source is contemporary archival materials in order to come as close to social reality as possible. Fernando González Ollé's examination of the diminutive includes its use in the *Cuentas de Gonzalo de Baeza*, the treasurer of Queen Isabel.¹⁰ He concludes that the frequent use of diminutives to designate servants represents 'la denominación con que los correspondientes sujetos (de la mayoría consta expresamente su condición de servidores reales [...]) eran conocidos en la corte' (138-139), and that these diminutive forms 'han de considerarse como sus denominaciones habituales' (104). The accounts of Gonzalo de Baeza give, however, no indication of the age of the servants thus designated. In this respect, the following extract from the Inquisition documents relating to the trial of Mayor González in 1511 is more revealing:

Preguntada que moços e moças a avido en la dicha casa [...] dixo que a la dicha su hermana Elena, e Maria e Ysabel, esclabas, que son defuntas, e Catalina,

que es de Argamasilla, hija de Diego de la Villa [...], vna Pasculina, conversa, de hedad de doze años, fija de Juan Sanches, vesino de Malagon, e Françisca, donzella, fija deste testigo, que es de hedad de diez e seys años [...]. E que agora tienen en casa dos moços, el vno se llama Miguelito, hijo de Miguel Rodrigues, vesino de Las Casas, e Juanico, de diez e ocho años, hijo de Juan Moños que vive en Las Casas.¹¹

Here, Pasculina, aged twelve, Miguelito, of unspecified age, and the eighteen-year-old Juanico all have diminutives; whether the latter's may have been dictated to some extent by the need to differentiate him from his father Juan is a moot point, since the latter was not resident in the establishment concerned. Clearly if this household and that of Queen Isabel were typical, servants might be identified with a diminutive instead of their actual name as a matter of course even at the age of eighteen. The overtones of the diminutive 'Tristanico' might therefore have been a source of some initial uncertainty for contemporary readers; but on balance the age-related explanation should probably be regarded as paramount in view of the later explicit statement in the text about Tristán's youth (though his precise age is not specified), and since he is the only one of Calisto's servants to be treated thus.

When Calisto first calls Tristán, however, we are faced simply with the diminutive, and therefore with an unresolved problem of evaluation. Tristán's response to his master's call is immediate, though, and the ensuing scene is of some importance in establishing his character. Ordered by Calisto to fetch Pármeneo and Sempronio, he is unable to find them, and is at once instructed first to open the windows to ascertain the time of day, and then immediately to close them again and to leave Calisto to sleep until mealtime. The parallels with the exchange between Calisto and Sempronio in Aucto I are obvious: on each occasion Calisto calls for his servant, there is a brief exchange, and then Calisto asks to be left in the dark, leaving the servant standing outside his room (213-216).

Here the similarities end, however, and quite apart from the differences of context (Calisto returning home in a foul temper and abusing his servant; Calisto awakening from a short night's sleep and behaving self-indulgently), there are significant differences in the servant's response. Sempronio's well-known monologue is self-

centred and cynical, with no evidence of any genuine concern for Calisto, about whose behaviour it contains unfavourable comments (216-217). Tristán's, on the contrary, exemplifies the apparently model servant's anxious concern to do his master's bidding, and contains no comment at all upon his master's behaviour: 'Quiero baxarme a la puerta por que duerma mi amo sin que ninguno le impida, y a quantos le buscaren se le negaré' (489). At this point, however, Tristán's thoughts are interrupted by the din and clamour audible from the marketplace, on the cause of which he speculates.

When Sosia then comes into view, Tristán's function is extended to introduce this new character by identifying him and giving his status in the household ('De allá viene Sosia, el moço de espuelas', 489); but the scene also reinforces our impression of Tristán as model servant through his comments on the appearance and demeanour of his colleague: 'Desgreñado viene el vellaco. En alguna taverna se deve haver rebolcado, y si mi amo le cae en el rastro, mandarle ha dar dos mil palos; que, aunque es algo loco, la pena le hará cuerdo' (489-490). In dismissing it as 'toda acotación' (*Estructura*, 128), Stamm concentrates upon its narrative function and overlooks the importance of the monologue for what it tells us of Tristán's character, and its implications for other questions. Tristán's obvious disdain for Sosia's supposed activities not only underlines his own apparently loftier ideals; it confirms other indications which we have received concerning Calisto's exercise of his authority as master.

The reference to *palos* reinforces a previous aside of Calisto's ('¡Palos querrá este vellaco!', 275) and suggests that the earlier reference to corporal chastisement is not a merely figurative expression of annoyance; the fact that Sosia may easily, in Tristán's mind, have been carousing in a tavern until after daybreak also adds weight to an impression – based on Calisto's exchange with Sempronio in Aucto I, on Pármeno's inability (276) to locate any servants to prepare the horse required by Calisto (an occasion on which he specifically alludes to Sosia's absence), and on his certainty that he will easily be able to pillage his master's larder and conceal the thefts (394) – that Calisto's control over his household is generally loose and ineffective, but punctuated by outbreaks of ill-temper and the application of severe punishments. This would give added point to Pármeno's words to Areúsa (386: 'De mucha pena soy digno [...] Si voy más tarde no seré bien recebido de mi amo'), himself (387: 'Trabajo tengo con mi amo si es salido fuera'), and Sempronio (393:

'Aun hasta en esto me ha corrido buen tiempo'), as coming from someone who is anticipating a drubbing (whether verbal or physical) and then finds that he has escaped it.

In the following messenger scene of Aucto XIII, Tristán (who, contrary to the impression given by Dunn, 122, is unaware of the executions) has the role of coaxing information out of Sosia about what the latter has witnessed in the square. It not only serves the narrative function of informing us about the fates of Pármeno and Sempronio, but is consistent with our initial judgement of relations between the two; Tristán calls Sosia 'loco' (490), and addresses him thus: 'O tú estás borracho, o has perdido el seso, o traes alguna mala nueva' (490).

The order of these conjectures is, I think, significant: Tristán evidently begins to realise that his original assumption was incorrect, and rapidly modifies it. Its inaccuracy, however, not only creates additional ironic humour in this specific episode, but also inevitably raises the question of whether Tristán's original hypothesis reflects known habits of Sosia's (remembering his earlier unexplained absence), or a prejudice against him on the part of the speaker: the disdain, perhaps, of the page for the stable-boy in a hierarchically-organized society, which is overcome only in circumstances where their shared condition of servitude and subordination, or a particular shared experience, gives them common ground. Once Sosia blurts out the news, however, Tristán immediately takes command of the situation and determines to awaken Calisto: not necessarily an easy decision, if the record of the latter, Sempronio's hesitation about disturbing him in Aucto I ('si entro allá, matarme ha', 216), and the references to *palos* are recalled (491), but one which Tristán takes with extreme rapidity.

Calisto's response is predictably negative and hostile until Sosia tells him of the situation. The ensuing soliloquy by Calisto brings the next reference to Tristán at the end of Aucto XIII (495) when his master, who has by now finally determined to continue his pursuit of Melibea undaunted by the deaths of Pármeno and Sempronio, decides to replace them with Sosia and 'Tristanico'. The only references to Tristán by name in this act, therefore, both of them uttered by Calisto, give him the diminutive suffix. In the *Comedia*, Tristán's next appearance follows Calisto's decision virtually immediately as Aucto XIV opens with him, Sosia and Calisto outside

Melibea's garden the next night. Here again his role contrasts with that of one of the previous pair of servants, as various commentators have noted (e.g., Dunn, 121-2; Stamm, *Estructura*, 130). Whereas Pármeno, fearing lest a trap may have been laid for Calisto by Melibea, ingeniously invents plausible excuses not to comply when ordered by Calisto to go up the ladder first (458), Tristán volunteers to climb with Calisto in order to ensure that nothing untoward is awaiting the latter (499). As already noted, however, Calisto rudely rejects the offer.

The overall impression of Tristán created thus far in the *Comedia* is probably a favourable one, despite the problem posed by his evaluation of Sosia. While Calisto and Melibea are indulging in sexual contact, however, we see that Tristán's apparently superior standards do not extend to sexual matters, on which he is happy to share with Sosia his reactions to the events taking place in the garden. How Sosia and Tristán obtain their knowledge of these events is an unresolved problem; Tristán refers to hearing the goings-on between Calisto and Melibea ('oygo tanto'), but there is also a reference to sight ('Veslos a ellos alegres y abraçados', 502), which, if taken literally, would imply that the servants have some means of observing events (the ladder?). It is impossible to decide whether a figurative or a literal reading of 'Veslos' is more appropriate, but there are important indications of Tristán's sexuality. His comment that 'Oygo tanto, que juzgo a mi amo por el más bienaventurado hombre que nació. Y, por mi vida, que, aunque soy muchacho, que diese tan buena cuenta como mi amo' (502) could perhaps be taken to support the view expressed by some critics that we have here an equivalent to Pármeno in the sense that Tristán is thus far uncorrupted - but is, it seems, potentially corruptible.¹²

On the other hand, there is a distinct possibility that this may be a self-assessment informed by experience, rather than representing mere adolescent braggadocio.¹³ Whilst it is not clear quite what kind of relationship is implied by Lucrecia's addressing Tristán as 'mi amor' (576) slightly later in Aucto XIV of the *Comedia* when she is trying to ascertain what has happened to Calisto outside the garden, it does obviously indicate some unexplained previous acquaintance between them, as has been noted by previous commentators (e.g., Stamm, *Estructura*, 133): this is, after all, the first occasion on which Tristán has gone to the garden with Calisto, and nobody has mentioned his existence to Lucrecia at any point in the text. Unless

it is taken as merely a sociable expression of regard for someone whom she vaguely knows (an interpretation which seems to me unlikely, and which would need to be supported with other contemporary examples), or as an expression of unilateral desire on the part of Lucrecia, this seemingly rather affectionate mode of address at least raises the possibility that Tristán, too, has experienced an amorous liaison while off duty. This must cast some retrospective doubt upon the impression of moral rectitude which he initially created. Doubt is also, of course, sown by his comments to Sosia on the nature of life as a servant, in which his relations with his master are also revealed to be far from idealistic, despite his previous faithful service outside the bedroom door, his rather superior comments upon what he assumes to have been Sosia's behaviour, and his assiduous attentions in the matter of climbing the ladder; the acid comments he makes to Sosia on the fate of Pármeno and Sempronio are worthy of note:

Ya los tiene olvidados. ¡Dexaos morir sirviendo a ruines! ¡Hazed locuras en confianza de su defension! 'Viviendo con el conde, que no matase al hombre', me dava mi madre por consejo. Veslos a ellos alegres y abraçados y sus servidores con harta mengua degollados. (502)

This contains an explicit evaluation of Calisto by Tristán as *ruin*: an important point, as previous critics have noted, since it aligns Tristán with the views of their master expressed by Sempronio and by the corrupted Pármeno.

When events in the garden have reached their climax, and Calisto takes his departure, Tristán again assumes the role of our source of information on happenings offstage, with his lament that Calisto has fallen to his death. Here we revert to the loyal servant syndrome both in his lamentations ('¡O mi señor y mi bien muerto! ¡O mi señor y nuestra honrra despeñado!', 575) and in his comments to Lucrecia ('¡Lloro mi gran mal, lloro mis muchos dolores!') and Sosia ('Llevemos el cuerpo de nuestro querido amo donde no padezca su honrra detrimento', 576). We should perhaps also note that it is Tristán who takes command in the removal of Calisto's body from outside the garden, and he who gives instructions to Sosia, thereby reverting to the role of decisive and determined taker of initiatives in which we previously saw him both on receipt of Sosia's tragic news

and on arrival at the garden: an aspect singled out for comment by Russell.

Essentially, then, in the *Comedia* Tristán is a somewhat ambiguous figure. At the outset, we begin to perceive what seems to be a deliberately-wrought contrast with Sempronio, and a moral stance akin to that of Pármeno emerges when Tristán comments upon Sosia in a tone which recalls, to some extent, Pármeno's comments upon Sempronio earlier in the text (254, 261). Tristán is clearly the dominant element in this second pair of servants, despite the possibility that he may be the younger of the two (though Dunn, 121, seems to imply that he may be the older); his general dominance is not diminished by the fact that on one occasion Sosia tells him where to put the ladder. It is also interesting that, like Pármeno, Tristán refers to his mother; for Tristán, however, she is a source of effective and valuable advice which he remembers in the appropriate circumstances: a contrast with Pármeno's perspective upon his mother (at least, once Celestina gets to work upon it).¹⁴ But a contrast with the corrupted Pármeno emerges when Tristán offers to climb the ladder, so that Tristán cannot be seen simply as a Pármeno-substitute: at some points he resembles Pármeno, and at others he contrasts with him, and the same is true when he is compared with Sempronio in role, situation, function, and character.

Once Calisto is in the garden, however, some revision is forced upon our perceptions by the conversation between Sosia and Tristán on the relationships between masters and servants and upon sexual matters, as it is also by the mode of address used by Lucrecia, with its possible implications for the background to Tristán's comments on his own sexual performance were he, and not Calisto, with Melibea. The significance of a possible amorous relationship with Lucrecia would vary in inverse proportion to the age assigned to Tristán, from an indication of corruption of minors in the society of *Celestina* at one extreme to an ordinary adolescent relationship at the other. On another level, his comments on the master-servant relationship suggest a deep cynicism in the young servant. Tristán's role in the *Comedia* is not, therefore, a simple matter, and he is not as minor a character as might at first sight appear to be the case; he is, in fact, a further instance of the ambiguity which pervades the work, and illustrates the technique so effectively employed in the text of first establishing a character in whom readers may perceive a moral

viewpoint with which they can identify and then creating sufficient doubt or ambiguity to undermine any such identification.

In the *Tragicomedia*, whilst there is much continuity in his depiction and functions (e.g. an effective humbling of Sosia and shattering of his illusions, 563), there are certain changes to Tristán. His youth is more strongly underlined, when he himself refers to his 'tierna edad' (563), when Sosia also alludes to his age in a manner which implies youth ('mucho más has dicho que tu edad demanda', 565), and when Calisto refers to him as a 'pajezico' (573). He is also, however, much more of a *puer senex*, inasmuch as not only does he display (as Russell notes, 516: note 75b) a medical knowledge of sleep and emotion when accounting for Calisto's staying long abed, but it is he who acutely penetrates the motives of Areúsa in inviting Sosia to visit her (much to Sosia's admiration, 565), and begins at once to plan a counter-stroke ('ármale trato doble, qual yo te diré', 564). As Shipley notes: 'As Rojas' irony would have it, there follows this diffident preamble (which claims little authority and possesses no persuasive force) as accurate a reading of the facts of the matter and the motives of the players as we encounter in all *La Celestina*.¹⁵

The irony is that it is all too late, as Shipley notes: they are already at the garden and are promptly hushed by Calisto, so that Tristán's perception is not acted upon (a lost opportunity, perhaps, for a further sixteenth-century continuation in the manner of the *Auto de Traso*). His perspicacity is nothing new; it had already been established in the *Comedia* by his penetrating comments upon the master-servant relationship. It should not, however, be overstated; we have seen in the *Comedia* his inaccurate assessment of the reasons for Sosia's dishevelled appearance, and his comments on what is in Calisto's mind are pure speculation -- but speculation which, by its seemingly authoritative medical content, may possibly be designed to impress Sosia.¹⁶ Tristán's comment 'Otro seso más maduro que el mío' before proceeding to demolish Sosia's dreams could be seen as an awareness of his own limitations -- something which we have not previously associated with Tristán; it may, on the other hand, be an ironic modesty topos employed to emphasize his own superiority over Sosia. The latter, whilst addressing him as 'hermano Tristán' (562), seems dependent upon him for approbation. Dunn (122) considers Tristán's handling of Sosia in this episode to be 'firm and tactful', but to me it seems brutally frank, and another instance of the

'tonillo arrogante' which Lida de Malkiel (615) sees in his dealings with his companion.

The hint at a relationship between Tristán and Lucrecia posed in the *Comedia* is retained in the *Tragicomedia*, but the question is rendered more complex by the fact that in the *Tragicomedia* Lucrecia specifically refers to Calisto's servants never having taken any initiative with her ('Pero también me lo haría yo, si estos necios de sus criados me fablassen entre día; pero esperan que los tengo de yr a buscar', 572). This would, of course, reinforce the interpretation, in this version at least, of her earlier affectionate vocative as an expression of desire on her part rather than as evidence of an established relationship.

If we take Tristán's diminutive as indicating relative youth (as the other references to him suggest is reasonable) rather than small stature, household status, or any particular affection in which he is held by Calisto, it is a source of further important literary conclusions in the *Tragicomedia*. Calisto regards him as ineffectual in support of Sosia, and rushes to their assistance: 'No le maten, que no está sino un pajezico con él' (573). Whatever the actual motivation for this unprecedented action by Calisto (a sudden urge to show off in front of Melibea, or awareness of the vulnerability of his situation after the loss of Pármeno and Sempronio, might seem more likely explanations than an onset of genuine concern for his servants, unless we assume that Calisto has suddenly recovered from the mental affliction caused by love and is now for the first time revealing his real nature), its stated reason is Tristán's inadequacy in the imagined danger. This precipitate intervention is, however, unnecessary: Sosia and Tristán are his most effective retainers, and the contrasts with Pármeno and Sempronio are surely deliberately drawn.

Pármeno and Sempronio are praised to Melibea by Calisto as doughty fighters and reliable companions at the very moment when we have just witnessed their cowardice and flight in the face of an imagined threat to their persons (469-472); because of his fears of a trap, moreover, Pármeno refuses to go up the ladder first when ordered to do so by Calisto (458). Tristán, on the other hand, offers to ascend first and is peremptorily refused by Calisto. Let us recall also Tristán's general dominance over Sosia, which we see from the very first scene in which they are both involved, when he coaxes the information about the deaths of Pármeno and Sempronio from the

distraught stable-lad. Tristán therefore serves as a further illustration of the ineptitude of Calisto's judgements of people; this did not emerge clearly in connection with him in the *Comedia*, but is pointedly shown in the *Tragicomedia*. His function has thus expanded in this respect in the final version of the text.

The humorous dimension of the scene outside the garden must not be overlooked either. Stamm explicitly rejects the idea of any humour here (*Estructura*, 172): 'Tristán y Sosia, suplentes en este nuevo menester, son precisamente los fieles guardaespaldas que fingían ser los anteriores, lo cual sirve para obviar cualquier toque de comicidad a este punto'. It is, however, surely the case that Calisto's woefully inaccurate judgement -- of both the seriousness of the situation (a reversal, again, of the previous occasion, where Pármeno and Sempronio, having fled at no real danger and having been praised by Calisto to Melibea, have to urgently summon him when real danger threatens) and the reliability of his servants -- is a potent source of the black, ironic humour which is so important in the work. (Compare the ironic humour of the incorrect interpretation of Sosia's appearance by Tristán in Act XIII.) This is not, of course, the only point at which Sosia and Tristán contribute to a humorous note in the added *Tragicomedia* material: the stupidity of the former and the reproaches of the latter upon returning home (504-505) are, as Stamm notes, 'un tipo de comedia verbal' (*Estructura*, 157): though again there is a serious point, since it is Tristán who sees the risk posed by Sosia's loud-mouthed revelations. The latter's opening remark to Tristán at the beginning of Act XIX on the next visit to the garden (562) returns to this point, stressing how quietly they must speak, necessary as narrative information for the reader, but again revealing their destination. On this occasion, however, Tristán does not reproach him.¹⁷

Other aspects of Tristán require comment. His use of language has been singled out by Lida de Malkiel as indicating his intellectual qualities: 'la sutileza intelectual de Tristán se expresa estilísticamente en frecuente artificio literario, por ejemplo en la rima que remata su citada observación sobre el olvido de Calisto [...] y en las antítesis con que abrumba a Sosia [...] y en particular en la breve endecha paralelística a la muerte de Calisto' (615-6). His name has been seen as semantically significant because of his role in discovering Calisto's broken body and lamenting his death (Russell, 96), presumably because of association with 'triste'.¹⁸ The most

elaborate exploration of the point about the association of the name with sadness is undoubtedly that of Fernando Cantalapiedra. Noting that Rojas owned a copy of a version of the Tristán story at his death in 1541, he expounds in detail the associations of the character and the indeed the very christening of Tristán with sadness and death in the Arthurian legends, and suggests a similar role for him in *Celestina*, concluding that 'el propio nombre evoca, y más aún en aquella época, el final trágico de Tristán e Iseo, y sirve de preparación narrativa a la muerte de Calisto y Melibea'.¹⁹ (Cantalapiedra's other arguments about the name are concerned with using it to bolster his theory of a change of authorship after the first twelve acts, and do not concern us here.) Other critics, including Russell (96), note that the name is of literary origin.²⁰

The association with sadness is a possible, but not a necessary, conclusion; this is merely one part of his role in the text, and other associations of the name may well be of greater importance. Whilst a directly literary inspiration cannot be ruled out, in terms of the reception of the work the overtones of the name will obviously have varied from reader to reader. It is, for instance, necessary to balance the weight of literary associations with the fact that 'Tristán' was quite well known as a contemporary personal name. Only by examining its distribution, both social and geographical, in late mediaeval and early modern Spain can we hope to approach an understanding of what the name of Calisto's servant might have signified for an early reader of *Celestina*: whether it would have appeared modishly literary, archaic, exotic, commonplace, regional, particularly appropriate or comically inappropriate to an individual of this status. No full investigation of this question has yet been made.

A study published by Isabel Beceiro Pita draws attention to some important questions surrounding the use of the name 'Tristán' in Spain in the later Middle Ages.²¹ Unfortunately Beceiro Pita does not include a catalogue of the individuals whom she located, but her study of sources including the *Registro General del Sello* produced 114 occurrences of literary names from the mid-13th century to the mid-16th century, of which one half are of 'Tristán'; this name is also the commonest in Portugal and it is the most widespread geographically (331). Her first cases of this name are Tristán Valdés, c. 1350 (326), and Tristán de Leguizamón, 1380 (330); she detects an increase in the use of literary names as the period progresses. Beceiro notes the

existence of a converted rabbi Tristán Bogado and a murderer (*homiciano*) Tristán Ortiz (332), but observes that the literary names are often associated with the households of the nobility, royal administration, or urban oligarchies; she states that 'le rapport entre prénom arthurien et condition de serviteur ou d'officier apparaissait si marquée que Fernando de Rojas [...] appela l'un des serviteurs du héros Tristán' (332).

Beceiro Pita's study may, however, understate the distribution of literary names in late medieval and early modern Spain. Before my attention was drawn to it, I had already delivered a conference paper in which I pointed out, with a catalogue of literary anthroponyms, the importance of the *Registro General del Sello* as a source of onomastic information.²² Some further cases have since been added from other late 15th and early 16th century documentary sources, to give a sample chronologically focussed on four decades around the first printed publication of *Celestina*.²³ The resulting corpus of literary names is given below as Appendices I-II. It will be noted that while Beceiro Pita's survey, which covers three centuries, records only five cases of 'Leonís' (331), my sample covering around four decades contains eight (Appendix II); 'half' her total sample (=57?) consisted of cases of 'Tristán', while in my shorter period there are around fifty-three cases as a forename and twenty-one as a byname.

To draw conclusions from an incomplete survey is hazardous, since the particular selection of documentary sources used will materially affect the sample; my conclusions will remain, therefore, general, and my catalogue of names is offered as a starting point rather than a definitive statement. As will be seen from Appendix I, occurrences of 'Tristán' cover a very wide area of the Peninsula and as wide a range of social groups. For the purposes of the present paper, the catalogue lists only historical individuals attested by contemporary documentation, and ignores references to the literary character Tristán; these, which appear first in the Peninsula in the second half of the twelfth century with troubadour poems, do not bear directly upon the question of the distribution of the name in Spanish society in the era of *Celestina*. 'Tristán' is the commonest of all the literary names encountered in this sample, which confirms Beceiro's conclusions on this point; the relative paucity of other literary names is amply attested by the list in Appendix II.²⁴

The actual number of documented individuals bearing literary names is still very small in relation to the total population, but it is becoming clear that they were more widely distributed than has perhaps been realized. Given this relatively widespread contemporary use, 'Tristán' may not, then necessarily have been a name whose literary overtones would have been dominant for either the author or the earliest readers, though they are obviously an important potential level of additional meaning. As is so often the case in *Celestina*, even the significance of the name is ambiguous and uncertain.

Whilst he is admittedly a secondary character if his role is considered in purely quantitative terms, Tristán nonetheless cannot be so easily dismissed as has been occasionally assumed. In the *Comedia*, he provides narrative information through the *acotación* in his remarks, and is a source of humour; but, more importantly, in terms of his structural significance, he represents a further example of the technique of destabilisation and disorientation perpetrated in the text by introducing a character who appears to have lofty ethical standards, but about whom doubt is soon created. The subsequent re-evaluation of Tristán is the more important because of his apparent youth, which makes him a potentially telling indicator of the extent of corruption and cynicism in his society. In the *Tragicomedia*, however, his role is more significant even than this; if Calisto's excuse to rush to his aid is taken at face value (and it is at least consistent with his use of the diminutive not only for Tristán's name but also for his station, *pajezico*), there is some force to the argument that Tristán's presence outside the garden is a major contributory factor in precipitating Calisto's death in this version of the text (as Lida de Malkiel notes, 'ese menudo detalle incide en la acción', 614). Tristán, in these circumstances, approaches the level of significance earlier associated with Pármeno and Sempronio. Above all, in this way in the final canonical state of the work the culminating moment of the irony and reversal which is so consistent in *Celestina* is directly associated with him.

APPENDIX I

Catalogue of Individuals named 'Tristán' in
selected documentary sources, 1475-1513

The references are to the date, plus item or page number in the source cited (for which see note 23). Individuals are identified where possible by specific details of status, office, or locality of residence. Whilst I have attempted to group multiple references to the same individual under a single entry, sufficient details are not always given by the sources to enable this to be done; as a result, there may be some duplications in this list. The converse may also be true; no. I.A22, for instance, may represent three separate individuals. Entries are in chronological order of first documented reference.

A. 'Tristán' as a Christian Name

1. **Tristán de Leguizamo [Leguizamón]** (27.4.1475: RGS, I, no. 462); 29.6.1475 (RGS, I, no. 533), named *armador mayor* of the fleet; 1.7.1475 (RGS, I, no. 535), named *preboste* of the town of Barrazunaga; 8.8.1475 (RGS, I, no. 608); *vecino de Bilbao* (4.10.1477: RGS, I, no. 2812). Numerous subsequent references in later volumes are not listed here; but note also **Tristán Díaz de Leguizamo** *preboste de Bilbao* (18.8.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2749; 9.12.1493: RGS, X, no. 3179); *merced* to **Tristán de Leguizamo, el mozo, por muerte de su padre** (22.5.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 833; cf. also nos. 974, 993, 994); and **Tristán Díaz de 'Laquiza'** *vecino de Bilbao* (13.4.1485: RGS, IV, no. 702). There is a problem with the repeated use of 'Tristán' as a forename by different members of this family, as reported by Avallé-Arce.²⁵
2. **Tristán Daza** supporter of the Portuguese party whose *rentas* in Gozón are confiscated (18.9.1475: RGS, I, no. 660); pardoned (20.3.1477: RGS, I, no. 2065); **Tristán de Aza** built a fortress about 22 years previously in Melgar de Yuso (13.12.1493: RGS, X, no. 3216)
3. **Tristán Palomeque** *vecino de Salamanca* (20.12.1475: RGS, I, no. 830)
4. **Tristán de Salazar** would-be rapist assaulted by servants and sons of his intended victim, his aunt (19.3.1476: RGS, I, no. 992)
5. **Tristán de Silva** (13.2.1477: RGS, I, no. 1800)
6. **Tristán de Arauso** *regidor* of Ecija (25.5.1478: RGS, II, no. 593)

7. **Tristán Barma** [?] (2.8.1479: RGS, II, no. 1758)
8. **Tristán de Espinosa** (13.12.1480: RGS, III, no. 920; 9.8.1487: RGS, V, nos 827, 828); *vecino de Cespedosa* (14.4.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 563)
9. **Tristán** *vecino de Rabe* (Medina del Campo), *repostero de cámara de SS. AA.* (10.10.1483: RGS, III, no. 1431)
10. **Tristán de Medina** *bachiller* (26.10.1484 and subsequently: Beinart, I, 422, 427-28, 439-40, 451-52, 464-65, 476 (*el bachiller Francisco Tristán de Medina*), 477); Dr, inquisitor (29.5.1488: RGS, V, no. 3066)
11. **Tristán de las Casas** *alcaide de Osuna* (27.10.1484: RGS, III, no. 3622)
12. **Tristán Holguín** *vecino de Medellín* (22.2.1485: RGS, IV, no. 382); **Tristán Holgin**, killed by Miguel Dávalos of Medellín before October 1499 (2.10.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 2159); see also no. 49 below
13. **Tristán de Villareal** (15.4.1485, 23.4.1485: RGS, IV, nos 744, 852); **Tristán de Villaherrael** (5.2.1487: RGS, V, no. 67)
14. **Tristán Vázquez** *regidor* of Bayona de Miño (*deceased before* 17.6.1485: RGS, IV, no. 1199)
15. **Tristán de Silva** of Córdoba? (18.6.1485: RGS, IV, no. 1202)
16. **Tristán Redondo** runaway husband of the sister of a canon of Cuenca (2.3.1486: RGS, IV, no. 2505)
17. **Tristán de Machileón** pillaged the valley of Arana together with the *merino* of Estella (1.2.1488: RGS, V, no. 2456)
18. **Tristán de Guevara** (22.1.1489: RGS, VI, no. 205); *vecino de Tormantos* (23.3.1492: RGS, IX, no. 933)
19. **Tristán de Molina** (14.3.1489: RGS, VI, no. 880); *vecino de Castillo de Garcimuñoz* (16.1.1495: RGS, XII, no. 175)
20. **Tristán de Valdés** (9.5.1489: RGS, VI, no. 1313); of Carreño, Asturias (7.4.1490: RGS, VII, no. 1255)
21. **Tristán de Quesada** bonesetter (2.12.1489: RGS, VI, no. 3464); *vecino de Sevilla, maestro de álgebra* and bonesetter (15.8.1490: RGS, VII, nos 2678, 2679); bonesetter (18.2.1495: RGS, XII, no. 700)
22. **Tristán del Castillo** *vecino de Villanueva de Barcarrota*, debtor (11.2.1490: RGS, VII, no. 323); in other documents **Tristán de Castillejo** *vecino de Barcarrota* (n.d.10.1491: RGS, VIII, nos 2889, 2892); **Tristán de Castillo** (26.8.1492: RGS, IX, no. 2765); **Tristán de Castillejo** (10.9.1493: RGS, X, no. 2443); **Tristán de Castillejo** *vecino de Jérez de la Frontera* (7.9.1493: RGS, X, no.

- 2429); *Tristán del Castillo merino de Candemuñó* (21.10.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 1980)
23. *Tristán Ortiz vecino de Sevilla, homiciano* (18.5.1490: RGS, VII, no. 1677)
24. *Tristán Cruzado vecino de Almansa* (19.6.1490: RGS, VII, no. 1885)
25. *Tristán de Silva debtor* (19.8.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2755)
26. *Tristán de Silva corregidor de Madrid* (26.8.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2824; in 1491: RGS, VIII, nos 15, 73, 139, 635, 1132, 2253, 2301, and as ex-corregidor, no. 2860; 3167; in 1492: RGS, IX, nos 216, 1340, 1956, 2445; in 1493: RGS, X, nos 1346, 2744)
27. *Tristán de Cepeda vecino de Zamora* (28.8.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2853)
28. *Tristán de Ecija had his hand cut off for spilling a sack of wheat at the fortress of Gómara* (2.3.1492: RGS, IX, no. 588)
29. *Tristán de Vallos vecino de Alcaraz, pardoned for killing his wife on suspicion of adultery* (25.4.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1251)
30. *Tristán de Arajo/Araujo vecino de Orense* (24.6.1492: RGS, IX, no. 2360)
31. *Tristán de Zúñiga vecino de Palencia* (24.11.1493: RGS, X, no. 3009)
32. *Tristán Bogado or Govado criado del rey de Portugal* (1493: *Cuentas*, II, 61, 126, 205, 259, 340, 410, 454, 507, 535, 569)
33. *Tristán de Silva of Ciudad Rodrigo* (15.2.1494: RGS, XI, no. 393)
34. *Tristán de Sandoval deceased* (20.2.1494: RGS, XI, no. 481); owned property in Sotillo (28.7.1495: RGS, XII, no. 2923)
35. *Tristán de Merlo vecino de Córdoba* (6.3.1494: RGS, XI, no. 619)
36. *Tristán de Gante* (24.4.1494: RGS, XI, no. 1435)
37. *Tristán de Abrojo merino mayor del conde de Monterrey, Galicia* (6.5.1494: RGS, XI, no. 1737)
38. *Tristán de Agramonte vecino de Alcalá de Henares, assault victim* (1.10.1494: RGS, XI, no. 3020)
39. *Tristán de Çaballos vecino de Camargo, Santander* (n.d.11.1494: RGS, XI, no. 4112)
40. *Tristán de Arcilla* (20.12.1494: RGS, XI, no. 4461); *Tristán de Arcilla/de Arcila vecino de Aranda* (22.8.1495: RGS, XII, no. 3236; 24.9.1495: RGS, XII, no. 3546).
41. *Tristán de Sahagún* (?1494: *Burgos Carta de censo de Francisco de Lerma vicino de Burgos sobre Tristán de Sahagún y Constancia del Castillo su muger: Moorat, Catalogue*, pp. 1468-69, no. 802[7]); *vecino de Burgos* (9.9.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 1740)
42. *Tristán de Domesain castellano de San Juan Pie de Puerto* (31.3.1496: Suárez Fernández, IV, p. 655)
43. *Tristán de Azcue* (n.d.6.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 1728)

44. **Tristán de Molina** *caballero de la Orden de Santiago* (1.3.1498: RGS, XV, no. 501)
45. **Tristán de la Peña** *vecino de Guadarrama y Colmenar Viejo* (15.6.1498: RGS, XV, no. 1600)
46. **Tristán de Quevedo** *vecino de Jaén* (26.7.1498: RGS, XV, no. 1831). Possibly different from **Tristán de Quevedo**, involved in an incident at Perpignan which was later the subject of royal attention (26.4.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 616)
47. **Tristán de Ballesteros** *escribano de Alcaraz* (23.2.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 420)
48. **Tristán de Avendaño** (also **Aredaño** or **Avedaño**) *vecino de Cuenca* (25.5.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 880; 18.11.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 2745)
49. **Tristán Holgin**, son of **Tristán Holgin**, no. 12 above, petitioner after his father's death (2.10.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 2159)
50. **Tristán de León** *bachiller* (6.3.1505: *Testamentaria*, pp. 381, 385)
51. **Tristán** *don, criado del Gran Capitán* (1505: *Testamentaria*, p. 111)
52. **Tristán** *escudero de pie* (1505: *Testamentaria*, p. 443)
53. **Tristán tondidor**: witness in an Inquisition trial in 1513, referred to in the fullest references as *Tristán, tondidor, christiano viejo*, and as *vezino de Ciudad Real* (Beinart, II, 349, 357, 398, 400, 405, 527). Possibly to be identified with **Tristán Cauallero tondidor** (Beinart, III, 159, 160, 162, who is described in the fullest reference as *Tristán Cavallero, vesino de Çibdad Real, tondidor, testigo jurado, etc, dixo que de hedad de quarenta años, christiano viejo* (25.10.1513: 182-83; also 194, 208, 209, 212, 221); he was *de edad de çinquenta años, poco mas o menos* in November 1520 (Beinart, III, 225)

B. 'Tristán' as a Byname

Where 'Tristán' occurs as a byname, the likelihood is that an ancestor bore this name; in most cases it is impossible to know at what date the name was first acquired, since by the period under review it is fully transmissible (e.g., **Juan Tristán** son of **Pedro Tristán**, no. I.B18 below). Byname occurrence is still, however, an important dimension of the incidence of 'Tristán' in late medieval Spanish onomastics.

1. **Catalina Tristán** (4.5.1476: RGS, I, no. 1134)
2. **Francisco Tristán** former secretary of Enrique IV, named *escribano de Cámara* (15.4.1477: RGS, I, no. 2219)
3. **Juan de Tristán** *mayordomo* of Fernando Arias de Saavedra (14.10.1477: RGS, I, no. 2834)

4. **Gonzalo Tristán** (9.9.1484: RGS, III, no. 3320)
5. **Juan Tristán vecino de Sevilla** (1.6.1485: RGS, IV, no. 1051; 16.5.1491: RGS, VIII, no. 1554; 17.5.1491: no. 1561; 24.7.1489: RGS, VI, no. 2087); *almojarife*, Seville? (29.4.1491: RGS, VIII, no. 1452); *vecino de Sevilla* (17.1.1492: RGS, IX, no. 89; 4.2.1492: RGS, IX, no. 218; n.d.4.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1345, same as Suárez Fernández, III, 277-78: *vecino e jurado de Sevilla*, shipowner; 3.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1412; 7.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1482); *recaudador mayor de Sevilla* (18.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1766; 28.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1933; 7.11.1492: RGS, IX, no. 3249; 12.11.1492: RGS, IX, no. 3295; 2.5.1494: RGS, XI, no. 1686; 27.11.1494: RGS, XI, no. 4028, 3.12.1494: RGS, XI, no. 4170, 11.12.1494: RGS, XI, no. 4258; 8.1.1495: RGS, XII, no. 43); *deceased* (26.10.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 2022; 8-9.5.1498: RGS, XV, nos 1322, 1323, 1346)
6. **Martín Tristán** (30.7.1487: RGS, V, no. 745; 22.8.1489: RGS, VI, no. 2477)
7. **Francisco Tristán vecino de Sevilla**, owned olive groves in Ecija (4.9.1487: RGS, V, no. 1154); debtor (12.9.1489: RGS, VI, no. 2736); *vecino de Sevilla*, debtor, *reconciliado*, brother of Gonzalo Tristán (no. I.B14 below; 10.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1539)
8. **Pedro Tristán repostero de camas**, owner of pinewood (15.1.1489: RGS, VI, no. 118)
9. **Lope Martínez de Tristán vecino de un lugar del valle y tierra de Mena** (10.9.1489: RGS, VI, no. 2720)
10. **Juan Tristán vecino de Utrera** (14.9.1489: RGS, VI, no. 2749)
11. **Juan Tristán vecino de Sanlúcar**, assault victim (6.7.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2077)
12. **Juan Tristán** of Lebrija? (15.7.1490: RGS, VII, no. 2232)
13. **Juan Tristán vecino de Medina del Campo** (9.4.1491: RGS, VIII, no. 1285)
14. **Gonzalo Tristán vecino de Sevilla**, debtor, *reconciliado*, brother of Francisco Tristán (no. I.B7 above; 10.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1539)
15. **Luis Tristán arrendador y recaudador mayor de las alcabalas de Ecija** 1488-1489 (5.9.1493: RGS, X, no. 2394); possibly the same as **Luis Tristán** who had been *arrendador de la alhóndiga de Sevilla* during 1489 (8.5.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 691)
16. **Pero Tristán vecino de Miruelo** (and/or of Cudeyo?) 13.7.1495: RGS, XII, no. 2720)
17. **Juan Tristán** debtor of Ecija? (16.2.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 554)
18. **Pedro Tristán**, and **Juan Tristán** his son sentenced because of *alboroto* (7.3.1498: RGS, XV, no. 581); same as **Pedro Tristán**

whose family were involved in a lawsuit (15.7.1499: RGS, XVI, no. 1157)

19. **Diego Tristán**, *escribano público* in Granada (28.11.1509: Bejarano, p. 101, no. 518)
20. **Rodrigo Tristán** mentioned in the trial of María González, 1511-1512, but which includes witness statements taken as early as January 1475 (Beinart, II, 216, 219; 21.10.1513: III, 83)
21. **Francisco Tristán** (25.10.1513: Beinart, III, 130, 224): *este Françisco Tristán no se halla en Çibdad Real; dizese que esta en Toledo*

APPENDIX II

Catalogue of Other Personal Names of Literary Origin

The same sources are used as for Appendix I (see note 23); entries are in chronological order of first documented appearance.²⁶

A. Braçaida: 4

1. **Breizaida criada y mujer del Marqués de Aguilar** (reign of Enrique IV: RGS, V, no. 41); same as *Brazaida, muger de García Fernández Manrique* (8.10.1476: RGS, I, no. 1510)
2. **Braçayda de Benavides** (1489-1503: *Cuentas*, I, 297, 403; II, 380, 415, 595)
3. **Bracida Sánchez** (12.4.1494: RGS, XI, no. 1214)
4. **Braçayda de Almada** (13.6.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 968)

B. Briolanja: 3

1. **Briolangel González** (a.k.a. Briolangel de Padilla, 1483-84: Beinart, I, 81, 149, 392, 394, 396, 400, 402, 404, 408-11, 413-19, 558-59)
2. **Briolanja Muñoz** (24.10.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 1994)
3. **Briolangel de Vera** (1503: Beinart, III, 164; IV, 405)

C. Florestán: 3

1. **Floresdán de Tapia** (3.3.1486: RGS, IV, no. 2502)
2. **Florestán** (13.8.1493: RGS, X, no. 2165)
3. **Francisco Floristán** (6.5.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 1268)

D. Galaor: 3

1. **Galaor Osorio** (*deceased before* 22.2.1491: RGS, VIII, nos 515, 1413, 1430; in 1497: RGS, XIV, no. 2092; in 1498: RGS, XV, nos 1795, 1894)
2. **Galor Mosquera** (30.6.1491: RGS, VIII, no. 1833; in 1493: RGS, X, no. 1095; in 1496: RGS, XIII, nos 2243, 2686, 2687; in 1497: RGS, XIV, no. 2635)
3. **Galaor de la Carrera** (8.4.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 972)

E. Galáz: 2

1. **Galás de Leguizamo** (16.10.1483: RGS, III, no. 1499)
2. **Maese Galáz** (1485-1503: *Cuentas*, I, 91; II, 57, 75, 588)

F. Galván: 8

1. **Diego Galván** (24.11.1485: RGS, IV, no. 2008; 20.9.1498: RGS, XV, no. 2294)
2. **Juan de Galván** (17.1.1488: RGS, V, no. 2058)
3. **Cristóbal Galván** (8.10.1488: RGS, V, no. 3990)
4. **Pero Galván** (n.d.2.1490: RGS, VII, no. 464); **Pedro Galván** (*Cuentas*, II, 74, 1493)
5. **Aparicio de Galván** (10.5.1493: RGS, X, no. 1184; 20.9.1498: RGS, XV, no. 2281)
6. **Antón Galván** (24.7.1493: RGS, X, no. 1991)
7. **Alonso Galbán** (father) (9.11.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 2482)
8. **Francisco Galbán** (son) (9.11.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 2482)

G. Iseo: 4

1. **Iseo Fernández** (5.12.1487: RGS, V, no. 1745)
2. **Iseo Maldonado** (18.7.1492: RGS, IX, no. 2462)
3. **Iseo Fajardo** (12.7.1493: RGS, X, no. 1905)
4. **Iseo** (1.9.1495: RGS, XII, no. 3310)

H. Lanzarote: 3

1. **García Lanzarote** (24.3.1487: RGS, V, no. 238; 16.9.1492: RGS, IX, no. 3014)
2. **Lanzarote de Ameçaga** (3.7.1490: Suárez Fernández, III, 198)
3. **Lanzarote** (28.2.1497: RGS, XIV, no. 653)

I. Leonís: 8

1. **Leonís Méndez de Sotomayor** (22.10.1479: RGS, II, no. 2025; 22.6.1488: RGS, V, no. 3283); **Leonís Méndez** (24.2.1492: RGS, IX, no. 501); **Leonís Méndez de Sotomayor** (in 1495: RGS, XII, no. 1145; in 1498: RGS, XV, no. 2670; in 1499: RGS, XVI, nos. 657, 2596)
2. **Leonés de Noroña** (23.10.1487: RGS, V, no. 1561)
3. **Leonís de Villanueva** (10.10.1491: RGS, VIII, no. 2737; in 1492: RGS, IX, nos 2320, 2648, 3339, 3351)
4. **Leonís** (2.5.1492: RGS, IX, no. 1371)
5. **Leonís/Lionel de Ribera** (28.5.1492: RGS, IX, nos 1912, 1932)
6. **Leonís de Narváez** (28.2.1493: RGS, X, nos 447, 522)
7. **Pero Leonés/Pedro Leonís** (7.10.1495: RGS, XII, nos 3660, 3903)
8. **Leonís de Valdés** (19.12.1498: RGS, XV, no. 3010)

J. Merlín: 2

1. **Pedro [Alonso] Merlín** (12-14.1.1490: *Trujillo*, 306, 313; 6.3.1490: 344, 345-6)

2. Diego Merlín (n.d.1.1491: RGS, VIII, nos 264, 462)

K. Perseval: 3

1. Perseval (4.2.1478: RGS, II, no. 240)
2. Perseval de Grimaldo (7.11.1489: RGS, VI, no. 3204)
3. Perseval son of Pedro (2.9.1496: RGS, XIII, no. 1564)

(An earlier *Perseual Martines*, who falls outside the chronological scope of this survey, is referred to in a letter of Enrique de Villena dated 'IX kalendas junii anno xxvij' discussed by Derek C. Carr in his paper 'Neologisms in the *Carta de don Enrique de Villena al Deán y Cabildo de Cuenca*', IV Colloquium on XVc Literature, Queen Mary & Westfield College, London, 3-4 July 1992)

L. Troilo(s): 1

1. Troilos Carrillo (28.1.1478: RGS, II, nos 184, 751, 821, 177); Troilo Carrillo (27.4.1484: RGS, III, no. 2721), Troilos Carrillo (1485: RGS, IV, no. 745, 2408; in 1486: 2618; in 1491: RGS, VIII, no. 1473)

Pleberio. Lucrecia. Abclieba.



Valencia 1514. Grabado del 20^o aucto.

NOTES

¹ *Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, edited by Peter E. Russell, Clásicos Castalia, 191 (Madrid: Castalia, 1991), 96. All references are to pages of this edition, except where another specified edition is cited to clarify a textual point.

² Peter N. Dunn, *Fernando de Rojas*, Twayne's World Authors Series, 368 (Boston: Twayne, 1975), 121-2.

³ 'People, Characters and Roles: A View of Characterization in *Celestina*', in *Fernando de Rojas and 'Celestina': Approaching the Fifth Centenary. Proceedings of an International Conference in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Death of Fernando de Rojas (Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 21-24 March 1991)*, edited by Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow (Madison: HSMS, 1993), 181-91, at 184-5.

⁴ *Celestina. Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, Introducción y edición crítica de Miguel Marciales, al cuidado de Brian Dutton y Joseph T. Snow, Illinois Medieval Monographs, I, 2 vols (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985), I, 276.

⁵ María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, *La originalidad artística de 'La Celestina'*, 2nd edition (Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 1970), 614-6, at 614-

⁶ *Comedia de Calisto & Melibea*, ed. Jerry R. Rank, Estudios de Hispanófila, 49 (Chapel Hill, NC: Hispanófila, 1978), 191, with 'leuantate' in the main text and the reading 'leuanta' noted (239 n. 29) in two of the early *Comedia* editions.

⁷ *La estructura de 'La Celestina'. Una lectura analítica*, Acta Salmanticensia, Estudios Filológicos, 204 (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1988), 128.

⁸ A feature retained in the *Tragicomedia*: 504, 515, 562, 565.

⁹ Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, *Arcipreste de Talavera*, ed. Marcella Ciceri, 2 vols (Modena: STEM-Mucchi, 1975), I, 134, with my corrections of the readings *Alosillo* and *ma*.

¹⁰ Fernando González Ollé, *Los sufijos diminutivos en castellano medieval*, RFE Anejo LXXV (Madrid: CSIC, 1962). For the *Cuentas de Gonzalo de Baeza*, see note 23 below.

¹¹ Haim Beinart, *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Cuidad Real*, III, *The Trials of 1512-1527 in Toledo* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1981), 399. Further cases of servants referred to with a diminutive are encountered in the Inquisition records concerning María de Cazalla in the 1520s-1530s edited by Milagros Ortega Costa, *Proceso de la Inquisición contra María de Cazalla* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1978): 'Aguilarico, criado de Tovar' (479), 'Francisquillo su page' (518), but again with no information on their ages.

¹² A point noted also by Hajime Okamura, 'Lucrecia en el esquema didáctico de *Celestina*', *Celestinesca*, 15:1 (mayo 1991), 53-62, at 61-2 note 18: 'Quizá no habrá mucha distancia entre Tristán y Sosia, por una parte, y los otros tres criados, por otra. Pármeno, se sabe, se convierte en mal criado porque ha sufrido tratamientos injustos de Calisto; Tristán y Sosia siguen fieles, porque no los sufren. Pues éstos tienen la posibilidad de perjudicar a su amo en cualquier momento según posibles cambios de circunstancias.' But neither of them has, of course, spoken to Celestina, as Lida de Malkiel notes (615).

¹³ For Alan Deyermond, 'Divisiones socio-económicas, nexos sexuales: la sociedad de *Celestina*', *Celestinesca*, 8:2 (otoño 1984), 3-10, at 7, this speech 'difiere de la reacción de Celestina frente a los encuentros eróticos de Areúsa y Pármeno, Elicia y Sempronio [...] sólo en la edad y la energía sexual de los que hablan', but this does not affect the question of Tristán's possible erotic experience.

¹⁴ Although here one could ask how accurate Pármeno's account of her to Calisto in Act I actually is, and whether in fact Celestina is simply reminding him of facts he would sooner have forgotten, rather than giving him a wholly manipulated portrait of his mother totally different from, and opposed to, his own recollections, it is relevant that he states that he left her at a very young age, and that at this point in the text we have no grounds for questioning Pármeno's veracity. Russell accepts that he genuinely knew nothing of her witchcraft (241 note 143). Note also that for James R. Stamm, 'Reading and Listening in *Celestina*', *Fernando de Rojas and 'Celestina': Approaching the Fifth Centenary*, 371-81, at 380, Tristán is among the

other figures who 'do not function as *personae* given primary access either to oral or literary authority, although the odd *dicho* will appear from time to time'. This, however, obscures the contrast between Pármeno's relationship to his mother once Celestina has manipulated it (a problem) and Tristán's (a source of help).

¹⁵ George A. Shipley, 'Authority and Experience in *La Celestina*', *BHS*, 62 (1985), 95-111, at 99.

¹⁶ Marciales considers Tristán's explanation of Calisto's state of mind a problem (I, 135) in view of its dependence on information which cannot have been available to the servants. If one concentrates rather on the medical dimension of the explanation, Tristán's observation can be seen as an intelligent guess, on the motivation of which one may legitimately speculate.

¹⁷ Are they speaking softly (Sosia having taken the previous occasion to heart), or is Tristán too concerned with the content of Sosia's revelations to worry about the conversation being overheard? No doubt in some quarters this point of difference between the two incidents would be seen as evidence for a difference of authorship in the two passages involved.

¹⁸ If a further footnote may here be added to this approach, it is curious that Tristán thrice uses the word 'triste' in the *Comedia*, and that on each occasion it is followed by a noun or adjective with an initial nasal (*tristes nuevas*, 491; *triste muerte*, 575; *triste y nueva*, 576). These juxtapositions may suggest that an element of verbal patterning is associated with the name of the character (cf. the final nasal of 'Tristán'), though it is equally uncertain whether much weight should be attached to this, and what its significance might be. The same pattern is observable in a remark he makes in the *Tragicomedia* additions (*el triste de nuestro amo*, 575).

¹⁹ 'Evocaciones en torno a los nombres de Sosia y Tristán', *Celestinesca*, 14:1 (mayo 1990), 41-55, at 44-7. For Rojas's copy of the book in 1541, see Stephen Gilman, *The Spain of Fernando de Rojas. The Intellectual and Social Landscape of 'La Celestina'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 439.

²⁰ It had been noted also by Julio Cejador, 'nombre tomado de la leyenda conocida del ciclo bretón': *La Celestina* (Madrid: Ediciones de La Lectura, 1913), II, 114 n.15.

²¹ Isabel Beceiro Pita, 'La fascination pour la "matière de Bretagne" dans la noblesse castillane du Moyen Age tardif', in *La Bretagne, terre d'Europe* (Brest: Centre de recherche bretonne et celtique, and Quimper: Société archéologique du Finistère, 1992), 325-34. I am grateful to Dr Peter Linehan, who kindly told me of the existence of this item in May 1993 and furnished me with a copy of it. Beceiro's study does not, however, adequately cover the earliest phase of Arthurian material in the Peninsula, for which see my *The Earliest Arthurian Names in Spain and Portugal*, Fontaine Notre Dame., I (St Albans: David Hook, 1991), and 'Further Early Arthurian Names from Spain', *La Corónica*, 21.2 (1992-93), 23-33.

²² 'Documentary Mentions of Literary Characters', IV Colloquium on XVc Literature, Medieval Hispanic Research Seminar, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London, 25 September 1992. The paper was accompanied by a printed list of 'Documentary References to Individual Homonyms of Literary Characters', distributed as a handout. The sixteen volumes thus far published of the *Registro* cover the period to December 1499; more than 58,000 documents are calendared, and each volume has an onomastic index. Further literary names will require collection from future volumes in the series.

²³ Sources used are as follows:

Beinart: Haim Beinart, *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Ciudad Real*, 4 vols (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1985). References are to volume and page.

Bejarano: Francisco Bejarano, *Catálogo de los documentos del reinado de los Reyes Católicos existentes en el Archivo Municipal de Málaga*, Biblioteca Reyes Católicos, Inventarios y Catálogos, VIII (Madrid: CSIC, 1961). References are to page and item number.

Cuentas: Antonio de la Torre and E.A. de la Torre, *Cuentas de Gonzalo de Baeza, tesorero de Isabel la Católica*, 2 vols, Biblioteca Reyes Católicos, Documentos y Textos, V-VI (Madrid: CSIC, 1955-56). References are to volume and page.

Moorat, *Catalogue*: S.A. J. Moorat, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library*, II: *MSS Written after 1650 A.D.*, Publications of the Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine, Catalogue Series, MS 3 (London: The Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine, 1973); the volume for N-Z contains a Supplement with additional pre-1650 MSS.

RGS: *Registro General del Sello*, I-XII (Valladolid: CSIC, 1950-1974), XIII-XVI (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, Dirección General de Bellas Artes y Archivos, 1987-1992). References are to volume and item number. Given the size of the RGS corpus, I have used the index to each volume rather than reading all the documents as is my usual practice; all index entries noted have however been checked against the calendared documents. Any cases of the literary names studied here which are not indexed will therefore have been omitted.

Suárez Fernández: Luis Suárez Fernández, *Política Internacional de Isabel la Católica*, 5 vols (I: Valladolid: Instituto 'Isabel la Católica' de Historia Eclesiástica, 1965; II-V: Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, Departamento de Historia Medieval, 1966-72). References are to volume and page.

Testamentaria: Antonio de la Torre y del Cerro, ed., *Testamentaria de Isabel la Católica*, Documentos, 10 (Valladolid: Instituto 'Isabel la Católica' de Historia Eclesiástica & CSIC, 1968)

Trujillo: Haim Beinart, *Trujillo. A Jewish Community in Extremadura on the Eve of the Expulsion from Spain*, *Hispanica Judaica*, 2 (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press/The Hebrew University, 1980).

²⁴ The 53 or so occurrences of Tristán as a forename and 21 as a byname in this corpus compare with a maximum frequency of eight cases for the commonest of the other literary names in Appendix II. The definition of a 'literary name' is, of course, problematic. For present purposes, it denotes a name which is not known to form part of the onomastic resources of the Iberian Peninsula previous to its appearance as the name of a character in a literary work. Thus Arthurian names such as *Galván* and *Artús* do not seem to have been known in the Peninsula before the twelfth century, but thereafter are documented with increasing frequency; names of characters in *Amadís de Gaula* occur in advance of the earliest known printed edition, indicating manuscript diffusion (e.g., Harvey L. Sharrer, 'Briolanja as a Name in Early Fifteenth-century Portugal: echo of a reworked Portuguese *Amadís de Gaula*?', *La Corónica*, 19:1 (1990-91), 112-18; for

a further problem with *Amadís*, see my "'Esplandian" (Logroño, 1294) and the *Amadís* Question', *Journal of Hispanic Research*, 1 (1992-93), 273-4). Among problems associated with the concept of 'literary names' is the fact that a name may become so well established that social imitation or family tradition rather than direct literary inspiration accounts for its continuing use as a forename (as in the case of the Leguizamón family recorded by Avalor-Arce, note 25 below); and that it may have multiple literary occurrences (e.g., the presence of *Galván* as a name in ballads, removed from its Arthurian origins; the references to Iseo, Tristán and Lanzarote in *Amadís de Gaula*, a work in which Leonís appears as a personal name, possibly based on the toponym Lyonesse in Arthurian tradition (cf. *Tristán de Leonís*); and the re-use of Braçaida from the Troy story in Juan de Flores's *Grisel y Mirabella*). One would also need to consider whether a form such as Briolangel (deriving from Briolanja by popular etymology or deliberate religious adaptation?) would constitute a 'literary name'. It is also necessary to distinguish between the active use of a literary forename and its eventual fossilisation as a byname, since this distinction must be taken into account for chronological reasons and in assessing, so far as the evidence will permit it, the changing popularity of particular literary forenames. In this sample, for instance, 'Galván' does not appear in current use as a forename, and is registered only as a transmissible byname: cf. Appendix II, nos F7-8. In earlier periods, 'Galván' outnumbers all other Arthurian names encountered (see my *The Earliest Arthurian Names* and 'Further Early Arthurian Names', note 21 above).

²⁵ Juan Bautista Avalor-Arce, 'Onomástica épico-caballeresca en la Vasconia medieval', in *The Two Hesperias. Literary Studies in honor of Joseph G. Fucilla on the occasion of his 80th Birthday*, edited by Americo Bugliani, *Studia Humanitatis* (Madrid: José Porrúa Turanzas, 1977), 41-53.

²⁶ I am grateful to Professor Alan Deyermond for the loan of an elusive bibliographical item, and to Professor Vivian Nutton for assistance with material at the Wellcome Institute.

THE TRAGICOMEDIA DE CALISTO Y MELIBEA
AND ITS 'MORALITIE'

Jeremy N. H. Lawrance
Manchester University

Few aspects of the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* have caused more perplexity than its authors' statements about the play's didactic intention or *moralitie*, as medieval authors might have called it. We prefer to believe that no work of art worthy of the name can have so low a thing as a moral; yet there is no getting round the palpable design announced in the *Incipit*:

Síguese la Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea, compuesta en reprehensión de los locos enamorados que, vencidos de su desordenado apetito, a sus amigas llaman y dizen ser su dios. Así mismo fecha en aviso de los engaños de las alcahuetas y malos y lisonjeros sirvientes.¹

As Bataillon pointed out, this heading was the work of the *antiguo autor*, and strictly belongs only to his unfinished Auto I, the plot of which it summarizes.² Even so, we cannot clear Fernando de Rojas of the grave charge of didactic intent, for he too insisted on a moral to his book: not only in the dedicatory epistle *El autor a un su amigo* ('avisos y consejos contra lisonjeros y malos sirvientes y falsas mugeres hechizeras', 185) and in the acrostic verses (189-93) inserted

in the first version of 16 acts, but also in the final verses 'aplicando la obra al propósito por que la acabó' which he inserted at the end of the second version of 21 acts (609-10). And the *Titulo* summed up: 'avisos muy necesarios para mancebos, mostrándoles los engaños que están encerrados en sirvientes y alcahuetas' (181).

In his preliminaries Rojas claimed, not surprisingly, that the exemplary and didactic purpose was connected with the most astounding novelty of his *comœdia*, its tragic ending. He explicitly claimed this innovation in the acrostic verses, asserting in time-honoured didactic fashion that he made it because of his desire 'to mix a medicinal pill with the lascivious sugar' (190):

Este mi desseo cargado de antojos
compuso tal fin que el principio desata.³

The special moral significance of the unexpected dénouement is underlined both here ('buscad bien *el fin* de aquesto que escrivo, | o del principio leed su argumento'; cf. 'vinieron los amantes y los que les [los *CDMp*] ministraron en amargo y desastroso fin', *Argumento*, 208) and in the final verses (609):

Pues aquí vemos qu n mal fenescieron
aquestos amantes, huygamos su dan a.

Rojas wished to make it quite clear that his work, however far it had travelled from that of the *antiguo autor*, still had a moral, and that this moral was to be found in the warning *exemplum* of the deaths of the lovers (in these final verses he does not include the deaths of 'los que les ministraron') at the end.

Rojas's contemporaries did not always doubt the earnestness of these claims. Juan Luis Vives opined in his *De causis corruptarum artium*, II, 4 *De grammatica* (1531) that, with his radical innovation of the tragic ending, Rojas had outdone Terence, whose comic plots (*fabulae*) represented 'silly and vulgar things popular with the public', love-affairs, the tricks of harlots, lies of pimps, and boastful swearing of soldiers:

All this incitement to vice corrupted the morals of the
commonwealth, especially as the authors of plays
commonly gave a happy ending to all their flirting

and filth [...] In this regard the author of the Spanish tragicomedy of *Scelestina* acted more wisely, giving to the process of the affair and carnal delights of pleasure the bitterest of endings: the death and destruction of lovers, procuress, and pimps.

So too the humanist 'corrector de la impresión' Alonso de Proaza, when he added a stanza to his laudatory verses to explain *Cómo se debía la obra llamar tragicomedia y no comedia* (615), noted that its 'trágico fin', following hard on the lovers' triumph, offered a cautionary lesson on the false glammers of this traitorous world. Bataillon and Peter Russell have shown that such didactic readings of the *Tragicomedia* were to remain standard throughout the Golden Age, despite the rational suspicion of the censors (shared by Cervantes and the majority of the public) that the play's too human exuberance was, to borrow Sydney Smith's words, 'not teaching, but raising up splendid associations in favour of being hanged'.⁴

It seems, at any rate, that the promise of a didactic intention in the authors' blurb was meant to be noticed; and some readers professed to find the promise fulfilled. There remain, of course, various weapons in the arsenal of modern criticism for gutting these obnoxious facts of their import. We might, for example, reject *a priori* any notion that authors set out to improve their fellow men (and women), and take the statements as an elaborate hoax, mere *flatus uocis*. More subtly, we might argue that the *primer autor*, the older and less grown-up writer, said what he meant out of deference to medieval tradition, and meant what he said out of misguided naivety; Rojas, however, in his usual malicious way turned the claim into parody (there is some support for this latter view in Rojas's *Prólogo*, as I shall suggest below.) Some critics go further, and detect in the body of the play a significant absence of references to Christian morality--no rehearsal of the hair-raising torments of hell, none of the macabre topics of medieval preachers on *contemptus mundi*. In their view this absence of Christian teaching lends a profound and cynical irony to the illusory claims about 'avisos'.

On the other hand--and this is the commoner stratagem--we may accept the authors' statements of an ethical intention at face value, but fall back upon contending that the actual moral, if there is one, transcends any such reductive formulae as those propounded in the preliminary and terminal pieces which frame the play. By this

account, the didactic message of the *Tragicomedia* was made ambiguous, blurred, or even subverted altogether by the vitality of its action and characterization; deliberately or not, the finished work burst free from the constraints of any intended homily. The upshot of this argument, a development of Wimsatt's familiar account of the intentional fallacy, is to relegate the rather insistent statements of intent by the two authors to a cabinet of amusing curiosities, and to get on with the business of interpreting the play without them.

My purpose in reopening the question of the moral of Rojas's play is not to deny the validity of approaches such as these. I do not defend or impugn the propriety of moralities in literature, and neither know nor care whether the *Tragicomedy* really has a moral message. We may accept with unruffled calm the proposition that the book's greatness has nothing to do with advice about how to deal with over-obsequious domestic staff or brothel-keepers with a sideline in the black arts. My concern is not with what the play means, but with the philological problem of what phrases such as 'avisos muy necesarios para mançebos' meant. What follows is thus offered as a postil to the *ingens opus* of Peter Russell's interpretative commentary.

The first thing is to clarify what the authors actually say about their moral. This is more peculiar than a first glance suggests. An understandable but superficial error, based on a phrase about 'defensivas armas para resistir sus fuegos [de Amor]' in the dedicatory epistle *El autor a un su amigo* (184) and several remarks about 'este fino arnés con que os defendáys [vosotros que amáys]' in the acrostic verses (192), is to suppose that the 'avisos y consejos' were meant to warn us against falling in love, or against courtly love, or against the perils of passion.

But this mundane message is never mentioned in the texts quoted in my first paragraph, which say something quite distinct; nor is it an idea which accords with the content of the play, whose plot seems designed from beginning to end to show that Calisto and Melibea, though at times they imitate the extravagant postures of the heroes and heroines of sentimental romance, are in the grip of a passion which is an irresistible madness, a sickness whose onset and pathology is governed by ineluctable fate (e.g. 'para comienço de lo qual dispuso el adversa Fortuna lugar oportuno', *Argumento*, 208; 'Pleb.: ¡O fortuna variable, ministra y mayordoma de los temporales bienes! [...] Pero ¿quién forçó a mi hija a morir, sino la fuerte fuerça

de amor?', Auto XXI, 597-602). The absurdity, or at least futility, of warning us to avoid the unavoidable would certainly not have been lost on the jurist Rojas; one might as well admonish people not to catch a common cold. The specific words about *sirvientes* and *alcahuetas* suggest that Rojas and his predecessor had in mind something much less anodyne than fatuous cautions on the vanity of fleshly things or the overmastering power of erotic mania.⁵

We must go beyond such jejune suppositions, therefore, and hold fast to the much more surprising thing which the text actually says: that is, that its *avisos* are not against the forces of natural instinct and passion, but against what Rojas calls the *vicios* of love (191, 192), and more specifically against the human agents of such vices, namely 'las alcahuetas e malos e lisonjeros sirvientes' (205), 'lisonjeros y malos sirvientes y falsas mugeres hechizeras' (185), or 'los engaños que están encerrados en sirvientes y alcahuetas' (181), so that to 'gente buelta y mezclada en vicios de amor' the fate of Calisto and Melibea 'les pornán temor | a fiar de alcahueta ni de mal sirviente' (191).⁶

Defined in this particular way, the authors' announcement of didactic intention can be recognized as a specific commonplace. It must not be confused with the general topics of moralizing intention to be found in most forms of medieval literature, but recognized for what it is: a distinct and deliberate allusion to the special decorum of the genre to which the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* aspired to belong. The words of the *Incipit* which specify an ethical aim ('compuesta en reprehensión de los locos enamorados [...] Así mismo fecha en aviso de los engaños de las alcahuetas y malos y lisonjeros sirvientes') recall the incipits of several humanist comedies, such as that of Leonardo Bruni's *Poliscena* (printed several times before the appearance of the *Tragicomedia*).⁷ These in turn allude to the elegiac verses from the medieval *accessus*, *Epitaphium Terentii*, included in the preliminaries to manuscript and early printed copies of the *Comoediae*:

descripsi mores hominum iuuenumque senumque,
 qualiter et serui decipiant dominos,
 quid meretrix, quid leno dolis confingit auarus:
 haec quicumque legit, sic puto, cautus erit.⁸

Terence was studied in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries primarily as a rhetorical text; and since, as Aristotle said, the highest aim of

oratory is to persuade us to virtue and dissuade us from vice, it was from this viewpoint that the humanists derived their moral definition of comedy.⁹ The Donatan *Excerpta de comoedia* which figured at the head of most early editions of the *Comoediae* stated baldly:

comedy is a fictional tale about the various customs of public and private behaviour, which teach us what is useful in life and what is to be avoided.¹⁰

The approach suggested by this last phrase is exemplified on almost every page of Donatus's scholia. In *Eunuchus*, for example, he asserts that 'Terence delights us with wit, instructs us with useful *exempla*, and satirizes human vices'; in *Adelphoe* the portrayal of contrasting styles of life 'is designed *ad exemplum* to show us what to imitate and what to shun'.¹¹

It was inevitable that the Renaissance humanist commentators and pedagogues who followed in the footsteps of Donatus should lay heavy and insistent stress on the moral *utilitas* of comedy. In a typical edition I have before me, for instance, the editor gives the following *Argumentum* to the second scene of Act I of the first of Terence's *Comoediae*, *Andria*, adding at the end a list of the ethical precepts to be extracted from it:

This scene shows that in civil life the conjectures of human wit and prudence are unable to discern the truth. It reveals the cleverness of a wily and experienced slave who considers and judges everything according to the capacity of his servile wit and mind, to avoid being caught napping; it also shows a father's excessive indulgence to his sons and neglect of their education. *Morals*. 1: Matrimony is a most useful remedy for lovers. 2: Bad examples at home are very pernicious. 3: Wicked servants make a rod for their own backs.¹²

Turning over a few pages we find the following *argumentum* to Act II, Sc. ii, which could as well stand at the head of both *Comedia* and *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* as the present *Incipit*:

This scene describes the agile wit of slaves, their deceitful impudence and innate desire to circumvent

their masters, so that it is difficult to guard against them, and our slaves become so many enemies. It also shows the behaviour of lovers who to their utter shame allow themselves in the blindness of passion to be governed by the advice of a deceitful slave.¹³

Erasmus recommended the study of Roman comedy to schoolboys ('avisos muy neçessarios para mançebos') as a propaedeutic to more rigorous courses in ethical philosophy, while Melanchthon claimed that Terence was 'better for educating the judgment of the young on common morals than any philosopher' because he exposes the vices of 'brawlers, sycophants, meddlers and flatterers', and especially provides defences against 'courtesans'.

The ethical was, it is true, only one side of the ancient and humanist concept of the didactic function of comedy. The other is exemplified in a remark in Donatus' prologue to his commentary on the *Hecyra* which is, again, reminiscent of certain remarks in the preliminaries of the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Donatus praises the style of that play for 'its many *sententiae* and figures of speech', adding: 'therefore it profits as well as delights the spectators'.¹⁴ The point was picked up by the humanist commentators; Melanchthon said of the *Andria*, for example, that as well as correcting our morals it 'enriches the style of our prose', while Josse Bade van Aaschen demonstrated the moral utility of the first scene of *Andria*, 'which has more moral doctrines than there are words in it', by selecting ten *sententiae* from the text, elaborating them with further citations of *auctoritates*, and commenting on the 'elegance and propriety of its language'. All this recalls the words of the *Título* ('la qual contiene demás de su agradable e dulce estilo muchas sentencias filosofales e avisos muy nesçessarios para mancebos', 181), and also Rojas's words in the dedicatory epistle to his first version of the play (*El autor a un su amigo*, 185):

Vi no sólo ser dulce en su principal ystoria o ficción toda junta, pero aun de algunas sus particularidades salían delectables fonteçicas de filosofhía; de otras, agradables donaires; de otras, avisos y consejos contra lisongeros y malos sirvientes y falsas mugeres hechizeras [...] Es digno de recordable memoria por la sutil invención, por la gran copia de sentencias entrexeridas que so color de donayres tiene.

To be sure, Rojas's personal view of the utility of *sententiae* was ambivalent. That is why he picks up the point again, with a thinly-veiled allusion to the pompous Renaissance schoolmasters' habit of attending to the details rather than to the whole, in the *Prólogo* to his revised version (201):

Pero aquéllos para cuyo verdadero plazer es todo, desechan el cuento de la hystoria para contar, coligen la suma para su provecho, ríen lo donoso, las sentencias y dichos de philósophos guardan en su memoria para trasponer en lugares convenientes a sus autos y propósitos.

The surreptitious irony in this remark emerges later.¹⁵ But the essential point is that these allusions to the humanist tradition of reading comedy for its ethical and rhetorical teaching, and Rojas's satire of that tradition in the last quotation, set the claims in a specific and readily recognizable context.

With the exception of Bataillon, critics have largely ignored the *Tragicomedia's* allusions to these ancient and Renaissance didactic commonplaces as empty formulae. But, of course, Bataillon was right; a moral dimension was evidently indispensable to comedy. The question remains: what sort of moral? This is the crux of my argument: a genre that had been read for its moral *avisos* at least from the time of Cicero, before the Christian era, and by pagan writers and grammarians for centuries afterwards, cannot have been didactic in a religious or theological, still less in a distinctively Christian, sense; and the examples adduced above demonstrate that the Christian followers of Donatus in the Renaissance did nothing whatever to change the terms of reference for moral analysis of Terentian comedy. To find significance in the absence from our play of any explicit Christian *moralitie* is to fall into an absurd irrelevance; to see in it the spiritual and theological conflict of 'buen amor de Dios v. loco amor del mundo', an approach powerfully and surreptitiously suggested to us by another work of medieval Spanish literature, is a pernicious red herring. Instead, the authors beg us over and over again to concentrate our moral concern on love as a social problem, love as a cause of civil 'escándalos', criminal adultery, and prostitution, with all the concomitant threats to family, state, and public morals.¹⁶

In fact, the attention of all the commentators was centred not merely on secular ethics, but on a strikingly restricted area within secular ethics: the tricks and lies of domestic slaves, the dangers of *malas mujeres*, the corruption of minors, and the perils of squandering the family patrimony and honour. One has only to read the commentaries to note their constant use of terms like 'civil' or 'public and private life', 'common morals', 'prudence', and 'utility'; it was taken for granted that the lessons of comedy concerned, not the deep dilemmas of guilt or cosmic evil, but familiar matters, civil morality, and social behaviour. This, according to medieval and Renaissance terminology, was *philosophia moralis*: not a branch of Christian dogma, but its pagan and secular counterpart. Aristotle, it was thought, had subdivided moral philosophy into the interconnected disciplines of *ethica* ('custom/character', conduct of the individual), *oeconomica* ('husbandry', the conduct of household and family), and *politica* ('policy', conduct of civil commonwealths); when a fifteenth or sixteenth-century writer talked of 'morals', therefore, he was thinking not so much of the salvation of souls as of the ethical, economical, and political *prudentia* of citizens in a well-regulated civil community.

It is in that sense, and that sense only, that the genre of humanist comedy to which the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* belongs might be said to have a moral message. The morality concerned owed its horizons and perspectives to the urban and civic mentality of Roman society and of its own times rather than to the otherworldly concerns of St Austin or St Benet. Seen in this light, the authors' claim to provide '*avisos y consejos contra lisongeros y malos sirvientes y falsas mugeres hechizeras*'--the claim, that is, that the morality of the book has to do not so much with the sinful (but natural) love of its young nobles as with the involvement in their affair of vulgar plebeian criminals--seems one which it is perfectly rational (though not obligatory) to take seriously. Note, for example, how the wages of debauchery and venal love are presented not in terms of psychological, spiritual, or eschatological abstractions (as they might be in sentimental romance, or sermons), but in a series of violent felonies--murder, seduction, rape, and suicide, the very images of civil disorder and criminal upheaval.

These, Rojas seems to say, are the effects, the *vicios*, of love: social problems rather than religious ones, malfunctions of public rather than inner morality. In his letter *A un su amigo* (184) he wrote

of 'la necesidad que nuestra común patria tiene de la presente obra, por la muchedumbre de galanes y enamorados mancebos que posee'. The claim must strike us as mere persiflage, if we forget that fornication was a matter of public concern, gravely discussed by political theorists and legislators, so that a *moralitie* about the ruin of a decent family by a criminal rabble of corrupt servants, prostitutes, pimps, and a procuress could indeed be described as 'necessary' to the civil community of the writer's *patria* (Toledo, Puebla de Montalbán?). Rojas's tongue may have been in his cheek, but his play undeniably addressed a subject which touched early modern sensibilities on the raw. The siege and overthrow of Pleberio's household held out in microcosm the hideous spectre of Disorder, the subversion of the God-enucleated commonwealth by vice, treachery, and violent death.

That both plot and theme are consistent with the authors' account of their didactic message is, perhaps, a rather facile point. It is in the detailed texture of individual episodes that the coherence becomes impressive. Take, for example, the speech which Melibea addresses to her father from the parapet of his tower (the household's defence) just before her suicide (XX, 586):

Bien vees y oyes este triste y doloroso sentimiento que toda la cibdad haze. Bien vees [oyes *Tragicom.*] este clamor de campanas, este alarido de gentes, este aullido de canes, este grande estrépito de armas. De todo esto fuy yo la causa. Yo cobrí de luto y xergas en este día quasi la mayor parte de la cibdadana cavallería.

The incorporated stage-directions and anaphoric demonstratives ('vees', 'oyes', 'este [...] este [...] este') indicate noisy alarms off-stage, beyond the *huerta* wall which symbolizes the integrity of Pleberio's house: wailing and keening intermingle with the tolling of the tocsin, the barking of guard-dogs, and the confused clatter of steel. The anonymous sixteenth-century commentator was struck by this description, which he explained as a reference to the old-fashioned Castilian funeral custom of smashing armour and shields 'en cada calle o encruzijada [...] en significación del gran dolor'.¹⁷ Or we may imagine Calisto's kinsmen and *bando* arming themselves to avenge the violent death of one of their clan, in one of those street affrays which were a daily feature of late-medieval urban life.¹⁸ At any rate, the

civil disturbance painted by the impetuous Melibea cannot be mere imagination: something is going on outside in the streets, or her invitation to 'look and listen' would be absurd.

The significant point of Melibea's vignette of civil disturbance is, however, the fact that Rojas included it at this pathetic and climactic moment of the action. It surprises us to learn that Calisto's accidental death is a matter of public import, which may even put paid to the whole charitable economy of 'pobres y vergonçantes' in the *ciudad* (586)--unless, that is, we have followed the authors' invitation to read the play from the beginning as a social morality. For such a passage seems designed on purpose to show how wrong Calisto and Melibea were (and us with them) to suppose that their affair could take place in a social vacuum.

The lovers' story is constantly interwoven into the social fabric of its setting by such effects of stagecraft; from the moment of their first encounter (according to the *antiguo autor* in a church, as Riquer deduced)¹⁹ its theatrical space is made full, material, and circumstantiated. The noise and bustle of streets, palaces, squares, churches, and disreputable side-alleys, all the scenery of Celestina's town, are economically but vividly sketched in the comings and goings, asides, stage-business, and reminiscences of the characters. Pármeno's evocation of Celestina's merry presence in taverns and gaming-shops, 'en los combites, en las fiestas, en las bodas, en las cofradías, en los mortuorios, en todos los ayuntamientos de gentes', and her progress through the various guild-streets of the town, 'si va entre los herreros [...], carpinteros y armeros, herradores, caldereros, arcadores' (Auto I, 240), is the work of the *primer autor*; it was a hint not lost on Rojas, who, in keeping with his more sombre vision, gives us the obverse of these peopled scenes: vivid evocations of the same haunts by night, when the *alguazil* and the guard patrol the unlighted streets with torches, armed miscreants prowl, terrified servants crouch abjectly in the shadows, and the *saltaparedes* goes about his furtive business with his ladder (XII, 408, 418-21; XIV, 495); or in the twilight of dawn, when, in Sosia's vivid *adumbratio* (XIV, 504-05),

suelen levantarse [...] los ricos, los cobdiciosos de temporales bienes, los devotos de templos, monesterios y yglesias, los enamorados como nuestro amo, los trabajadores de los campos y labranças, y los

pastores que en este tiempo traen las ovejas a estos apriscos a ordeñar.

The function of such passages, as of the evocation of the 'escándalo público' in the monologue of Melibea, is to keep before our eyes the fact that the action acquires its true dimension only as part of a definite social context.

This social context is not only present in the strongly-realized physical urban space of the play; it is also brought alive in the web of human relationships. Elicia is Areúsa's cousin; Celestina is Pármeno's mother's *comadre*; Pármeno, through his relationship with Areúsa, acquires Celestina as a sort of *consuegra*, and becomes the companion of Sempronio, Elicia's lover. In the Pleberio household, Alisa remembers Celestina as a *vecina* and *comadre*; the *criada* Lucrecia, from her different estate and for different reasons, knows the old woman too. It is even revealed, in the same surprising passage of Melibea's monologue already quoted, that Pleberio is an old friend of Calisto's family (587, with Russell's note *ad loc.*). In other words all the characters are bound to all the others by one or other of the various complex species of affinity which cemented medieval society; the cast is itself a microcosm of the links and obligations of kith and kin, *crianza*, and *compadrazgo*. And the purpose of the *Tragicomedia* is to show these relationships in a terminal state of malfunction, or, in a favourite metaphor of the time, to reveal a cancer in the body politic.²⁰

A passage which permits us vividly to sense that cancer is to be found is the speech at the end of Auto XIII in which the impractical dreamer Calisto, until then torn out of social space by the symptoms of his clinical madness, is jolted back into remembering his proper position in society by Sosia's spine-chilling account of the public execution of his two servants. Calisto's first thought is for his *honra*, his duty to maintain the reputation of his estate (493):

Pues yo bien siento mi honrra [...] ¡O mi triste nombre y fama, cómo andas al tablero, de boca en boca! ¡O mis secretos más secretos, cuán públicos andarés por las plazas y mercados! [...] ¡O día de congoxa! ¡O fuerte tribulación! ¡Y en que anda mi hazienda de mano en mano y mi nombre de lengua en lengua! Todo será público quanto con ella y con

ellos hablava, quanto de mí sabían, el negocio en que andavan. No osaré salir ante gentes.

But this thought is soon pushed aside by his obsession with the enchanted pleasures of Melibea's garden and the threat to his hopes of possessing her person, 'que es lo que más en este caso desastrado siento' (*ibid.*). Calisto decides to sacrifice social responsibility for the spurious duties of the devoted adulterer ('no dexaré de complir el mandado de aquélla por quien todo esto se ha causado', 494), a course he hypocritically justifies with this politic epitaph on the servants who suborned him, and whom he suborned (494-95):

Ellos eran sobrados y esforçados; agora o en otro tiempo de pagar havían. La vieja era mala y falsa, según parece que hazía trato con ellos, y assí que riñieron sobre la capa del justo. Permisión fue divina que assí acabasse, en pago de muchos adulterios que por su intercessión o causa son cometidos.

The young knight's judgment is impeccable; he aligns himself with the forces of law and 'good policy' in the civil commonwealth of which he is inescapably a part. But, typically, he fails to see the relevance of the social doctrine to himself—except insofar as the dishonour may require temporary exile or feigned madness, and a consequent suspension of hostilities against Melibea's maidenhead. Calisto's support for the forces of civil order reveals itself in decidedly machiavellian colours.

It is surely significant that Calisto is made to return to the theme of the abuse and corruption of civic responsibility one act later, in one of the most notable additions in the interpolated acts of the 1502 version. He does so in a monologue occasioned by the natural lassitude (*Omne animal post coitum triste est*) which follows copulation (Auto XIV, 506-15)—a lassitude which, as every schoolboy knew, moralists had for centuries held up as a physical type of the debilitating and vicious effects of erotic love.²¹ Representing as it does the second thoughts of Rojas, this speech, which at ten pages is one of the longest in the play, cannot fail to impress us, once again, with the ubiquity of the play's concern for the political (in the Renaissance sense). For Calisto rejects the standard explanation for his paradoxical melancholy in this crowning moment of his triumph (doctors of the day would have diagnosed it as the abrupt cooling of

vital humours brought about by ejaculation). It seems to him no medical thing, but an effect of 'el dolor de mi deshonrra' (506):

¡Ay, ay! que esto es. Esta herida es la que siento agora que se ha resfriado, agora que está elada la sangre que ayer ['last night'] hervía, agora que veo la mengua de mi casa, la falta de mi servicio, la perdición de mi patrimonio, la infamia que tiene mi persona.

The thought leads Calisto back to his own social responsibilities as a *caballero* ('¿Cómo me pude soffrir, que no me mostré luego presente como hombre injuriado, vengador, sobervio y acelerado de la manifiesta injusticia que me fue hecha?', 507); and thence to a lengthy philippic on the judge, on justice and the law ('eres público delinquente y mataste a los que son privados'), on the feudal bonds and mutual obligations of companionship ('amigos y criados antiguos, parientes y allegados'), and on the civil fabric of clienthood, patronage, and commensality ('¡Y qué mal pago me has dado del pan que de mi padre comiste! [...] en servir a mis passados y a mí érades compañeros', 508-09).

As Peter Russell has noted (*Temas*, 334-38), Calisto's speech is a mare's nest of contradictions and special pleading, a masterpiece of legal pettifoggery; it is duly abandoned for more delightful erotic contemplations ('¡Oh mi señora y mi vida!', 512). The dramatic purpose of the monologue's inclusion in the revised version of the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* is therefore, once again, to suggest how far Calisto is from realizing or fulfilling the social obligations which he himself analyses at such length. But that in turn serves to underline the existence of those obligations, and to remind the reader that it is their transgression which forms the real *vicio* of Calisto's infatuation, the real threat to public morals, the real corruption of youth.

These examples of references to the social or political theme in the *Tragicomedia* have been chosen to show that the promise of salutary 'avisos' on the moral health of the *patria* made in the preliminaries of both authors finds its echo in the text. We are now in a position to return to the *Argumento general* with new understanding of the stress which it lays on the social estate of each of the protagonists, and in Melibea's case (according to the mentalities

of her time wholly dependent on male relatives for her place in social space) on the citizen whose most important chattel she was (207):

Calisto fue de noble linaje, de claro ingenio, de gentil disposición, de linda criança, dotado de muchas gracias, de estado mediano. Fue preso en el amor de Melibea, muger moça muy generosa, de alta y sereníssima sangre, sublimada en próspero estado, una sola heredera a su padre Pleberio, y de su madre Alisa muy amada.²²

What we are being invited to do in these phrases, and all the other remarks in the preliminaries which I have examined, is to contemplate the workings of 'desordenado apetito'--the adjective is as much political as medical--as causes, and violent death as a symptom, of a socially transmitted disease which attacks the tranquil bastion of a respectable noble family;²³ socially transmitted, that is, because although Love is a necessary cause of contagion, the efficient cause is the intervention of that 'mala y astuta mujer' Celestina. In this perspective, Celestina's shabby and disreputable bordello represents the spatial antithesis of the *hortus conclusus* of Pleberio's *solar*; the 'madre' and her grubby clan of whores and pimps are a grotesque inversion of the patriarchal Renaissance household; their sordid couplings form the shocking counterpart to the illicit courtship of Calisto and Melibea. A pestilential corruption spawned in the criminal underworld of the stews is thus shown to spread like a virus through the limbs of the body politic, suborning 'con el anzuelo de cobdicia y de deleyte' (208) the loyalty of *criados*--the ancient Hispanic term well captures the feudal resonance of reciprocal trusts and sureties which bound lord and servant--until finally and fatally infecting the noble head. It is a telling point, not often noticed by modern commentators, that in his revision of the last strophe of the acrostic verses Rojas took pains to specify that the endangered head was composed not only of 'los que amáis', but of all the representatives of respectable married and marriageable citizenry (his own and his patron's class, that is): 'O damas matronas, mancebos, casados, ¡ notad bien la vida que aquestos hizieron'.²⁴

This social pathology, which throws the burden of criminal culpability upon the Third Estate, has caused some unease. It serves to remind us that the authors' social norms were, inescapably, those of their historical period. The ideas of the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y*

Melibea on society--on civil order and the polity, on class and criminality, on the situation of women, on family honour--were the conventional ideas of its day. But we may defend Rojas, at least, from the charge of class-hatred. That the play was read as a tract on prostitution there seems no doubt (the direction taken by the Celestinesque imitations, and above all by *La lozana andaluza*, is ample evidence); it is therefore worth recording that Rojas's view of this institution was not conventional. In early modern Europe prostitution was not considered by legislators and moralists as a social evil; on the contrary, in most cities the brothels, bagnios, and *casas públicas* were not merely tolerated, but actually managed by the municipal and ecclesiastical authorities, who justified the practice with the canonists' utilitarian argument that prostitutes provided an outlet for 'apetitos desordenados' (given the Church's stringent rules about intercourse within matrimony, this meant both in and out of wedlock), thus protecting the honour and safety of respectable citizens.²⁵

A striking example is the *cédula* granted to the Salamancan municipal authorities by the city's overlord Prince Juan, and confirmed by the Catholic Monarchs, to construct a new brothel or *mancebía para las muxeres públicas* in 1498, the profits of which were farmed out to the *regidor* Juan Arias Maldonado, a principal citizen, at an annual rent of 10,000 *maravedís*.²⁶ The same permissive attitude was not shown, however, to freelance prostitutes, whose unlicensed activities posed a threat not only to morals, but also, perhaps more importantly, to the revenues of official brothels. It is against the latter kind of prostitution that the *Tragicomedia* takes, or claims to take, its moral (in the Renaissance political sense) stand. What is novel in Rojas's presentation, however, is his clear implication that the evils of this trade are to be blamed as much on its clients as its suppliers.

It is not my intention, however, to discuss the historical background to the claimed *moralité* of our play, nor to speculate on the authors' sincerity in claiming it, but simply to establish the nature and meaning of the claims themselves. I close with two topics of Rojan scholarship on which I believe a proper understanding of the social nature of that *moralité*, if I have interpreted it aright, may throw some light. The first is the old question, so often posed by critics, of why neither Calisto nor Melibea consider marriage as a possible solution to their problem. Actually this is not quite true: the *primer autor*, in what Nicholas Round called the 'jolly erotic farce' of

his unfinished first act,²⁷ envisaged the marriage of Calisto and Melibea as the fitting end to his play. A clue to his intention is given by Calisto's first speech after his encounter with Melibea, when he prays that the *exemplum* of Seleucus's pity for his love-sick son may inspire like pity 'en el plebérico corazón' (214-15); this remark must surely mean 'induce Melibea's father to let me marry his daughter', as the anonymous sixteenth-century commentator noted.²⁸

By entitling his work *Comedia* the original author signalled his certain intention of developing this hint, and of concluding his play with the standard wedding of Terentian comedy. But Rojas rejected the happy ending in accordance with his tragicomic vision of the story, and went to extraordinary lengths, including the addition of a whole act (XVI), to show that, once Celestina and the lying servants became entangled in the plot, decent Christian and civil marriage ceased to be an option. The coy maiden of Act I, so conscious of her social standing and reputation, is portrayed in this additional act as a girl who despite her careful upbringing by Alisa does not hesitate to deceive her parents, who cannot bear to hear them discussing her marriage in order to 'quitarla [...] de lenguas del vulgo' because 'no hay cosa con que mejor se conserve la limpia fama en las vírgenes que con temprano casamiento' (533). Pleberio and Alisa see marriage, with all their contemporaries, as the only conceivable slot in society for their daughter; according to Melibea herself they have been discussing the problem of marrying her off for over a month. The servant Lucrecia's ironical aside reveals the *aviso* of this telling scene (534):

¡Aun si bien lo supieses, rebentarías! ¡Ya, ya,
perdido es lo mejor! ¡Mal año se os apareja a la vejez!
Lo mejor Calisto lo lleva. No hay quien ponga virgos,
que ya es muerta Celestina. ¡Tarde acordáys! ¡Más
avíades de madrugar!

The condemnation of the parents' lack of prudence is cutting. Nevertheless, their vain project provokes a notable moment of remorse in Melibea, who pronounces a little diatribe rejecting the sacrament of marriage altogether (535-38). This called forth a comment from Lida de Malkiel about the disconcerting and unhistorical incongruity of the girl's sentiment.²⁹ But her explanation, that Melibea's antipathy to the social norms of her day is another sign of the tyranny of her 'pasión avasalladora', a quixotic dream of heroic

or courtly love which refuses to recognize the conventions of custom and canon law, does not go far enough. What Melibea says is this (535-36):

Calisto es mi ánima, mi vida, mi señor, en quien yo tengo toda mi esperança. Conozco dél que no bivo engañada. Pues él me ama, ¿con qué otra cosa le puedo pagar? Todas las debdas del mundo resciben compensación en diverso género; el amor no admite sino sólo amor por paga [...] Haga y ordene de mí a su voluntad. Si passar quisiere la mar, con él yré; si rodear el mundo, lléveme consigo; si venderme en tierra de enemigos, no rehuyré su querer. Déxenme mis padres gozar dél, si ellos quieren gozar de mí. No piensen en estas vanidades ni en estos casamientos; que más vale ser buena amiga que mala casada [...] No quiero marido, no quiero ensuziar los ñudos del matrimonio, ni las maritales pisadas de ageno hombre repisar.

The argument is somewhat confused, but Melibea seems to be saying that as Calisto's wife--no need of bell, book, and candle--she cannot commit bigamy even with the man who is already her husband; she can only be his *manceba*. Yet, as the *Argumento general* makes clear and as she reminds her father in her suicide speech, that flower of *cibdadana cavallería* Calisto would by no means have been an unacceptable match, even in a marriage of convenience ('el qual tú bien conociste. Conociste assí mismo sus padres y claro linaje', 587). Her rejection of legitimate civil marriage with the man she loves must be due not to passion, but to the shameful adultery in which she has become embroiled as a result of the intervention of Celestina. It is this which effectively cuts Melibea off from every conceivable link with the society of her day, so that in truth her offer to sell herself into slavery in a Moorish harem falls little short of any actual fate that might await her. We must conclude, therefore, that Rojas introduced the theme of marriage in Auto XVI explicitly in order to demonstrate that a wedding of the two lovers, though in theory acceptable, was excluded by the criminal means which they used to pursue their affair. The scene, like Calisto's speech on crime and punishment in Auto XIV, portrays the violent unhinging and malfunction of social norms brought about by the action and conduct of Celestina and the servants.

This point can be clarified by a comparison with the sentimental romances on which Melibea, like a medieval Emma Bovary, modelled her behaviour. Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor*, for instance, is another story with a social dimension: Leriano cannot marry Laureola for reasons of honour and social inequality, and also for reasons of state to do with the king's need for a suitable heir. But in San Pedro's book these motifs are thin, one might almost say rachitic, pretexts for motivating a plot whose chief dramatic mechanisms remain sentimental and psychological: artificial *estorbos* invented, like the fictional 'ley de Escocia', merely in order to provide excuses for Leriano's *Liebestod*, and, above all, for initiating the tiresome controversies on the casuistry of courtly love which are the true purpose of the book. The romance concentrates on introspection, and lacks any feeling of social space. In the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, on the other hand, the social dimension is no structural makeshift for motivating a plot with other centres of interest; it is the centre of interest.

As if to prove the point, we have at the very end of the work my second topic for comment, the famous *planctus* of Pleberio (Auto XXI). Critics have not been slow to point out the parallel of this parent's lament over a child *in articulo mortis* with that of Leriano's mother at the end of the *Cárcel de amor*. The latter is a transparent manoeuvre for the insertion of a pathetic *peroratio* which could not, for reasons which need not detain us, be made by Laureola herself; and Bataillon considered Rojas's Auto XXI to be little more, accusing Pleberio's plangent despair of being a rhetorical excrescence on the comic body of the play.³⁰ Seen from our social or 'economic' perspective, however, the father's lament turns out to be an entirely logical and definitive conclusion of all that has gone before. For if the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* is in some sense designed to show a love-affair subverting the pillars of civil order, that order must, of course, be represented not by Calisto, but by citizen Pleberio and his household. I have already spoken of the walled garden and its watch-tower as symbols of a threatened social republic; Pleberio and his womenfolk represent, or ought to represent, all that is decent and respectable in the honourable estate of civil and family life. That in turn means that, if there is any tragedy in this tragicomedy, it is the tragedy of the destruction of Pleberio's calm and ordered husbandry (596):

[Y]a quedas sin tu amada heredera. ¿Para quién edificué torres? ¿Para quién adquirí honrras? ¿Para quién planté árboles? ¿Para quién fabriqué navíos?

I do not claim to have found in the preceding analyses any key to the artistic significance of the *Tragicomedia*. The question of whether the didactic meaning can be, or was meant to be, sustained by an overall reading of the play has not been touched upon; and besides, as I hinted at the outset, it is my belief that the authors' intentions in this matter are largely irrelevant to criticism. Nevertheless, if my proposal helps to sharpen understanding of the function of some words or passages in the text, or to clarify some imprecision of critical interpretation, it will have served its purpose. Above all, I have tried to argue that the authors' offer of *avisos* against the evils of prostitution and vice need not, given the social parameters of their age, have been as foolish or nugatory as we might at first sight suppose. We may even be able to understand why someone could have thought a work like the *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* a 'necesidad que nuestra común patria tiene [...], por la muchedumbre de galanes y enamorados mançebos que posee'.

Elicia Arcusa. Sofía.



Valencia 1514. Grabado del 17^o auto.

NOTES

¹ Fernando de Rojas, *Comedia o tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, ed. Peter E. Russell (Madrid: Castalia, 1991), 205. Quotations are from this edition, except that I use italics for emphasis, not to indicate interpolations in the '1502' revision.

² Marcel Bataillon, '*La Célestine*' selon Fernando de Rojas (Paris: Didier, 1961), 70. This is why the *Incipit* does not come at the beginning of the text, but after Rojas's preliminaries and acrostic verses, as I have suggested in 'On the Title *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*', in *Letters and Society in Fifteenth-Century Spain: Studies Presented to P. E. Russell on his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Alan Deyermond & Jeremy Lawrance (Oxford: Dolphin, 1993), 79-92 (83).

³ 'El principio desata' should be glossed 'undoes the [generic constraints of the *primer autor*'s comic] beginning', as I suggest in 'On the Title *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*' (for this sense of *principio* compare 'el primer autor quiso darle denominación del principio, que fue plazer, y llamóla *comedia*', *Prólogo*, 202); the revised version of the lines cited in Russell's note *ad loc.* does not affect the meaning. On the authorial statements of didactic intention Bataillon's account of the facts (201-25; also 77-107, and *passim*) remains incontrovertible, although it is possible to disagree about their relevance to the play; for two counter-attacks see María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, *La originalidad artística de 'La Celestina'* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 1962), 292-316, and P. E. Russell, 'Ambiguity in *La Celestina*' [review-article of '*La Célestine*' selon Fernando de Rojas], *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 40 (1963), 35-40.

⁴ Bataillon, 226-50, and 251-68 (on Kaspar von Barth); P. E. Russell, 'The *Celestina* comentada', in *Medieval Hispanic Studies Presented to Rita Hamilton*, ed. A. D. Deyermond, Colección Tamesis, A42 (London: Tamesis, 1976), 175-93, repr. in his *Temas de 'La Celestina' y otros estudios: del 'Cid' al 'Quijote'*, Letras e Ideas, Maior, 14 (Barcelona: Ariel, 1978), 293-321, and many incidental notes elsewhere. Lida de Malkiel, 294-300, gives the contrary evidence for sceptical views of the morality of the *Tragicomedia*.

⁵ Bataillon, 73 ('cette «moralité» à signification restreinte et fort explicite [...] dont les modernes ont abusivement étendu la portée jusqu'à en faire une grandiose malédiction jetée sur l'amour et sur la vie').

⁶ The first author specified one further topic, the sacred hyperbole ('*a sus amigas llaman e dicen ser su dios*'). This trivial commonplace of court sermons (see 219, note 47 on Íñigo de Mendoza) was not followed up by Rojas.

⁷ Russell cites Vergerio's *Paulus*, '*comoedia ad iuuenum mores corrigendos*' (Rojas, 47).

⁸ 'I described the manners of mankind, young and old; how slaves deceive their masters, what lies the prostitute uses for deception, and what the pimp. Whoever reads my works will surely be forewarned.'

⁹ For an account of humanist commentaries on Terence see Marvin T. Herrick, *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964).

¹⁰ Ps-Donatus (=Euanthius), *Excerpta de comoedia*, V, 1: '*Comoedia est fabula diuersa instituta continens affectuum ciuilium ac priuatorum, quibus discitur quid sit in uita utile, quid contra euitandum*', in Aelius Donatus, *Commentum Terenti*, ed. P. Wessner, 3 vols (1902-08, repr. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1962-63), I, 13-31 (22). In the same paragraph Euanthius quotes Cicero's famous dictum, '*comoediam esse imitationem uitae, speculum consuetudinis, imaginem ueritatis*'.

¹¹ *Ad Eun.* Praef. I, 9, '*in hac Terentius delectat facetiis, prodest exemplis, et uitia hominum [...] carpit*' (in Donatus, I, 266-67); *ad Adelph.* Praef. I, 9, '*in hac spectatur quid intersit inter rusticam uitam et urbanam, mitem et asperam, caelibis et mariti, ueri patris et per adoptionem facti; quibus propositis ad exemplum imitanda perinde fugiendaque Terentius monstrans artificis poetae per totam fabulam obtinet laudem*' (in Donatus, II, 5).

¹² *Publii Terentii Comoediae VI post optimas editiones emendatae. Accedunt Aelii Donati commentarius integer, cum selectis notis Guieti et variorum*, ed. Cornelius Schrevelius (Leiden: Hackius, 1657), 29, Argum. ad *Andr.* I. ii: '*Et humani ingenii ac prudentiae coniecturam in re ciuili non sufficere ad ueritatem dispiciendam haec scena declarat; et serui non stolidi sed uersuti calliditas exprimitur, qui rem omnem pro captu seruilis ingenii ac rationis considerat et ratiocinatur ne incautus opprimatur; et patris nimia indulgentia erga filios ac negligentia in illorum educatione describitur. Ethica 1. Matrimonium utilissimum*

est amatoribus remedium. 2. Domestica exempla sunt admodum pernicioso. 3. Improbis seruis sua est poena'.

¹³ *ibid.*, 55, Argum. ad *And.* II. ii, 'dexteritatem seruilis ingenii haec scena describit, et dolosam iactantiam et animum ad circumueniendos dominos natura propensum, ut difficile sit cauere, totidemque nobis esse hostes quot seruos. amantium insuper affectus exprimitur qui libidinis caligine obducti consilio serui dolosi reguntur, quod uel maxime dedecet'.

¹⁴ *Ad Hecyram*, Praef. I. 3, 'multum sententiarum et figurarum continet in toto stilo, unde cum delectet plurimum non minus utilitatis adfert spectatoribus' (in Donatus, II, 189). Compare the remark in *ad Adolph.* Praef. I. 3, 'prodest autem et delectat actu et stilo' ('it profits and delights by both action and style', *ibid.*, II, 3).

¹⁵ The play demonstrates that whereas apophthegms and *exempla* can be used by unscrupulous characters like Celestina to justify any evil, they offer no genuine help, either because they cannot be 'guardados en la memoria para trasponer en lugares convenientes' ('Mel.--Algunas consolatorias palabras te diría antes de mi agradable fin coligidas y sacadas de aquellos antiguos libros [...] sino que ya la dañada memoria, con la grand turbación, me las ha perdido', Auto XX, 589-90, and note *ad loc.*), or because they are not 'convenientes' ('Pleb.--Aunque más en mi fatigada memoria rebuelvo presentes y passados [...] todo esto bien diferente es a mi mal', Auto XXI, 600-01). Both passages, let it be noted, are in the sixteen-act version. See George Shipley, 'Authority and Experience in *La Celestina*', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 62 (1985), 95-111.

¹⁶ That the *Tragicomedia* is about public morality rather than religious or chivalric ideology was intuited, before Bataillon, by Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, ed. Enrique Sánchez Reyes, 4 vols, Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas, 13-16 (Santander: CSIC, 1943), III, 219-458, who wrote that the play reflected a fatty degeneration of the Spanish social fibre brought about by Semitic infiltration in the reign of Enrique IV (1454-74)—a judgment which the evidence of history forces one to admit would have struck a chord with Rojas's contemporaries. The most thought-provoking examination to date, however, is the historian José Antonio Maravall's *El mundo social de 'La Celestina'*, 3rd ed. (Madrid: Gredos, 1972); although his concerns are different from mine, Maravall agrees on the

social nature of the moral (see his first chapter, '*La Celestina* como «moralidad»: la conciencia de crisis en el siglo XV', 15-31).

¹⁷ Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional MS 17.631, fol. 206v. In addition to Russell's note *ad loc.* see '*The Celestina comentada*', in his *Temas de 'La Celestina'*, 305-06.

¹⁸ See, for example, Angus MacKay, *Anatomía de una revuelta urbana: Alcaraz en 1458*, CSIC, Confederación Española de Centros de Estudios Locales, Serie I: Ensayos Históricos y Científicos, 24 (Albacete: Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses, 1985), which concerns, incidentally, a *torre*. Also relevant is his 'Courtly Love and Lust in Loja', in *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom*, ed. Alan Deyermond & Ian Macpherson (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), 83-94.

¹⁹ Martín de Riquer, 'Fernando de Rojas y el primer acto de *La Celestina*', *Revista de Filología Española*, 41 (1957), 373-95.

²⁰ On the late-medieval social structures to which I refer here see, for example, David Starkey, 'The Age of the Household: Politics, Society and the Arts c. 1350-c. 1550', in Stephen Medcalf (ed.), *The Later Middle Ages, The Context of English Literature* (London: Methuen, 1981), 225-90. It is the thesis of Maravall's book, *El mundo social de 'La Celestina'*, that the play reflects the breakdown (which he too calls 'desorden') of these structures in the face of a nascent capitalist economy based on money. Julian Weiss has brought to my attention an important recent essay on this subject by Miguel-Angel Ladero Quesada, 'Aristócratas y marginales: aspectos de la sociedad castellana en *La Celestina*', in *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma: Revista de la Facultad de Geografía e Historia* (UNED, Madrid), Serie III, 3 (1990), 95-120, which I was unable to consult for incorporation here.

²¹ On the general point see, for example, Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, *Libro de buen amor*, ed. Alberto Blecha (Madrid: Cátedra, 1992), strophe 188a-b 'De cómo enflaquezes las gentes e las dapñas | muchos libros ay d'esto', and 291-94, with the note on 293c; and Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, *Arcipreste de Talavera, o Corbacho*, ed. E. Michael Gerli, *Letras Hispánicas*, 92 (Madrid: Cátedra, 1981), [Libro I], Cap. XVI 'Cómo pierde la fuerza el que se da a luxuria' (97-99).

²² Russell's punctuation of the last phrase, with the comma after 'Pleberio', is precise, and vital; every attribute of Melibea's (even including her physical beauty, according to contemporary medical theories on the properties of the 'homuncule' or sperm) she owed to her father; all that was left for her mother, another (and less valuable) Pleberian chattel, was the lame afterthought of maternal affection.

²³ For *desordenado* in the political sense, compare Martínez de Toledo, *Arcipreste de Talavera*, prologue: 'uno de los usados pecados es el amor desordenado, especialmente de las mugeres, por do se siguen discordias, omezillos, muertes, escándalos, guerras e perdiçiones de bienes' (63). There is a useful commentary on the medical sense of the word in Michael Solomon, 'Alfonso Martínez's Concept of *Amor Desordenado* and the Problem of *Usus Immoderatis* [sic] *Veneris*', *La Corónica*, 18.2 (Spring, 1990), 69-76.

²⁴ *Amonesta a los que aman que sirvan a Dios y dexen las vanas cogitaciones y vicios de amor*, 192-93, note 27; Rojas moved the substituted strophe to the final verses (609).

²⁵ Jacques Rossiaud, *Medieval Prostitution*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988); J. Brundage, 'Prostitution in the Medieval Canon Law', *Signs*, 1 (1976), 825-45, repr. in Judith M. Bennett (ed.), *Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989). Studies of prostitution in medieval Spain are in an elementary stage, but the pioneering work of Pierre Heugas, *'La Célestine' et sa descendance directe* (Bordeaux: Institut d'Études Ibériques et Ibéro-Américaines, 1973), established the importance and interest of this subject for Rojan studies; for the present, see the useful pages by María Eugenia Lacarra, *Cómo leer 'La Celestina'*, *Guías de lectura*, 5 (Madrid: Júcar, 1990), 23-29, and her 'El fenómeno de la prostitución y sus conexiones con *La Celestina*', in Rafael Beltrán and others (eds.), *Historias y ficciones: coloquios sobre la literatura del siglo XV* (Valencia: Departament de Filologia Espanyola, Universitat de València, 1992), 267-78.

²⁶ Salamanca, Archivo Municipal, Inv. Tumbo, fols. 233v-35, 19 November 1498, edited in Manuel García González, *Salamanca en la baja Edad Media* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1982), §8, 147-48, and in Lacarra, 'El fenómeno de la prostitución y sus conexiones con *La Celestina*', 277-78; the Arias family retained control of this

lucrative business for two centuries (I am grateful to Professor Ian Michael for this reference). I do not here speculate on what bearing this fact may have had upon Rojas's work, nor on the disturbing evidence for the real existence of a Salamanca *alcahueta* named Celestina discussed by P. E. Russell, 'Why Did Celestina Move House?', in *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs*, 155-61.

²⁷ Nicholas G. Round, 'Conduct and Values in *La Celestina*', in F. W. Hodcroft and others (eds.), *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies on Spain and Portugal in Honour of P. E. Russell* (Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, 1981), 38-52 (41).

²⁸ Doubts have been expressed about Pidal's emendation of the contested reading 'piedad de silencio [*Com: celestial Tragicom*]' to 'Seleuco'; they do not affect my argument. Cejador further conjectured that *plebérico* means 'of Melibea', which appears to have been accepted even by editors who recognize the allusion to Valerius Maximus's anecdote; I profess to finding the suggestion perverse and incomprehensible. I am grateful to Donald McGrady for allowing me to see his paper, 'Eras, Crato, Erasistrato, Seleuco and "el plebérico corazón": an explication', *Romance Philology* (in press) which provides a most useful discussion of the evidence.

²⁹ *La originalidad artística de 'La Celestina'*, 214-15 ('en absoluto un rasgo de época'). Lida's whole discussion of this problem, 206-20, is worth consulting, and convincing. I have not seen Ivy A. Corfis, 'Laws of Head of Household in *Celestina*', in J. Beer and others (eds.), *RLA: Romance Languages Annual* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation, 1992), 397-401, which contains a discussion of some legal aspects of this act.

³⁰ 'Rojas laisse un peu emporter ou déporter sa plume par la verve rhétorique [...] où il perdait nécessairement de vue le brillant modèle' (9); and, in more detail, 'dénouement grandiloquent [...] et artificiel à notre humble avis' (65). It is unfortunate that these should have become the best-known phrases in Bataillon's book; in taking issue with him, I record my unflagging admiration for what still remains, *à mon humble avis*, one of the two best books on Rojas yet published.

THE MAL DE LA MADRE AND THE FAILURE OF MATERNAL INFLUENCE IN CELESTINA

James F. Burke
University of Toronto

In Act VII of *Celestina* Fernando de Rojas devotes his attention to a medical problem which was thought in ancient and medieval times to afflict women. Areúsa is suffering from the *mal de la madre*: "Mal gozo vea de mí, si burlo; sino que á quatro oras que muero de la madre, que la tengo sobida en los pechos..." (II, 133). Critics heretofore have taken very little notice of how significant is the mention of this difficulty, doubtless understanding it as but yet another of the many references from the culture of the quotidian which are so common in *Celestina*. In addition, of course, Areúsa is a relatively minor character and the scene in which the *mal de la madre* is mentioned appears to have no great relevance to the overall structure of the work.

The *mal de la madre* or "wandering womb" was a malady familiar to both lay and medical people in ancient times and it was widely commented upon in medical writings. The womb was thought of as a kind of animal, a frog or a toad, and it was believed that this being could at certain times wander about within the body of a woman producing a number of unpleasant symptoms such as

shortness of breath, aphonia, pain, paralysis, choking and suffocation as well as a violent seizure of the senses (Veith, 10, 12, 23, 29). The concept was accepted as valid by both Plato (Veith, 7) and Hippocrates (Zilboorg, 47) although denied by Galen (Veith, 31). The idea was firmly rooted in folk culture and it has continued to exist there down to modern times. Rabelais mentions it in *Pantagruel* (Veith, 107-108), it is referred to in *Mamotreto* 23 of Francisco Delicado's *La Lozana andaluza* (108), and the modern historian of Spain William Christian states that the belief in the wandering womb was still held to be a cause of madness at the shrine of La Balma in Spain at the beginning of the twentieth century (196).

Celestina's remedy for the discomfort is completely in accord with the advice of ancient physicians who believed that strong odors, both pleasant and unpleasant, could be effective in relieving symptoms (Veith, 3, 5, 13, 23, 30). "Todo olor fuerte es bueno: assí como poleo, ruda, axiensos, humo de plumas de perdiz, de romero, de moxquete, de encienso: recebido con mucha diligencia, aprovecha y afloxa el dolor, y buelve poco a poco la madre a su lugar" (Act VII; II, 134). But she also realizes, as did most medieval doctors (Jacquart and Thomasset, 174) that the only permanent cure for the infirmity is indulgence in sex and eventually motherhood: "mientras no parieres, nunca te faltará este mal y dolor que tienes agora (II, 135). And, indeed, such is seen to be the case at the beginning of Act VIII when Areúsa finds that her night of love with Pármeno has availed her little in regard to her suffering: "...no se me á quitado el mal de la madre" (II, 145).

It is also in Act VII of *Celestina* that Fernando de Rojas begins to establish firmly the idea of Celestina as "mother" or perhaps, better, "stepmother" to Calisto and Melibea and also to the various servants.¹ In her lengthy discourse to Pármeno at the beginning of the Act the old bawd attempts to convince him (and by extension all the others) that they should accept her as a strong and positive maternal figure: "porque yo te tenía por hijo, a lo menos casi adoptivo" (II, 121). She then entwines a long series of images and themes which she uses to associate herself with ideas related to the caring and protective mother:

¹ See Jane Hawking's article which shows how firmly Rojas establishes Celestina as a mother figure, albeit a negative one.

Pues mira, amigo, que para tales necesidades, como estas, buen acorro es una vieja, conocida, amiga, madre y más que madre, buen mesón para descansar sano, buen ospital para sanar enfermo, buena bolsa para necesidad, buena arca para guardar dinero en prosperidad, buen fuego de invierno rodeado de assadores, buena sombra de verano, buena taverna para comer y beber. (II, 122)

This imagery suggests that Celestina is an affirmative mother figure in two ways: First, she is interested in and capable of fulfilling the needs of her "children" in very real and concrete terms. For Calisto and Melibea this means that she will be able to facilitate a relationship between them, the desire for which will become the only object of their existence. Calisto has accepted her in this role from Act I when he refers to her as "la madre" (II, 42). When Celestina arrives at Melibea's house in Act X, the young woman who was previously so full of disdain now immediately accepts her in the maternal role of alleviator of illness: "Madre mía, que me comen este coraçón serpientes dentro de mi cuerpo" (II, 176-77).

Second, the imagery implies the possibility of a return to or an existence in a safe and protective ambience which would resemble the womb. Such a restoration would bear all the implications for positive rebirth and regeneration which have been and still are associated with this idea. Again Calisto has seen Celestina in such terms from Act I: "¡O salud de mi pasión, reparo de mi tormento, regeneración mía, vivificación de mi vida, resurrección de mi muerte" (II, 41); and it is clear that in Act X Melibea has reached the same conclusion: "¡O mi madre y mi señora!, haz de manera como luego le pueda ver, si mi vida quieres" (II, 184).²

Celestina does, of course, help to facilitate the trysts in Melibea's garden which produce short-term sexual satisfaction for the lovers. But the result of her actions is negative in extreme for practically all the characters in the work. Far from being a positive mother figure who secures the well-being of her children in both

² See my 1977 article in which I attempt to relate these themes to the imagery of alchemy.

physical and metaphysical terms, the old woman initiates a course of action which brings ruin and destruction to those who have been foolish enough to seek metaphorical shelter under her mantle.

There is textual evidence to suggest that the phrase *mal de la madre* can imply both the wandering womb and the negative influence of the old woman herself. In Act I Pármemo has accused his master of a most heinous variety of idolatry because he has expressed such strong admiration for Celestina: "¡Y en tierra está, adorando a la más antigua y puta vieja [tierra] que fregara sus espaldas en todos los burdeles del mundo!" (II, 42).³ Calisto does not hear or understand what his servant has said as his mind is fixed only on what he hopes will be the palliative words of Celestina who has just finished whispering something to Sempronio. "¿Qué dezía la madre?" (II, 42) asks Calisto. This phrase, with its article "la" sets a kind of grammatical identification of Celestina as "madre" with the image of the womb as "madre."

When Fernando de Rojas introduces the theme of the "wandering womb," the *mal de la madre* in Act VII, he does so, I believe, to suggest far more than just the physical illness which afflicts Areúsa. He means to associate the pretensions of "la madre Celestina" and her supposed positive role with the themes and images which for centuries had been connected with a disease which bore important symbolic meanings in ancient and medieval civilization. My thesis is that Areúsa's "wandering womb" serves as a symbol which demonstrates the failure of affirmative maternal functions in *Celestina*. The unhappy endings for all the characters in the work result then from a metaphorical "mal de la madre," centered in Celestina, which is the opposite of all that which metaphorical positive motherhood can imply.

The possibility for a return to a positive and stable protective womb which has been suggested by Celestina's presentation of herself in Act VII disappears as the author continues to develop the mood of carelessness and flight which will soon characterize the drama. After

³ Marciales chooses the word "vieja" over the "tierra" of several other editions. But if one takes the phrase as "puta tierra," then Pármemo is identifying Celestina with the the earth, one of the most basic symbols for the matrix.

the characters in the work accept Celestina as a motherly refuge, they begin to move toward that situation which will eventually result in the destruction of many of them.

In Act VIII the text brings forward those images of sleep, forgetfulness, and abandonment of responsibility which will so color the work thereafter. Pármeno awakes after his night of love with Areúsa suddenly aware that he has neglected his responsibilities to his master: "¡En qué gran falta é caído con mi amo! De mucha pena soy dino. ¡O qué tarde es!" (II, 145). A bit later in the same Act Calisto will also awaken and will find it difficult to believe that it is so late: "¿Qué dizes, loco? ¿Toda la noche es pasada?" (II, 152). The eventual result of the process initiated here will be Calisto enclosed in his darkened house during the day sallying forth in the evening not for some knightly enterprise but only for the felicities of Melibea's garden. He has in fact fashioned a womblike atmosphere for himself but it is hardly one that can result in rebirth or regeneration.

It is also true that those patriarchal foundations which we would normally associate with works produced in Western culture are not presented as successful in *Celestina* (Burke, 1993). Calisto as "diestro caballero" should have been the epitome of what late medieval civilization might have desired in a young man of aristocratic birth. But it is evident in his diatribe against the "crüel jüez" in his beautiful soliloquy in Act XIV that he has certainly abandoned this role if he ever had embraced it. Pleberio throughout his life seems to have been an exemplary embodiment of patriarchal accomplishment since it is obvious from his long declamation at the end of the work that he had labored intensively to fulfil the mandates imposed upon him by culture. But it is equally clear that he is convinced that he has not succeeded: "Del mundo me quexo, porque en sí me crió" (Act XXI; II, 267).

It is important to remember, however, that the failure of both Calisto and Pleberio to accomplish what they should results from the interventions of Celestina. It is her negative influence which is responsible for the severe problems which beset them the characters in the work. A question perhaps implied, or at least latent in the text, is whether an exercise of positive maternal force might have yielded affirmative results. This idea apparently did not interest Rojas, so that we are left only with the principle that the *mal de la madre* has produced disaster. The failure of the maternal function in *Celestina*

is in line with what Dorothy Severin sees as the overall message of the work--there is no human system which can be understood as well-ordered and which yields positive results (120).⁴

Pleberio ends his complaint not with some final reference to his failure as father and executor of grand patriarchal designs but with an allusion which effectively associates the nonfulfillment of both maternal and paternal functions in *Celestina*: "¿Por qué me dexaste penado? ¿Por qué me dexaste triste y solo in hac lacrimarum valle?" (II, 267-68). This Latin phrase is from the antiphon "Salve Regina" sung in praise of the Virgin and it implies within itself very well both the positive and negative poles of the maternal image and by extension those of the paternal as well. Pleberio's question is one which seems to have been constantly posed in the Middle Ages, as is evident from this commentary on the antiphon done by in the twelfth century by the Austrian monk Odo of Morimond: "Heu! mater mea: cur me genuisti filium doloris et amaritudinis, indignationis, plorationis?" (Canals, 232). Mary as positive female figure can, of course, aid in freeing the suffering sinner from the condition of misery. But as M. M. Davy has shown, the Virgin not only symbolically represents within herself images and themes relating to protection, salvation, and renewal but also bears within an "aspect ténébreux." This "aspect ténébreux" should bear no connection to evil but is one rather which would suggest the natural processes of all life (375).

Nevertheless on occasion certain symbols linking the idea of the mother to themes of destruction and annihilation were attracted to a locus of images related to the Virgin. Such negative imagery is illustrated by Odo a few lines above the one previously quoted: "Contremisce a dentibus bestie infernalis, a uentri inferi a rugientibus preparatis ad escam." These teeth of this hellish beast and this lower belly are not simply images that imply a situation contrary to the one suggested by the succour of the Virgin, but are ones, I believe, that relate to and derive from various ancient precepts having to do with the idea of the "destructive mother" which find representation in *Celestina* in terms of the *mal de la madre*.

⁴ In her article in this volume Severin suggests that there is a magical empowerment of women in *Celestina*. But again the advantage can be seen only as temporary.

A. A. Barb has studied a large number of ancient symbols of what he has termed the "*Matrix*-archetype" (1953, 210) and has found that in many cases such representations herald the kind of ambivalence sensed above in the citations from Odo of Morimond. On the one hand the womb-symbol suggests rebirth and fulfilment. On the other it is connected with a whole series of images linked with the earth, the abyss, the nothingness to which active, organic life is always slated to return. Critics of a psychoanalytical bent explain such symbolism as resulting from a desire on the part of the human being for a return to the unconscious to find renewal or, in its negative aspect, for an escape from the painful striving of life (Rank; Jung and von Franz).

Barb presents a great array of symbols from ancient cultures which have been used to represent this *matrix* in both its positive and its negative terms. One of the strong negative emblems is the animal-like uterus which supposedly roamed through the woman's body (211). Certain Byzantine amulets which he describes are concerned with taming this wandering creature which "coils like a serpent," "hisses like a snake," and "roars like a lion" and seek to direct it to "settle down like a lamb" (1953, 210-211).

Marija Gimbutas, in her study of archaeological remnants that support her thesis that matriarchal cultures preceded Indo-European civilization in Europe, has found that the figure of the mother goddess as life-giver was frequently represented in the shape of a toad or a frog (1982, 174; 1991, 244), animals which sometimes were used to represent the theme of fertility.⁵ But she hastens to remark that the toad also bore negative connotations and she mentions that it was often connected with the idea of the wandering womb. The implication here is that there existed some variety of link between the concept of the mother goddess in her negative aspects and the image of the roaming uterus.

The power that the image of this roaming uterus might obtain in the popular and literary imagination finds superb illustration in

⁵ Celestina is associated with frogs in Pármeno's long denunciation of her in Act I when he says that all the sounds and noises of the world proclaim her as "puta vieja." "Las ranas de los charcos otra cosa no suelen mentar" (II, 35).

King Lear when the aged father begins to realize fully what evil his treacherous daughters Goneril and Regan are capable of perpetrating. As one critic has noted, Shakespeare has taken the symbol of the wandering womb from its usual feminine context and has used it to imply that Lear carries hell within him and that it should be called "Mother" (Aronson, 227):

O, how this mother swells up toward my heart
Hysterica passio down, thou climbing sorrow;
 Thy element's below (II, iv, 54-56).

The positive side of maternal influence alluded to in the phrase which Pleberio quotes from the antiphon from the *Salve Regina* figures the Virgin as the ultimate protector of the human race. In *Celestina* the role of the Virgin is not greatly stressed although Calisto does call upon her for succour just after he has fallen from the ladder (II, 250).⁶ The text does make reference, however, on a number of occasions to St. Mary Magdalene who by her very name enters into close figurative association with the mother of Christ.

The Middle Ages believed that the locution *Eva-Ave* was a brief formula that compressed a long sequence of events from Sacred History into one simple phrase. The transgressions of the first mother Eve were rectified when the Angel Gabriel addressed Mary with an "Ave" which signalled that she would bear the Christ-child. This process of conversion is an extremely important positive, spiritual trajectory embodied in the feminine and epitomized in those women who mirror in their lives the sequence established for the benefit of human beings by the Virgin who reverses the harmful effects of the actions of Eve. This paradigm of conversion expressed in *Eva-Ave* was extended in hagiography to apply to the lives of a number of other women such as Mary Magdalene and Mary of Egypt who bore the same name as the Virgin. In this re-writing of the *Eva-Ave* scheme the beautiful, but morally corrupt young prostitutes Mary Magdalene and Mary of Egypt undergo a conversion to become either the figure

⁶ And this is despite the fact that Barb says that she was often invoked to help against the wandering womb (1966, 23, n. 153). Fontes has argued, nevertheless, that *Celestina* is to be seen as the antithesis or, perhaps better, antitype to the Virgin.

weeping at the foot of the Cross or the old and grotesquely deformed, but saintly, penitent in the desert.

In Act VIII Areúsa and Pármeno awake with the former still complaining about the *mal de la madre* and the latter wondering whether she could be pregnant or not (II, 149). A bit later Calisto arising late from sleep, will decide to go to the Church of St. Mary Magdalene to pray to God for help in his quest for Melibea (113). This is a pivotal point in the text because if Areúsa is indeed pregnant, she should be cured of her real physical problem. If Calisto could remember and accept as valid for him the critically important message of conversion implied in the life of the Saint whose name is borne by the church where he will pray, he and the others might escape from the effects of the metaphorical *mal de la madre*. But the thought never enters his mind: "Agora lo creo, que tañen a missa. Daca mis ropas; iré a la Madalena. Rogaré a Dios aderece a Celestina y ponga en corazón a Melibea mi remedio o dé fin en breve a mis tristes días" (II, 152). He, of course, will see his first two wishes completely fulfilled and ironically the final one also which he had thought to be an alternative.

At the start of her excellent article dealing with the legend of St. Mary of Egypt, Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez studies the image of St. Mary Magdalene in *Celestina* and demonstrates that the common topic of conversion for the Middle Ages, figured in the phrase *Eva-Ave*, is unsuccessful in the work. Seidenspinner-Núñez in my view has understood the full import of what the author has accomplished with his introduction of the theme of St. Mary Magdalene at this point: "Fernando de Rojas grotesquely subverts the topos of the harlot-saint to illustrate instead humanity's penchant for nonconversion, its propensity for sin, its moral blindness, and its boundless capacity for self-delusion" (115). Thus a critically important formula which could help the sinner to reform his or her life is shown to fail in *Celestina* and its disfunction becomes apparent shortly after the introduction of the theme of the *mal de la madre* to the text.

In addition to the failure of the conversion formula as explained by Seidenspinner-Núñez, I believe that the work also demonstrates a problem with another scheme associated in Spain with positive maternal functions. The *Eva-Ave* phrase has important implications for the metaphysical destiny of the characters in the

drama and for humanity in general. The second process has to do with the socio-political workings of Hispanic communities.

Manuel Delgado Ruiz has studied and has attempted to explain the significance of an activity which takes place during festivals all across the Peninsula. A young bull, some other sexually potent animal seen as equivalent or a male dressed to resemble one of the two is suddenly released upon society to be countered by a feminized figure, which is sometimes called "la madre" (129) or "la dama" (120).⁷ He believes that the *novillo* stands symbolically for the aggressive young male whose only desire is to be satisfied sexually. The adversary with its feminine attributes is an actant whose role is to utilize the blindness induced by overwhelming desire to lead the male by a kind of "seducción femenina" either toward an acceptance of "conducción social y femenina" or to destruction and death as typically represented in the bull ring (121). The *toreador* with his striking *traje de luces* is seen as the most elegantly developed type of the basic feminized opposant; and "la victoria en el ruedo no es la del macho," it is "el triunfo de la comunidad" (134).

Delgado Ruiz believes that ceremonies of the *vaquilla* and the *corrida de toros* in symbolic form represent a pattern and figure a process which necessarily takes place in the everyday life of Spanish society.⁸ He believes that the mother and the female community in general seek to enhance the aggressive and domineering tendencies of the young male in a wide variety of ways. This is done in order to help him to develop the strength and drive which can be of use to

⁷ See also Caro Baroja (252-261) for a discussion of this phenomenon, which was even extended by the Spanish to the New World. In one place in Spain the feminized male opposant is called "la Madre cochina"—a phrase which might allude to possible negative qualities in what was supposed to be a positive figure.

⁸ Delgado Ruiz has gathered evidence from a wide variety of sources to provide proof for his consideration that Hispanic society in its basic aspects functions as a matriarchy (128-129). But many anthropologists doubt that true matriarchy has ever existed (see Carroll, 36). But the positive cultural roles for female figures which Delgado Ruiz describes could exist whether the theoretical base for the society was, indeed, matriarchal or not.

the community. The result is "un varón joven sexualmente agresivo, que exige ser satisfecho instintualmente" (82). But ultimately the young male must understand that it is absolutely essential that he submit himself to the rules and regulations of society, he must be "enculturado" (132.) It is the responsibility of women, the mother and especially the sweetheart, to make sure that the aggressive young male accepts his final role. If he refuses to do so, the lesson from the ritual process is that he must be destroyed.

One example of this process in literary form which Delgado Ruiz mentions, but which he does not develop to any great degree, is that given in Lope de Vega's drama *Peribáñez*. The play begins when a *novillo* comes tearing through the streets of the town to encounter, down, and render unconscious the Comendador, the local lord, who has deigned to grace the wedding festivities of his vassal with his presence.⁹ At that point the image of driven, savage instinct transfers from its primordial symbol, the young bull, to the Comendador who quickly forgets the dignity of his position and his responsibilities to launch himself in mad pursuit of that object which he first sees upon regaining consciousness, the young wife Casilda. Much later in the play, when Peribáñez pleads his case before the King and Queen, he makes the identification of the Comendador with the bull explicit: "Vine yo, súpelo todo, / y de las paredes bajas / quité las armas, que al toro / pudieran servir de capa" (3060-3063).

The action sequence of the play basically is a drawing out of the ritual process as described by Delgado Ruiz. The Comendador is not tamed, he does not repent of his errors and accept the rule of law and the code of conduct expected by the community until he is wounded to death at the end of the play.

When the Comendador goes to the house of Peribáñez hoping to seduce Casilda, he hears a group of "músicos" singing the kind of popular refrain which may have served as inspiration to Lope in composing the play:

⁹I have studied the function of this process in greater detail in "The Ritual Structure" and provide here only a summary of my conclusions as well as the relevant connections and references to *Celestina*.

Cogióme a tu puerta el toro,
 linda casada;
 no dijiste: "¡Dios te valga!"
 El novillo de tu boda
 a tu puerta me cogió;
 de la vuelta que me dio
 se rió la villa toda;
 y tú, grave y burladora,
 linda casada,
 no dijiste: "¡Dios te valga!" (2718-27)

This song encapsulates two major themes, that of the charging bull whose energy merges into the passion of the sexual aggressor and the scornful, inattentive young woman who will become the misplaced object of that passion and who must, in some fashion, help to tame that passion. I believe that one can also perceive the same two ideas at the beginning of *Celestina* when Calisto rushes into Melibea's garden. The overflowing animal energy is here portrayed in terms of the hawk, a bird obviously identified with the brutality and rapacity of the hunt.¹⁰ It is clear that this energy also transfers to Calisto. And, of course, Melibea will react to his advances in a scornful manner. From the very beginning of *Celestina*, because of the powerful image of the hawk, the young knight is associated with the idea of the rapacious animal and the text continues to underline such a connection throughout the early portions of the first act.

Immediately after his return home in his conversation with Sempronio, Calisto expresses his preference for his animal passions rather than those of higher nature: "más querría que mi espíritu fuese con los de los brutos animales, que por medio de aquel ir a la gloria de los santos" (II, 22). Sempronio in an aside makes clear what kind of animal image now informs the energy of the young lover: "Parece al amante que atrás queda, y que todos le pasan; todos rompen, pungidos y esgarrochados como ligeros toros; sin freno saltan por las barreras" (II, 23).

¹⁰ On the image of the hawk within the tradition of the medieval hunt, see Gerli. For a broader survey of animal imagery in *Celestina*, and its mainly indirect relationship with the bestiary tradition, see Shipley (1977 and 1982).

The bull symbol returns again as Sempronio continues to attempt to convince his master to abandon his mad pursuit: "¿No as leído de Pasife con el toro, de Minerva con el can?" (II, 24-5). Calisto does not accept the veracity of these old tales, retorting "No lo creo, hablillas son." But Sempronio counters with a response which seems to establish some absolute connection between bestial nature and Calisto's lineage: "Lo de tu abuela con el ximio, ¿hablilla fue? Testigo es el cuclillo [cuchillo] de tu abuelo" (II, 25). In accord with medieval and renaissance theories of conception, if Calisto's grandmother had indulged in sexual dalliance with an ape, simian features and characteristics could have been incorporated into her line and transmitted to her descendants (Burke, 1977-78; Jacquart and Thomasset, 85, 165).

There is also the matter of the young knight's name, Calisto—an appellation applied in Greek and Roman mythology to a young nymph beloved of Zeus (Jupiter) who is transformed into a bear and cast into the skies as a constellation. Medieval zoological works grant an important place to the description of the bear which they describe as indulging in sexual practices analogous to those of the human being (Jacquart and Thomasset, 162). This animal thus becomes an important symbol of unnatural affection and cohabitation between species and of the strange offsprings which tradition believed could be engendered during such couplings. It is then understandable that the name of the object of Calisto's affection, Melibea, should be related to the food that has frequently been recognized to be the primary object of the bear's physical appetite.

Sempronio toward the end of Act I will realize that it is hopeless to try to convince his master to abandon his mad pursuit of Melibea and he suggests that he knows someone who can help the young knight to fulfil his fantasies. Calisto will then encounter not the adversary described in the ritual process but another androgenous figure, the "vieja barbuda" Celestina (II, 30), who will not oppose the bestial desires of the young knight but, on the contrary, will do everything that she can to further them. Sempronio's admonitions for sensible behavior are now subtly metamorphosed into maxims which no longer challenge Calisto's intended course of action. At the beginning of Act II Sempronio supports his master's decision to give money to Celestina with an allusion to a basic tenet of Aristotelian thought: "Cuanto es mejor el acto que la pasión, tanto es más noble el dante quel recipiente. Entre los elementos, el fuego, por ser más

activo, es más noble, y en las esperas es puesto en más noble lugar" (II, 55).

But a bit further along he effectively reverses the image of the aggressive animal which previously has characterized Calisto. The young knight should abandon his active stance for the passivity and forgetfulness inherent in the state of the supine lover: "en el contemplar, está la pena de amor; en el olvidar el descanso. Huye de tirar coces contra el aguijón; finge alegría y consuelo, y serlo á" (II, 58). Calisto should cease his struggles and accept a passive role. He must become "enculturado," but not in the positive sense explained by Delgado Ruiz. His culture will be that of the negative maternal context engendered by Mother Celestina.

In the civilizing process, the aggressive male is either assimilated into the structure of the community as a productive member or he is killed. In *Celestina* the result is to be the same for Calisto who has constructed a role for himself, as becomes clear in his soliloquy in Act XIV, which obviously is not acceptable to society. At the beginning of his long interior monologue the young knight seems satisfied with his situation, declaring, "¡Cuánto me es agradable de mi natural la solitud y silencio y oscuridad!" (II, 233). But immediately thereafter he laments his fate and his lack of activity. He is particularly concerned about his failure to struggle against those forces which might penalize him for what has happened. He portrays his predicament in a series of images, several of which show him to be in the position of the previously aggressive actant now tamed and submissive. But here, of course, what he has submitted to is a grouping of negative role structures.

Calisto, like the *novillo*, the *vaquilla*, or the bull in the ring has been wounded. "Esta herida es la que siento agora que se á resfriado, agora que está elada la sangre, que ayer hervía" (II, 233). No longer the raging bull or the marauding bear, he is, in his passive state, like a sheep ready to be shorn. "¡Tresquílanme en concejo, y no lo saben en mi casa!" (*ibid.*)¹¹ The image of the rapacious hawk which

¹¹ Covarrubias explains the proverb as referring to "los que están infamados en toda la república, y quieren encubrirlo a los propios de su casa y parentela" (345, b, 40). As far as the text is concerned, Calisto seems to have no family and very little household from whom

launched him on his course has vanished, to be replaced by that of the crow which in traditional Spanish proverbial context figures the treacherous child. Calisto, with an ironic twist, applies the symbol to the cruel judge, creature of his father, who now oppresses him: "¿Quién pensara que tú me avías de destruír? No ay, cierto, cosa más empecible quel incogitado enemigo. ¿Por qué quesiste que dixessen: del monte sale con quien se arde, y que crié cueruo que me sacasse el ojo?" (II, 234). Soon, of course, he will fall from the ladder to his death.

In the ritual process the sweetheart of the young man to be tamed also had an important role to play. She, along with the mother, was to share in the task of forcing the aggressive young man to accept his place in a well-ordered, well-functioning society. Melibea, after her initial period of resistance, had done nothing to dissuade Calisto or to convince him that his desired course of action was wrong. Her inactivity and her acceptance of the negative circumstances contrived by Celestina help to explain, perhaps, the significance of a somewhat puzzling portion of her final declamation to her father in Act XX:

Bien oyes este clamor de campanas, este alarido de gentes, este aullido de canes, este estrépito de armas. De todo esto fue yo la causa. Yo cobrí de luto y xergas en este día casi la mayor parte de la ciudadana cavallería, yo dexé muchos sirvientes descubiertos de señor, yo quité muchas raciones y limosnas a pobres y envergonçantes. (II, 258)

Perhaps she feels so responsible because, in becoming the willing tool of Celestina, the symbol and embodiment of the negative maternal circumstances, she failed to fulfill her proper role in the process by means of which young men are positively initiated into the structures of society.

Ironically, at the end of the work we are left with the voice of unsuccessful patriarchal culture proclaiming failure to an equally unsuccessful positive mother. Both of Melibea's parents, for whatever

to conceal his misfortune. This would, perhaps, imply that the force of the first part of the saw is what disturbs him.

reasoned, remembered their responsibilities far too late.¹² But Alisa recedes as a personage into non-existence after Pleberio begins his long lament "¡Ay, ay, noble muger!" (II, 261). And what we remain with at the end of his declamation is that strongest of images which reminds us of the powerful negative maternal function which has brought all to grief and woe in *Celestina*: "¿Por qué me dexaste triste y solo in hac lacrimarum valle?"



Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea.

En la qual se contiene de mas de su agrada-
blez dulce estilo muchas sentencias

De la portada de British Library C.20.c.17
Sevilla: J. Cromberger, hacia 1511.

¹² In Act IV Alisa seems incapable of understanding the danger that Celestina poses for her daughter although Lucrecia clearly alludes to it: "Más conocida es esta vieja que la ruda. No sé cómo no tienes memoria de la que empicotaron por hechizera, que vendía las moças a los abades y descasava mil casados" (II, 77-78). In Act XVI when Pleberio and Alisa finally recall that they should make suitable arrangements for Melibea according to the acceptable modes of society, Lucrecia comments "¡Tarde acordáis!" (II, 241).

WORKS CITED

- Aronson, Alex. *Psyche & Symbol in Shakespeare*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1972.
- Barb, A. A. "Antaura: The Mermaid and the Devil's Grandmother." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 29 (1966): 1-23.
- _____. "Diva Matrix." *JWCI* 16 (1953): 193-238.
- Burke, James F. "Calisto's Imagination and His Grandmother's Ape." *La Corónica* 5 (1977-78): 84-89.
- _____. "Law of the Father - Law of the Mother in *Celestina*." *Fernando de Rojas and 'Celestina': Approaching the Fifth Centenary. Proceedings of an International Conference in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Death of Fernando de Rojas. Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 21-24 November 1991*. Ed. Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1993. 347-357.
- _____. "Metamorphosis and the Imagery of Alchemy in *La Celestina*." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 1 (1977): 129-52.
- _____. In press. "The Ritual Structure of Lope de Vega's *Peribáñez*." In *The Centre and Its Compass: Perspectives on Medieval Literature in Honour of Professor John Leyerle*. University of Western Michigan P.
- Canals, José María. *Salve Regina Misericordiae: Historia y leyendas en torno a esta antifona*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1963.
- Caro Baroja, Julio. *El carnaval (análisis histórico-cultural)*. 2nd ed. Madrid: Taurus, 1979.
- Carroll, Michael P. *The Cult of the Virgin Mary: Psychological Origins*. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1986.
- Christian, William A. Jr. *Person and God in a Spanish Village*. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1989.
- Covarrubias, Sebastián de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Ed. Martín de Riquer. Barcelona: Horta, 1943.
- Davy, M. M. *Sources et clefs de l'art roman*. Paris: International, 1973.
- Delgado Ruiz, Manuel. *De la muerte de un dios: la fiesta de toros en el universo simbólico de la cultura popular*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península, 1986.
- Delicado, Francisco. *La Lozana andaluza*. Ed. Bruno Damiani. Madrid: Castalia, 1969.
- Fontes, Manuel da Costa. "Celestina as Antithesis of the Virgin Mary." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 15 (1990-91): 7-41.

- Gerli, E. Michael. "Calisto's Hawk and the Images of a Medieval Tradition." *Romania* 104 (1983): 83-101.
- Gimbutas, Marija. *The Civilization of the Goddess: The World of Old Europe*. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.
- . *The Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe: 6500-3500 BC Myths and Cult Images*. 2nd ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1982.
- Hawking, Jane. "Madre Celestina." *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, Sezione Romanza*. 9 (1967): 177-90.
- Jacquart, Danielle, and Claude Thomasset. *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*. Trans. Matthew Adamson. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.
- Jung, Emma and Marie-Louise von Franz. *The Grail Legend*. Trans. Andrea Dykes. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.
- Lope de Vega. *Peribáñez y Fuente Ovejuna*. Ed. Alberto Blecua. Madrid: Alianza, 1981.
- Rank, Otto. *The Trauma of Birth*. New York: R. Brunner, 1957.
- Rojas, Fernando de. *Celestina: Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Ed. Miguel Marciales (al cuidado de B. Dutton y J. T. Snow). 2 vols. Urbana, Ill.: U of Illinois P, 1985.
- Seidenspinner-Núñez, Dayle. "The Poetics of (Non)Conversion: The *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca* and *La Celestina*." *Medievalia et Humanistica, NS*, 18 (1992): 95-128.
- Severin, Dorothy Sherman. *Tragicomedy and Novelistic Discourse in 'Celestina'*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Ed. Alfred Harbage. New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Shipley, George A. "Usos y abusos de la autoridad del refrán en *La Celestina*. In *La Celestina y su contorno social: Actas del I Congreso sobre La Celestina*. Ed. Manuel Criado de Val. Barcelona: Borrás, 1977. 231-244.
- . "Bestiary Imagery in *La Celestina*." *Homenaje a Stephen Gilman. Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* (Puerto Rico), 9 (1982): 211-218.
- Veith, Ilza. *Hysteria: The History of a Disease*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1965.
- Zilboorg, Gregory. *A History of Medical Psychology*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1941.

**THE FORM OF CELESTINA:
DRAMATIC ANTECEDENTS**

Keith Whinnom †

(edited by Alan Deyermond
Queen Mary & Westfield College-London)

[From some time in the first half of 1966 to the late summer of 1969, the greater part of Keith Whinnom's research and writing was dedicated to a book on *Celestina*. This was originally planned as a fairly short guide for students, to be published by Tamesis: a longer book than the 158-page Lacarra 1990, and different in content (he described it in a letter of July 14, 1966, to D.W. McPheeters, as "a sort of critical commentary on the available criticism and theorizing"), but still accessible financially and intellectually to undergraduates. The origin of the book is to be found in the lectures that Whinnom gave at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was a faculty member from 1956 to 1961; these were extensively revised as lectures to graduate students at Emory University in the spring semester of 1965, and the text of those lectures provided the outline and some of the material for the book. As the book progressed, it became much more detailed, and by 1968 it seemed to me, as the Tamesis editor responsible for the project, that this was going to be not a students' guide but a guide for *Celestina* scholars, though Whinnom still saw his principal audience as the more advanced undergraduates. I think that soon after that he

may have become daunted by the magnitude of the task, and it is fairly clear that, having suspended work on the book in August 1969 in order to prepare his Diego de San Pedro editions for Clásicos Castalia, he never returned to it.

I have given a detailed account of the book's history and contents elsewhere (Deyermund in press), and all that it is now necessary to add to the summary in the previous paragraph is that at the time when Whinnom interrupted his work on the book he had completed Part I (this is self-contained, and arrangements have been made to publish it as an independent book, *The Textual History of "Celestina"*), and the first two chapters of Part II, on antecedents and sources, were written in draft (a typescript with some deletions and substantial changes and interpolations). The first of these two chapters consists of a complex and very interesting discussion of problems of identifying *Celestina's* sources (I intend to publish this elsewhere), and the second constitutes the article printed below. I have - in addition, of course, to the normal procedure in editing from a penultimate draft - followed the same practice as in the two previous Whinnom articles that I have edited for *Celestinesca*. The work's title is given in the form that Whinnom later chose; this and other points of detail are silently emended, and bibliographical references expanded (Whinnom used the author-date system, but had not prepared the bibliography for the book at the time that he interrupted his work on it). References to the text of *Celestina* are to Cejador 1913, the only edition that it was realistically possible to cite when Whinnom was working on this project (he suspended work on it just as Severin 1969 was published). To substitute references to a more recent and better edition would not, I think, be useful except in a context of extensive reworking of this article so as to bring it up to date in the light of the last twenty-five years' research, and if that were done the article would no longer be Whinnom's. Similarly, the addition of recent bibliographical references has been kept to a minimum; any such additions are in brackets.

Had Keith Whinnom lived longer, he would certainly have wanted to contribute an article to *Celestinesca's* tribute to Peter Russell, a teacher for whom he felt both admiration and gratitude. I should have liked to contribute an article, but having recently written two long *Celestina* papers for the Proceedings of conferences I have nothing new to say that might deserve Peter Russell's attention. It is a privilege to be able to play a small part in this tribute by editing Keith Whinnom's article. ALAN DEYERMOND]

a privilege to be able to play a small part in this tribute by editing Keith Whinnom's article. ALAN DEYERMOND]

The form of *Celestina* has long caused difficulties, the critics debating heatedly whether it is a play or a novel or something else again (there is a splendid anthology of all the nonsensical labels in Lida de Malkiel 1962: 64-66, n. 29). Ferdinand Wolf thought it was "epic-dramatic" ("Seine Forme ist in der That eine episch-dramatische", 1859: 280). Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo called it "un poema dramático" (1962: 220) but felt obliged to deal with it in a history of the novel, and, of course, innumerable writers have referred to it as a novel. As late as 1962, Stephen Gilman was insisting that *Celestina* is essentially a dialogue or a "dialogue novel," and wrote: "The outward sign of the inner uniqueness and originality of the *Celestina* was its twenty-one acts of unbroken dialogue. A book looking like this had never been printed or seen before; [...] before the *Celestina* there had been no systematic use of dialogue for its own sake, nothing resembling the two major dialogue forms today so taken for granted, the drama and the novel. [...] The *Celestina* in one stroke changed all this" (1962: 285-86). In all this two distinct problems are, I think, confused. The first of these is a pseudo-philosophical problem which might be rephrased: "When is a play not a play?" If a work is written, as *Celestina* is, in the way one would write a play, does it become "not a play" (a) if its author did not envisage it being performed by actors on a stage; (b) if, because of its length, scabrous episodes, or other considerations, it is unactable (Lida de Malkiel argues strenuously that it is not in fact unactable at all, 1962: 65-68); or (c) if it is, by some other less demonstrable criterion, "undramatic" (Gilman 1962: 301)? The question is merely frivolous in so far as it presupposes that all fiction is assignable to one or other of two clearly defined categories, novel or drama. Much more serious is the second problem, that of the "generic uniqueness" (Gilman 1962: 301) of the work. *Celestina* may be the first of its kind in Spanish, but it is by no manner of means unique; and if the first of the problems I have identified has any philosophical validity whatsoever, it must be discussed with reference to the entire genre of humanistic comedy. The critics have tended consistently to make *Celestina* even more of a miracle than it is, and have credited Rojas (or the author of Act I) with a capacity for innovation which would have been astounding in the twentieth century and impossible in the fifteenth.

or which work Rojas and his predecessor borrowed their form, but we must identify a group of authors or works with which they could reasonably be presumed to have been acquainted. We must, that is, face the problem of transmission.

1. Classical comedy: Plautus and Terence.

Statements are repeatedly made in works of criticism and histories of literature that *Celestina* owes much to the Roman stage, and even that it is, specifically, a "Terentian comedy."¹ Rojas himself, indeed, in the first version of the acrostic verses, compared the old author's Act I with a play by Terence ("Jamás no vi sino terenciana" etc.), but he thought better of this and deleted the references to Terence from the revised verses of 1502 (perhaps by then he had actually read a play by Terence).

Plautus we really do not need to spend much time over. Menéndez Pelayo takes it for granted that Rojas was acquainted with Plautus (1962: 287-95), but Castro Guisasola could find not a single clear case of borrowing, and concluded that Plautus's "relaciones con *La Celestina*, séame lícito decirlo, se han exagerado" (1924: 50). The elements in *Celestina* which have been considered to be Plautine are:

- a. The acrostic verses.
- b. Certain stock characters, such as Centurio, regarded as an imitation of Pyrgopolynices, Plautus's *Miles gloriosus*, or one of his other braggart soldiers like Therapontigonus in *Curculio*; and *Celestina*, regarded as a development of the Plautine go-between who appears in such plays as *Asinaria*, *Cistellaria*, *Curculio*, and *Mostellaria*.
- c. The name of the character Sosia (a servant in *Amphitruo*).
- d. The title *Tragicomedia*.
- e. A number of commonplace ideas which appear both in the plays of Plautus and in *Celestina*.

The first three categories of similarities we can at once refer from Plautus to Terence, since the acrostic verses, the same stock characters, and the names not only of Sosia (who appears in *Hecyra* and *Andria*) but of various other *Celestina* personages are also to be found in Terence.

The term *tragicomedia* is a little bit more complex.² There is, of course, no such genre in the classical theatre, and in the prologue

to *Amphitruo* Plautus calls his play a "tragico-comoedia" as a joke. The term is, apparently, used only once between Plautus and Rojas, by Carlos Verardo, a Spaniard, in the dedication of a Latin work by his nephew Marcelino, *Fernandus salvatus*, of 1493. While insisting on Rojas's debt to Plautus, Menéndez Pelayo thought that it was "fuera de duda que Rojas conocía la obra de Verardo" (1962: 291). Castro Guisasola (1924: 52) was more inclined to see the influence of Verardo alone. I am unable to understand why it is impossible that the term *tragicomedia* (which is in any case not the "tragico-comoedia" of Plautus or Verardo) could not have occurred independently to Rojas.

Castro Guisasola lists a series of vaguely similar "verbal reminiscences" (1924: 53-56), but the closest parallels are: "Et ego et tua mater ambae / meretrices fuimus" (*Cistellaria*, I.1) with "tan puta vieja era tu madre como yo" (Cejador 1913: I, 98), and "Vides quae sim et quae fui ante?" (*Mostellaria*, I.3) with "¡Ay, quién me vido y quién me ve agora!" (II, 43), and they fail to convince Castro Guisasola.³

Nevertheless, Castro Guisasola, following Menéndez Pelayo, insists on the dependence of *Celestina* on the Roman stage, and decides that Rojas relies heavily on Terence. The proofs he offers may be categorized as follows:

- a. The acrostic verses.
- b. The stock characters.
- c. The names of certain characters: Parmeno appears in *Eunuchus*, *Adelphoi*, and *Hecyra*; Sosia(s) in *Hecyra* and *Andria*; Crito in *Andria*, *Heauton Timorumenos*, and *Phormio*; Thraso in *Eunuchus*; and Chremes - Alisa says in Act IV that she is going to visit the wife of Cremes - in *Andria*, *Eunuchus*, *Heauton Timorumenos*, and *Phormio*.
- d. A number of "verbal reminiscences."
- e. The dramatic technique. "Lo que principalmente ha asimilado Rojas del dramaturgo latino [es] la concepción dramática y técnica escénica, el arte de las situaciones, la infinidad y variedad de recursos artísticos para animar la escena, la expresión de los afectos; en suma, ese aliento vital" (1924: 86).

The acrostic verses are a particularly weak demonstration of dependence, since acrostic verse is cultivated throughout the Latin

Middle Ages, and by numerous fifteenth-century Spanish poets, including Juan de Mena and Jorge Manrique. But it is the last and least concrete argument which is the weakest link in the chain, for it draws our attention to the enormous differences that exist between Terence and *Celestina*. Terence always, in his six surviving plays, uses five acts and writes in verse; he has a light touch, uses fast-moving and highly complicated plots (sometimes, indeed, practising *contaminatio*, i.e. combining two Greek comedies in his one Latin one), and in general avoids coarseness and obscenity; and though a young man's desire for a girl provides the motivation for his plots, love in Terence is a light diversion. *Celestina* consists first of sixteen and then of twenty-one acts, and is in prose; while its plot is extremely simple, the story moves slowly, the author probing the thoughts and motives of the characters; the humour is serious, and there is no shunning of the unpleasant aspects of life, whether brutal or obscene; and *Celestina* treats of love as a dominating, all-consuming passion and a moral sin. There is a huge gulf between the plays of Terence and *Celestina*.

I shall return to the question of verbal reminiscences; for the moment, let me just reemphasize that it is abundantly clear that the authors of *Celestina* did not imitate the form of the work from Roman comedy.

2. Classical tragedy: Seneca.

Another suggestion came from Leo Spitzer, who made it (1957) in reviewing Gilman 1956. Briefly, he seeks antecedents for *Celestina* in classical tragedy, rather than comedy, and, because of the heavy Stoic element in *Celestina*, the fusion of rhetoric and dramatic dialogue, most specifically in Seneca.⁴ There are, certainly, passages of the first act of *Celestina* which are literal translations from Seneca. The evidence is set out by Castro Guisasola (1924: 94-98), but, as he demonstrates:

- a. All the borrowings come from Seneca's moralizing prose-works, not from his plays.
- b. The most substantial passages quoted from Seneca all derive from the *Epistulae morales* (the letters to Lucilius) and are to be found in the first act of *Celestina*.
- c. Other moral maxims from other works, such as *De beneficiis* and *De vitiis*, as well as from the *Epistulae morales*, are quoted by Rojas in Acts II-XXI, but could have reached him by a

variety of routes, the most likely of which appears to be the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, which, having lost the N to V section (they are alphabetically ordered) before the ninth century, was completed with the anonymous *De moribus*, falsely attributed to Seneca, and led a vigorous life, acquiring more maxims from a variety of sources, in the later Middle Ages [the complex situation is set out by Round 1972].

In short, there is no evidence that either of *Celestina's* authors knew the plays of Seneca, which are in any case formally as unlike *Celestina* as are the comedies of Terence.⁵

3. Humanistic comedy.

Other "dramatic" antecedents examined in connexion with the form of *Celestina* include the elegiac comedies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but since there is no formal resemblance, and since elegiac comedy leads us on into some very complex questions, I postpone examination of the problem.⁶ There is really no possible doubt that the shape of *Celestina* owes everything to humanistic comedy.⁷

Menéndez Pelayo argued (1962: 325) that there were only three humanistic comedies which could have influenced *Celestina*: Ugolino Pisani's *Philogenia*, Leonardo Bruni d'Arezzo's *Poliscene* (or *Poliscena*), and the *Chrysis* of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. He then proceeded to eliminate *Philogenia* ("tengo muy por dudosa esta fuente," 326) and *Chrysis* ("puede tenerse por cierto que Rojas desconocía la existencia de la *Chrysis*," 330). Castro Guisasola disposed of humanistic comedy in two very brief paragraphs (1924: 145): "Para las analogías señaladas [by Menéndez Pelayo], remito al lector a los *Orígenes de la novela* [...]. Aquí sólo diré que ninguna de las semejanzas con nuestra Tragicomedia (como no sean las de la *Poliscena*) es concluyente." It would seem that Castro Guisasola, finding Menéndez Pelayo's parallels unconvincing and the texts difficult of access, did not think it worth while to investigate the matter on his own account. The unfortunate result is that in a book of almost 200 pages on the sources of *Celestina*, the most important source next to Petrarch is dismissed in nine lines.

The question was reopened in 1953 by José María Casas Homs's edition of a hitherto unknown humanistic comedy, the

Poliodorus of Johannes de Vallata, but his remarks on "La *Celestina* y la comedia humanística" are tentative in the extreme, and it was left to María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, first reviewing Casas Homs in 1956, and then in her huge book of 1962, to put the case with the energy and decisiveness characteristic of her work.

Humanistic comedy, as distinct from other medieval drama in Latin, starts, like so much else, in fourteenth-century Italy, and its initiator was that remarkable innovator and greatest of European writers, Francesco Petrarca (Petrarch). It could be argued that the term "humanistic comedy" is something of a misnomer, since it might much more aptly be applied to the plays written by the humanists of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which are much closer imitations of classical comedy: humanism, indeed, in recovering purer classical standards, killed "humanistic comedy." Petrarch refers twice in his letters to his "comedia" *Philologia*, but his friend Giovanni Boccaccio writes that Petrarch "scripsit pulcherrimam comediam cui nomen imposuit *Philostratus*," and Francesco Nelli wrote to Petrarch in 1354 asking him to send copies of his plays: "Dic michi quando [...] legam [...] in commediis [tuis]" (Casas Homs 1953: 38-39). From a fragment of a letter described by Vittorio Rossi (1945: 558, n. 9) it would seem that the full title of one play was *Philologia et Philostratus* (like *Calisto y Melibea*), but whether Petrarch wrote more than one play remains obscure. At any rate no play of his survives, and we can gather very little about *Philologia* from the scattered references to it. In Boccaccio's view it was - like Act I in Rojas's view - superior to Terence; but it is also reported that Petrarch himself was ashamed of his play, having written it before becoming familiar with Terence (Lida de Malkiel 1962: 43, n.7). The only surviving fourteenth-century humanistic comedy is Pietro Paolo Vergerio's *Paulus*, but the fifteenth century saw an enormously increased production of these works. Those extant include Leonardo Bruni's *Poliscene* (of which there were numerous printed editions starting in 1478, as well as a great many manuscripts), Leone Battista Alberti's *Philodoxus* (also frequently printed), Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini's *Chrysis* (of which only one manuscript survives, though there are two modern editions), Ugolino Pisani de Parma's *Philogenia* (many times copied in manuscript and printed early) and his *Confabulatio coquinaria*, Vallata's *Poliodorus*, *Canichiolus*, Siccone Polentone's *Catinia*, Antonio Buzario or Barzicio's *Cauteriarina*, *Columpnarium*, the *Comoedia bile*, the *Comoedia electoralis*, the *Comoedia sine nomine*, Luigi Morelli's *Dolos* and another of the same title by Pietro de Roado, the *Fraudiphilia* of disputed authorship,

Mercurius Rantius's *Hypocrita*, and *Janus sacerdos*; and we have secure references to the now lost *Admiranda* and *Aphrodisia* (see Casas Homs 1953: 249-52).⁸

On the whole, though one can put together a respectable specialist bibliography on humanistic comedy (see Lida de Malkiel 1962: 37-38, n. 6), little attention has been paid to these plays by scholars working on the vernacular literatures, and, as with so many other things, the ignoring of this Latin background has led to undue emphasis on the novelty of works in the vernacular and specifically, in this case, of *Celestina*.

It is not easy to summarize the characteristics of humanistic comedy, since one of its principal features is precisely the diversity of its formal aspects. Some works were clearly written to be read (Leonardo Bruni writes in the introduction to his *Poliscene*: "perlege tu [...] lector"), while others are known to have been performed, frequently by students. Some are short, mere interludes, and some are long. Some are in verse and some are in prose. The various authors employ a variety of styles, ranging from the pseudo-classical to the racy colloquial. All show a clear, even though superficial, debt to Roman comedy: in the names of the characters (they are all classical or pseudo-classical, even when they are not actually to be found in Terence), in the situations employed, in the vocabulary and odd lines quoted from Terence, and in such devices as the incorporation of stage-directions into the dialogue. But all this is in fact relatively unimportant, for these fourteenth- and fifteenth-century plays differ quite radically from Roman comedy, and in every major way in which they do diverge from classical drama they coincide with *Celestina*. The points of similarity between *Celestina* and humanistic comedy (excluding the few I have noted which they share with Roman comedy, such as the names of the characters) may be listed as follows:

- a. **The use of prose instead of verse** (there are, of course, comedies in verse, but the very popular *Philodoxus*, among others, is in prose).
- b. **The flexible structure**, which rarely accepts the restriction of the classical five-act symmetrical development. (*Paulus* has five acts, but *Poliscene* has thirteen scenes, *Philodoxus* has twenty, *Chrysis* has eighteen, *Philogenia* has fifteen, *Poliodorus* has twenty-six, and so on.) Sundry features of humanistic

comedy are certainly related to this rejection of the more exigent form, but whether consequentially or causally it is not easy to say. Economy, for instance, is not a consideration (as it is in Roman comedy), so that situations are repeated, one finds unnecessary characters who do not advance the plot, and there are long digressions: their virtues rarely include conciseness. A further concomitant of the neglect of the classical structure is that these works are often rather shapeless, and it could be argued that (as with many another medieval work - see Spearing 1964: 24-25 and 46-67) the units of construction, in this case the scenes, show pattern and organization which is not evident in the work as a whole. Some humanistic comedies are indeed little more than a succession of semi-independent *cuadros*, linked by a very slender plot: which is to say that there is little unity of action.

- c. **The treatment of space and time**, which is quite unlike that in Roman comedy. In humanistic comedy, as in *Celestina*, the action takes place in numerous different settings; there are monologues and dialogues which take place as the characters move from one part of the town to another; conversations start outdoors and finish indoors, and so on. This may be explained partly by the authors' writing for readers rather than actors, partly, in the plays which were acted, by the absence of stage properties and machinery. But it is also paralleled by (and there may be some link with) an equally flexible concept of time, so that we can have the successive representation of scenes which are actually simultaneous, or the elapse of time between scenes or acts. Again, the classical unities are ignored.
- d. **Greater realism and lack of decorum**. Though there is no doubt much in humanistic comedy which could be argued to be realistically unlikely, the verisimilitude of the genre is incomparably greater than in the plots of Plautus and Terence, which rely on far-fetched coincidences, mistaken identities (notably with identical twins), and so forth. The background in humanistic comedy tends to be sketched in very much more fully, so that from some we can gather numerous realistic details of life in contemporary Italy. (Similar vivid little touches in *Celestina* have been much praised.) Though some Roman comedy might be adjudged mildly indelicate, some humanistic comedy is quite scabrous, examining incest, homosexuality, and the like. There is, of

course, no reason to suppose that the bawdy and crudity of certain scenes of *Celestina* necessarily derive from Italian humanistic comedy, since both are in this respect typically medieval.

- e. **The characters.** Humanistic comedy does make use of the stock types of Roman drama. The standard characters in these plays are: a pair of lovers, their servants, and a go-between, with the less consistent appearance of parents, prostitutes, and other characters. But there is also in humanistic comedy a variety of types not to be found in Roman comedy, such as the deceived husband, the amorous priest, and the old woman in love, and the stock characters themselves are not fixed types, so that one finds variation within the accepted categories. Perhaps the most radical innovation is in the heroine, who is typically (like Melibea) passionate, independent, and given to protesting against the social conventions which restrict her freedom.

In Roman comedy in general the characters behave in such a manner as to secure certain obvious objectives (usually a woman or wealth), which are clearly felt by the author to require no justification, and the characters' emotions (fear, guilt, remorse, affection, love, loyalty, etc.) are facts given to explain their conduct but emotions which neither Plautus nor Terence feels impelled to analyse further, justify, or explain. But in humanistic comedy the motivation of the characters is examined in much greater detail, and one frequently finds meandering introspection, indecision, and internal conflict.

In harmony with the realism and lack of decorum I have mentioned, one finds little high-flown sentiment in humanistic comedy. The lovers are motivated by lust and their servants by self-interest, and parents are more frequently actuated by greed than by affection or thoughts of honour. In general the atmosphere is much more like that of the *Decameron* than that of Terence.

- f. **The mixture of styles:** there is in most humanistic comedies a non-classical mingling of stylistic levels.

One could argue that humanistic comedy represents an attempt at emulating the classical writers of comedy by Italians conditioned by medieval literary theory and practice -that is, to put it crudely, a cross between Roman comedy and medieval drama. One might, therefore, go on to enquire whether the author of the first act

of *Celestina* might not have arrived at a similar form by a similar route, and whether, given Act I as a model, Rojas need have been familiar with the humanistic comedy of Italy. But the general resemblance of form and treatment - which are such that the only proper label for *Celestina* is "humanistic comedy" - are also accompanied by a number of other coincident features, such as the use of a prefatory letter. It is true that some coincidences may be due to chance, to common sources, or to European traditions, but it is impossible that all the features common to *Celestina* and Italian humanistic comedy could have arisen independently. In his prose *Philodoxus*, written in 1426, Leone Battista Alberti says in a prefatory letter (addressed to Leonello d'Este) that he wrote it in fifteen days while a law student at Pavia. In Ugolino Pisani's *Philogenia* there is a character called Calixtus (the heroine's father), and a scene (like that in Act XII of *Celestina*) in which the parents are disturbed by a noise in their daughter's room. In Leonardo Bruni's *Poliscene* the go-between, Tharatantara, has a reputation as a witch; there is a passage in which she recalls the joys of youth which is strongly reminiscent of *Celestina*'s discourse on the topic; and exchanges between the go-between and *Poliscene* could have suggested those between *Celestina* and *Melibea*. The *Paulus* of Pietro Paolo Vergerio is subtitled "ad iuvenum coercendos mores." Sundry writers refer to the controversy their work has excited. And so on. Lida de Malkiel (1956) has listed an even greater number of similarities. Both the original author of Act I and Fernando de Rojas must have known some humanistic comedy.

Menéndez Pelayo found the problem of transmission difficult, inasmuch as the earliest authenticated representation of a humanistic comedy in Spain did not take place until the sixteenth century (at Salamanca), and the texts were printed late in Spain (the earliest Spanish edition of *Philodoxus*, for instance, is Salamanca 1501). But these difficulties seem to me quite unreal. In the first place, we do not have to suppose that either of *Celestina*'s authors need have watched a performance of a humanistic comedy, and the fact that these works were printed late in Spain signifies nothing: the Petrarch which Rojas indubitably used was printed in Basel, and humanist texts found their way to Spain readily enough from printing centres all over Europe. Menéndez Pelayo's point that manuscripts of these works are lacking in Spain is also wholly inconclusive on at least two counts: one, that it is not true, and two, that even it were true it would not mean that printed editions were not available.

A more real difficulty is encountered when one tries to guess at which of this large number of humanistic comedies the authors of *Celestina* might actually have read. The only suggestion I have to make is that perhaps the likeliest source is the *Margarita poetica*.

4. The *Margarita poetica*.

Albrecht von Eyb (Albertus de Eyb, Eib, Eiib, Eijb), [1420-75], was one of the earliest of the German humanists, who published, among other things, a summary of Book 2 of Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque Fortunae*, one of the earliest editions of two comedies of Plautus (the *Menaechmi* and the *Bacchides*: he printed them with Ugolino Pisani's *Philogenia* in 1518), a German translation by himself of the *Philogenia*, and the enormously popular *Margarita poetica*.⁹

The most cursory investigation, looking no further than the catalogues of the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the Biblioteca Nacional, shows that there were at least a dozen editions of this work which Rojas could have known. The first edition was printed in Nuremberg by Johann Sensenschmid in 1472 (BL and BNP), and thereafter there are editions by G. Husner, Strasbourg 1473? (BL); by U. Gallus, alias Han, Rome 1475 (BL and BNP); an incomplete edition of Paris c. 1475, noted by bibliographers but apparently not in BL, BNM, or BNP; by Simonel, Blandin, and Simon, Paris 1477 (BNP); by Ulricus Guering, Paris 1478 (BL and BNP); by Stephanus Plannck, Rome 1480 (BL and BNP); of 1487, without place but Venice (BL); by J. Rubrus, Venice, without date but 1493? (BNP); of 1493, without place but Venice? (BL); and by Johann Amerbach, Basel 1495 (BL, BNM, and BNP). In addition, as well as the sixteenth-century editions which are too late for Rojas to have known before writing *Celestina*, there are an undated Nuremberg edition by Sensenschmid and Kefer (BNP), two quarto editions without imprint (BNM), and one folio edition without imprint (BNP), all of which could be presumed to be incunables. According to Casas Homs (1953: 54, n. 13) there are two copies of the *Margarita* in the Biblioteca Universitaria of Barcelona, but he does not say what editions they represent. There are copies of some of these editions in Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and doubtless many another library. This makes the *Margarita* a best-seller among early printed books.

The work itself is a compendium of quotations from the poets, historians, and philosophers, but also an *ars poetica* and manual of

letter-writing ("de arte dictandi ac practicandi epistolarum opus") and an anthology of model passages selected from, among others, Plautus and Terence, and the humanistic comedies *Philodoxus*, the grossly scabrous *Comoedia de falso Hypocrita et tristi* of Mercurius Rantius (or Roncius) Vercellensis (performed in Pavia in 1437), and the *Philogenia* of Ugolino Pisani (including the soliloquy of the love-lorn hero Epifebus).

No one has as yet carefully examined the *Margarita* to see how much it might have contributed to *Celestina*.¹⁰ But if there are difficulties in supposing that Rojas could have known Aeneas Sylvius's *Chrysis*, which the author did all he could to suppress after he became Pope Pius II, there is no difficulty in supposing that Rojas could have known Leonardo Bruni d'Arezzo's *Poliscene* nor, via Albrecht von Eyb, fragments of *Philodoxus* and *Philogenia*, and odd lines and extracts from Plautus and Terence.

Conclusions

We are now in a position to return to the alleged influence of Terence on *Celestina*. Castro Guisasola takes nine pages (1924: 82-90) to list the "borrowings" from Terence, and even insists (86) that he would never be done if he tried to list them all. But they are a miscellaneous collection, and of the twenty-six alleged reminiscences, the least sceptical reader would surely be doubtful about many. Some are completely trivial (like "Ha, ha, hae!" "Quid risisti?" / "¡He, he, he!" "¿De qué te ríes?"), and most of the remainder are only vaguely similar. Wherever one does find a clear and unequivocal borrowing, involving one of Rojas's typical word-for-word translations (like "Amantium irae, amoris reintegratio est," rendered by Sempronio as "Las yras de los amigos siempre suelen ser reintegración del amor," Cejador 1913: II, 16), it turns out to be a secondary borrowing (in this instance from Petrarch's *Epistulae familiares*, V.8). In fact the only undeniable cases are those taken at second hand from Petrarch. This makes the literal non-comparability of the remaining "borrowings" highly suspect.

There are, nevertheless, two curious features about Castro Guisasola's "situaciones análogas" (as he ends by calling what at the beginning he said were textual reminiscences): one is that there are rather too many of these vaguely similar parallels for us to dismiss them without some misgiving, and the other is that they are for the

most part restricted to just two Terentian comedies, *Andria* and *Eunuchus*. The fact that Rojas does not take anything directly from Terence word for word could be explained by his not possessing a copy of these plays when he wrote *Celestina*. But whether he had at some earlier stage read *Andria* and *Eunuchus* we may perhaps never settle satisfactorily. They could have reached him via humanistic comedy. Castro Guisasola reverses this argument by saying (1924: 90, n. 1) that while these "analogues" are also to be found in humanistic comedy, it is the influence of Terence on both Rojas and humanistic comedy that explains the similarities between the latter and *Celestina*. This, however, is clearly wrong: Terence is not the "modelo inmediato de Rojas," and the form of *Celestina* is that of a humanistic comedy; but whether Rojas got his Terence from Terence, from humanistic comedy, or from a work like the *Margarita poetica* is something that only further research can clarify. Someone, in fact, has still to do the job which Castro Guisasola, who had the right gift for it, most unfortunately decided would be unprofitable.

I have dealt with this problem at some length, since it seems to me a typical and all-too-familiar case in hispanist criticism. Scholars find "sources" for medieval works in what are now well-known classical texts while ignoring all the then best-known writers in Latin (Boethius, Peter Comestor, Peter Lombard, St. Bernard, Thomas Aquinas; Jacob à Voragine, and others) along with the all-important and very numerous *compendia* and the teaching and preaching manuals in which all manner of anecdotes, descriptions, images, fragments of verse, and *sententiae* were anthologized and preserved as models. The older critics were convinced that *Celestina* was modelled on Terence; Lida de Malkiel (1962) has demonstrated unequivocally that it is in innumerable ways a typical humanistic comedy; but even she barely mentions (there are only three passing references) the *Margarita poetica*, which was actually the most widely diffused text of all.

To sum up the situation so far: the only sure sources from earlier drama which we are obliged to posit for the authors of *Celestina* are some compendium, almost certainly a late medieval version of the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, to account for the fragments of Seneca (the author of Act I had also read the letters to Lucilius), and one sample of a humanistic comedy (possibly the readily accessible *Poliscene*) and/or the *Margarita poetica*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Casas Homs, José María, ed., 1953. *Johannes de Vallata, "Poliodorus": comedia humanística desconocida*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Castro Guisasola, F., 1924. *Observaciones sobre las fuentes literarias de "La Celestina,"* Anejos de la RFE, 5. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos.
- Cejador y Frauca, Julio, ed., 1913. Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, Clásicos Castellanos, 20 & 23. Madrid: La Lectura.
- Corfis, Ivy A., 1984. "Fernando de Rojas and Albrecht von Eyb's *Margarita poetica*," *Neophilologus*, 68: 206-13.
- Deyermond, Alan, in press. "Keith Whinnom's *Celestina* Book," in *Medieval Hispanic Studies in Honor of Charles F. Fraker* (Madison: HSMS).
- Fothergill-Payne, Louise, 1988. *Seneca and "Celestina."* Cambridge: UP.
- Fraker, Charles F., 1990. *"Celestina": Genre and Rhetoric*. London: Tamesis.
- Gilman, Stephen, 1956. *The Art of "La Celestina."* Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- , 1962. "Rebirth of a Classic: *Celestina*," in *Varieties of Literary Expression*, ed. Stanley Burnshaw (New York: New York UP), 283-305. (Revised in Spanish as "Introducción" to Severin 1969: 7-29.)
- , 1972. *The Spain of Fernando de Rojas: The Intellectual and Social Landscape of "La Celestina."* Princeton: UP.
- Herrmann, Max, 1893. *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Hiller, Joseph Anthony, 1939. *Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist*. Washington: Catholic Univ. of America.
- Lacarra, María Eugenia, 1990. *Cómo leer "La Celestina,"* Guías de Lectura Júcar, 5. Madrid: Júcar.
- Lawrance, Jeremy, 1993. "On the Title *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*," in *Letters and Society in Fifteenth-Century Spain: Studies Presented to P.E. Russell on his Eightieth Birthday* (Llangranog: Dolphin), 79-92.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa, 1956. Review of Casas Homs 1953, *NRFH*, 10: 415-39.
- , 1962. *La originalidad artística de "La Celestina."* Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
- Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino, 1962. *Orígenes de la novela*, III [1910], Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas. Santander: CSIC.

- Rossi, Vittorio, 1945. *Storia letteraria d'Italia: il Quattrocento*, 3rd ed. Milano: Francesco Vallardi.
- Round, Nicholas G., 1972. "The Mediaeval Reputation of the *Proverbia Senecae*: A Partial Survey Based on Recorded MSS," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Section C*, 72: 103-51.
- , 1974-79. "Las traducciones medievales catalanas y castellanas de las tragedias de Séneca," *Anuario de Estudios Medievales*, 9: 187-227.
- Russell, Peter E., ed., 1991. Fernando de Rojas, *Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*, Clásicos Castalia, 191. Madrid: Castalia.
- Severin, Dorothy S., ed., 1969. Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina: Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Spearing, A.C., 1964. *Criticism and Medieval Poetry*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Spitzer, Leo, 1957. "A New Book on the Art of *La Celestina*," *HR*, 25: 1-25.
- Stäuble, Antonio, 1968. *La commedia umanistica del Quattrocento*. Firenze: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento.
- Webber, Edwin J., 1956. "The Literary Reputation of Terence and Plautus in Medieval and Pre-Renaissance Spain," *HR*, 24: 191-206.
- , 1957-58. "Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of Terence and Plautus in Spain," *RPh*, 11: 29-39.
- Whinnom, Keith, 1989. "Albrecht von Eyb's *Margarita poetica*: What Every *Celestinista* Should Know," ed. Alan Deyermond, *Celestinesca*, 13.2 (Nov.): 45-47.
- Wolf, Ferdinand, 1859. *Studien zur Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*. Berlin: A. Asher.

NOTES

1. [In addition to Webber 1956 and 1957-58, see now Fraker 1990: chap.2, and Russell 1991: 37-45.]
2. [This question and some others treated in the present article are discussed by Lawrance 1993.]
3. [All quotations are from Cejador's Clásicos Castellanos edition, first published in 1913, which had reached its 9th impression - whimsically described by the publishers as 9th edition - by the time Whinnom was writing. I do not know to which impression(s) his working copy belonged, but the page-numbers pencilled on the typed draft correspond to those in my own copy, in which vol. I is of the 3rd impression and II of the 4th (1945 and 1949 respectively).]
4. [For knowledge of Seneca's tragedies in medieval Spain, see Round 1974-79. Louise Fothergill-Payne renews the case for some influence of Seneca's tragedies on *Celestina*, 1988: 128-35.]
5. [In Whinnom's typed draft of this chapter, the section on Seneca is followed by the first fourteen lines of a section 3 on elegiac comedy, *Pamphilus de amore*, and the *Libro de buen amor*, which he describes as "a vexed and complex question." These lines, which end in mid-sentence, are crossed out, and the page is followed by a new section 3.]
6. [Whinnom says he postpones it "until the next section," i.e. the next chapter, but if this was ever written, apart from the lines mentioned in note 4, above, it has not survived.]
7. [The standard treatment of the genre is by Stäuble 1968. For its relation to *Celestina*, see now Russell 1991: 45-52.]
8. Lida de Malkiel (1962: 37-38, n. 6) drafts a slightly different catalogue, excluding a few items - those, apparently, which she was unable to see - and adding to Casas Homs's list seven plays by Tito Livio Frulovisi and the anonymous *Aetheria*.
9. For further information on this very important and neglected figure one can consult Hiller 1939; pp. 69-111 are on the *Margarita poetica*. [See also Herrmann 1893; pp. 174-214 on the *Margarita*. Whinnom decided in 1985 to give an account of the work for *Celestina* specialists, but his final illness prevented him from doing more than writing the first couple of pages; I have edited the fragment in this journal: Whinnom 1989.]

RESEÑAS

Miguel Garci-Gómez. *Tres autores en 'La Celestina': Aplicación de la informática a los estudios literarios*. Granada: Colección Romania. 1993. 267 pp.

El autor de este libro estudia el léxico de *Celestina*, trazando la distribución de frecuencias con ordenador para llegar a la conclusión de que tres partes de la obra fueron compuestas por distintos autores. Los estudiosos de *Celestina* encontrarán aquí un repaso completo del estado de la cuestión de múltiple autoría, más un gran acopio de datos relacionados con el vocabulario de la obra que serán de enorme utilidad para discutir temas y estilo, pero el libro dista de poner fin a dicha cuestión.

Garci-Gómez muestra profundos conocimientos de la obra en sí, además de gran pericia filológica. En dos capítulos examina vocablos discretos relacionados a temas, organizando su discusión y análisis de vocablos según categorías semánticas de la contienda, la caza, carnes, la cocina, la bestialidad, la religión, la brujería, la desconfianza, el servicio, el parentesco, impresiones sensoriales, la exclamación y la risa. Otros cuatro capítulos tratan los apartes, grupos morfosintácticos, diminutivos, pronombres, adverbios y frases, formas verbales y formas ortográficas. El autor sabe bien qué tipo de material se presta a la búsqueda computacional y presenta los datos en cuadros muy claros.

Si por una parte el libro lleva una nutrida bibliografía sobre *Celestina*, por otra parte no hay ninguna sobre el uso del ordenador para resolver casos de autoría disputada, una disciplina que cuenta con una respetable tradición. El ya clásico estudio de Mosteller y Wallace sobre los *Federalist Papers* (1964)¹ y numerosas publicaciones sobre los apócrifos shakespearianos y textos bíblicos han proporcionado modelos del uso de la informática para casos de

¹ Frederick Mosteller and David L. Wallace, *Inference and Disputed Authorship: "The Federalist"*, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1964.

autoría disputada. El presentar este estudio de *Celestina* como "logoscopia" sin citar modelos anteriores ni atenerse a principios comúnmente aceptados en el campo de la atribución autorial hace difícil aceptar las conclusiones.

El autor divide el texto de *Celestina* en tres partes para llevara cabo su análisis: AUTO (Acto I), COMEDIA (Actos II-XVI) y TRATADO (material interpolado). El solo hecho de considerar *Celestina* para el análisis textual como una concatenación de tres obras diferentes, además de representar una aceptación *a priori* de la presencia de tres autores, es problemático. La única prueba que conozco que utiliza textos concatenados es QSUM, pero sólo para estudiar hábitos lingüísticos, como el porcentaje de sustantivos o de palabras de cierta longitud.² También cabe pensar que si un autor ha reelaborado y continuado un texto comenzado por otro, es probable que la parte original no nos haya llegado "pura" y que lleve señales estilísticas de su intervención. Como reconoce Garci-Gómez en su introducción, se trata de textos "enrevesados" (26). Por eso mismo es mucho más complicado que comparar dos dramas para determinar si el estilo se acerca más a Shakespeare o a Marlowe.

El libro presenta los datos de una sola operación analítica, los que produce *WordCruncher* para trazar la distribución de frecuencias. Los datos están organizados en cuadros, con columnas que corresponden a: (1) casos (número absoluto de ocurrencias), (2) porcentaje real del texto que constituye el número absoluto, (3) porcentaje esperado (de estar distribuidos de modo aleatorio en textos de extensión igual) y (4) la diferencia entre el porcentaje real y el esperado. Como el uso de esta función para determinar autoría representa una metodología nueva, conviene, antes de presentar los datos, asesorar la validez del experimento utilizado para estos fines. La distribución de frecuencias de *WordCruncher* está basada en la premisa de que tal distribución *en una obra* (no de una serie de obras concatenadas) será suficientemente homogénea para ser asimilada a una distribución aleatoria. Se emplea normalmente como una especie de mapa para localizar la concentración de un determinado elemento en distintas partes de un texto. Se puede comparar el patrón de la repartición con el de otro autor o texto, como ha hecho Muller con

² David I. Holmes. "Cumulative Sum Charts for Authorship Attribution," *ACH-ALLC Conference Abstracts*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 1993.

textos de Racine y Corneille,³ siempre y cuando se emplea alguna prueba de significación, como la de χ^2 , que mide homogeneidad.

El autor no explica por qué decidió trabajar en dos capítulos con vocablos de contenido temático, que suelen ser muy variables para constituir un discriminante estilístico, en vez de seguir los modelos de atribución basados en el comportamiento de vocablos raros (Udne Yule⁴), funcionales (A. Q. Morton⁵) o de alta frecuencia que cumplen con una razón diferencial designada (Warren B. Austin⁶).

Otro problema es que la repartición de vocabulario puede ser muy irregular en un solo autor debido a causas temáticas y estilísticas (según señala una y otra vez Charles Muller en *Principes et Méthodes de la Statistique Lexicale*), sin que sea indicio de autoría distinta. Como la probabilidad de ocurrencia de un vocablo crece con la extensión del texto siguiendo una regla binomial, como ha demostrado Muller, se debe usar muestras de longitud igual para las comparaciones de vocabulario. Generalmente los estudios de atribución se ocupan de atributos que representen hábitos lingüísticos no afectados por temas específicos en el contenido del texto. En este sentido, los datos de Garci-Gómez sobre grupos morfosintácticos (prefijos, diminutivos, pronombres, etc.), formas verbales y formas ortográficas pueden tener validez, pero únicamente si se formula una hipótesis clara y se comprueba la significación estadística mediante alguna norma— χ^2 , desviación z, razón diferencial, índice de dispersión, cusum, etc.. Sin pruebas, los cuadros son interesantes pero no hay modo de juzgar si las diferencias rebasan las que normalmente se puedan esperar tratándose de un solo autor.

³ Charles Muller, *Principes et Méthodes de la Statistique Lexicale*, Paris: Classiques Hachette, 1977.

⁴ G. Udny Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1944.

⁵ Andrew Q. Morton, *Literary Detection*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.

⁶ Warren B. Austin, "The Authorship of Certain Renaissance English Pamphlets," *Proceedings: Computer Applications to Problems in the Humanities*, ed. Frederick M. Burelbach, Jr., Brockport, NY: SUNY College, 1970, 93-99.

Establecer múltiple autoría exige también más de un tipo de prueba. En los estudios de vocabulario hay muchas posibilidades, tales como la razón de vocablos a palabras (TTR), hapax legomena, el crecimiento incremental de vocabulario (posible desviación de la norma teórica binomial de Muller) y medidas de vocabulario solapado hechas sobre muestras aleatorias iguales de cada parte. También se echan de menos información sobre la extensión en número de palabras de cada parte (sólo se señalan porcentajes), una explicación del uso de frecuencias inferiores (como tres o de cuatro ocurrencias [185 y 186]); la enunciación de una hipótesis nula y una explicación de la metodología empleada.

Garci-Gómez considera que las diferencias que se desprenden de los cuadros de repartición son "de suficiente peso como para establecer la participación de un tercer autor en *La Celestina*" (192), pero para alegar autoría múltiple, hay que establecer significación estadística. Los datos aportados permiten afirmar solamente que el léxico varía entre las tres divisiones, como varía también en una obra escrita por un solo autor.

Ciertos resultados parecen dignos de notar, como los que tienen que ver con variantes ortográficas y morfosintácticas, porque éstas, a diferencia del vocabulario, son hábitos que no están sujetos a una relación binomial a la longitud del texto. La contundente afirmación de que los que "sostengan que los numerosos datos y la diferencias aquí analizadas no son de suficiente peso como para establecer la participación de un tercer autor en *La Celestina* serán los prefieran seguir refugiados en el presentimiento, en la corazonada, en el conviene, luego es" (192) no está justificada. Los que confían en los ordenadores y en las estadísticas tampoco se convencerán. La enorme bibliografía en torno a los estudios de autoría disputada aconseja en contra de afirmaciones tan tajantes y a favor de cautela, ya que hasta tasas tan altas como el 99% de significación estadística aún dejan algún resquicio a dudas.

En fin, la presentación de sugestivos datos léxicos y su organización en reveladoras categorías semánticas representan una labor digna de encomio, pero la evidencia aportada por este libro ha enriquecido la polémica--no la ha resuelto.

Estelle Irizarry

Georgetown University

Fernando de Rojas and *Celestina*: Approaching the Fifth Century. Proceedings of An International Conference in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Death of Fernando de Rojas. Edited by Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow. Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1993. xx + 439pp.

Those who were present for the warm collegiality at the Fernando de Rojas conference at Purdue University in November of 1991 will welcome those impressive papers in their definitive form. The hosts of that gathering, and editors of this anthology, proposed with their usual modesty to merely initiate the learned festivities that will undoubtedly surround the 500th anniversary of the first printed edition of *Celestina*. What they have actually done is set a daunting standard for scholars who come after them. While these were not commissioned essays — which means that there are some gaps in the range of *celestinesca* topics that might be covered — they embrace both traditional concerns and announce new frontiers for questions previously thought settled.

The introductory essay by the editors, "*Celestina* and *Celestinas*: Nearing the Fifth Century," sums up in an astute thematic way the status of *Celestina* studies, a service Joseph Snow has performed for us before¹ and which he continues in the pages of this journal. In his 1988 overview, Snow established as his three principal focuses the dating of editions and events, belletristic interpretations and the artistic legacy of *Celestina* in subsequent generations. Here Corfis and Snow devote most of their space to a discussion of the editions and avatars of Rojas' sole known work and also suggest overarching forces of dark desire as a locus of interpretation in both fictional character and historical reader.

Yakov Malkiel offers his own retrospective on *Celestina* studies from an inimitable vantage point. His "Analysis of Early Critical Reactions to María Rosa Lida de Malkiel's *La originalidad artística de*

¹ "Estado actual de los estudios celestinescos." *Ínsula* N°. 497 (abril de 1988): 17-18.

'*La Celestina*'" draws on the personal archives of his late wife to reveal the genesis and public aftermath of her massive study. Malkiel includes an insightful appraisal of Peter Russell's 1964 review of *La originalidad*.²

Two of the most substantive essays in the collection, by Alan Deyermond, "Female Societies in *Celestina*," and María Eugenia Lacarra, "La evolución de la prostitución en la Castilla del siglo XV y la mancebía de Salamanca en tiempos de Fernando de Rojas," are vigorous new contributions to the (at last, mainstream) subject of the experiences of women. Both skirt psycho-literary feminist criticism per se for a more socio-historical or anthropological perspective on the functional roles women played in each other's lives and in their wider communities.

Deyermond's brilliant account of women's familial, economic and fanciful social clusters yields striking results. Within late medieval male macrosociety there existed few relatively autonomous female microsocieties: the convent, the brothel, the widow's household and the (transient) female-led court, estate or household, and these differed widely from each other in stability and permanence. *Celestina*'s private house of assignation (it is not a public brothel) is also a center of commerce and light industry, delineated in the long description of the technical infrastructure of *Celestina*'s workshop. Male clients underwrite its fragile self-sufficiency, but cannot dictate its internal rules and communal memory. Within this microsociety *Celestina* is its historian, Elicia its elegist and Areúsa its ideologue. Melibea, with Lucrecia's assistance, creates a fantasy "convent of courtly love" complete with cloister garden and erotic hymns, but as soon as Lucrecia shows signs of passion for Calisto the sisterhood dies even before Melibea does. Both microsocieties are furtive, required to conceal their existence from the masculine world of public law even as they court the male gaze of selective individuals. By the end of the work patriarchal societies and households are in ruins, and only *Celestina*'s line shows signs of continuance.

² "Literary Tradition and Social Reality in *La Celestina*," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 41 (1964): 230-37.

Lacarra brings new documentation to this underworld of prostitution. One clear departure from *Celestina's* literary world is Lacarra's proof of control men held over the market for flesh in fifteenth-century Spain. *Terceros* kept their girls and women in a virtual state of slavery, with these prostitutes officially excluded from the protection of the law: those who committed crimes against them could do so with near impunity. The more manipulative practice of *alcahuetería* (males as well as females plied this trade) was punishable by burning if the sinful union had been successfully consummated. The legal records of the period have even yielded a grant from their Catholic Majesties for licensing a *mancebía* in Salamanca; the full document is photographically reproduced, transcribed and annotated by Lacarra as part of her article.

A further socio-historical study is provided by Jerry R. Rank in "'O cruel juez, y que mal pago me has dado...': Or Calisto's Urban Network." Rank's surprising but persuasive suggestion is that the "good old boy" society of the swain's city showed its own signs of degeneracy. More than the mere swooning male lover he was once thought to represent, Calisto comes equipped with a set of Mafia-style family connections with anticipated kickbacks to energize his pursuit of Melibea as a purchasable commodity.

Rhetoric is a major concern in this volume. "Conséjate con Séneca: *Auctoritas* in *Celestina* and *Celestina comentada*" by Louise Fothergill-Payne expands on some of the insights in her book on *Seneca and 'Celestina'* (Cambridge, 1988). Here she expands her grid to include the (sometimes thick-handed) witness of the *Celestina comentada* and to show how it explicates and betrays the pseudo-learning contained in Sempronio's diatribe against women in Act I. The malapropisms we enjoy in Cervantes' Sancho Panza apparently had their counterpart in Rojas' characters who bungled their quoteshmanship. In "The Four Humors in *Celestina*," Charles F. Fraker analyzes *Celestina's* cast as representatives of humoral descriptors and yet irreducible to those traits alone. He concedes that "Rojas ... [is] never very systematic about these matters" (142) but argues that to ignore the character types familiar to Rojas' readership is to miss deviations from character that Pleberio, say, signals when he departs from his anticipated melancholic temperament. Fraker's observations are highly perceptive, but while he would prefer not to ascribe the psychological complexity of modern fiction to the likes of Pármemo and Sempronio, he admits that humoral typology is a patchwork

affair at best, or as Nicholas Round observes elsewhere in this collection, "Unsuccessful roleplay was one of the grand paradigms of human conduct which Rojas was to take over and develop from the *Antiguo Auctor*" (97).³

"Rhetoric at Work: *Celestina*, *Melibea*, and the Persuasive Arts" by Edward H. Friedman provides a bracing tour of modern theoretical perspectives about language as constructive tool and subversive lever. Drawing on both De Man and Kristeva on the one hand, and Fraker and Gilman on the other, Friedman weaves a rhetorically dense composition of his own to sustain the thesis that Rojas portrays rhetoric as an ultimately doomed enterprise, unstable, and, in the face of death, all too insubstantial. Rhetoric is the self-referential engine that drives life and language to replicate themselves "transgressively" in this work.⁴

Other theoretical studies are on view as well. Nicholas G. Round in his "*Celestina*, Aucto, I: A Platonic Echo and Its Resonances" make a cautious sortie into territory we would like to know more about, namely how much Plato (as opposed to neoplatonic derivatives) Rojas could have actually read and absorbed in his Castilian surroundings. Lee Gallo (items 83 and 115 in the *Celestinesca* supplements) has argued that Rojas made his characters negative exemplars of neoplatonic virtues, and Round find parallels in the "double function of dialogue as didactic exposition and fictional action" (99). Pero Díaz' 1460s version of a vernacular *Phaedo* survives in a Salamanca manuscript and may have even been the copy read by the author of the first act, although perhaps only half-remembered or half-understood by him. The strongest structural match is Act IX, a *Symposium*-like dinner party turned into a debate on love, but that

³ For a recent study on the philosophy of love, see the astute work of Charles Heusch, "*La Célestine et la tradition amoureuse médiévale*," *Les Langues Néo-Latines* N° 279 (1992): 5-24.

⁴ On theories of classical rhetoric as manipulation, cf. Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1969).

too has to be consigned to mere stylistic convergence along with Celestina's own near-Socratic dominance of every conversation.⁵

"Law of the Father — Law of the Mother in *Celestina*" by James F. Burke, an essay which shares many points of textual reference with Deyermond's, explores the mythic and linguistic poles of paternity and maternity, the tensions between inherited wisdom and power (masculine) and self-creating, sometimes amnesic, authority (feminine). Catastrophe results when the father is either absent (in the case of Calisto) or irresponsible (in the case of Melibea). "Reading and Listening in *Celestina*" by James R. Stamm starts from the premise that Proaza understands "to read" (*leer*) as an oral, communal activity, "extroverted, dramatic," and that Rojas proved himself from his repeated private readings of the first act to be a "more modern, isolated ... a serious and analytical reader, a learner, a loner" (372), a "silent, 'visual' reader" (373). Unlettered Pármemo and Areúsa rely on oral wisdom, the *evangelio chico* of the *refranero*, to guide their actions, while Sempronio and Melibea quote helter-skelter from dimly remembered books, something new for an erotic heroine in Spanish letters. Calisto for his part displays only rhetorical flashiness, a veneer of courtly patter.

Emilio de Miguel Martínez weighs in with "*Celestina*, teatro." The preoccupation about *Celestina* being either drama or novel was thought to have calmed down some time ago: the fact that it straddles the worlds of parlor theater and formal novel surely pertains to modern fixations on genre theory that troubled no one in the sixteenth (or seventeenth or eighteenth) centuries. Even though Rojas' own *Celestina* was never carried to the stage until the very early 20th century, Miguel Martínez insists that the overpowering balance of evidence has to come down on the side of theater, i.e., life overheard and not just reported. His 25 pages are a tight marshalling of every good argument — many of them quite fresh — for insisting that the only fully actualized reading of the work is a dramatization, at least in the mind of a reader. He does not confront the counter-argument that the characters themselves tend to slip in and out of their purely dramatic identity while they assume the shared experience of "co-

⁵ Cf. Linde Marie Brocato, "Communicating Desire: Self and Discourse in *La Celestina*," diss., Emory Univ., 1991, esp. "Chapter 2. A World of Difference: Gender and Self Through Platonism," 23-45.

reader" of their interlocutor's address. He also overlooks the issue of words as speech acts (Austin, et al.), but his insights into the nature of read theater are subtle and penetrating.

Celestina has, of course, been repeatedly translated, and a number of studies in this collection explore the arching history of its translation into other languages, arts and genres. Whether these transformations are studied as 'readings' of the original or examined as instances of interart criticism, they have been a mainstay of *Celestina* research throughout this century. In the graphics arts, "Mute Commentaries on a Text: The Illustrations of the *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea*" by Erna Berndt Kelley belongs to the burgeoning field of text and image studies that are often on precarious methodological ground.⁶ The survey by Kelley is instructive and prudently framed and should supplement what Joseph Snow has explored elsewhere.⁷

Among dramatic reworkings of *Celestina* themes and/or characterizations, there are several entries. "Eighteenth-Century *Celestina* Reincarnations" by Kathleen V. Kish concentrates on England, with a side note on Goya as the pre-eminent draftsman of the bawd. Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego's "*Celestina* en escena: el personaje de la vieja alcahueta y hechicera en el teatro renacentista" offers a tour of the permutations of the old crone and her craft in some nine theatrical works of the sixteenth century. "*Celestina*'s Seductive Power in France: An Operatic Debut" by Adrienne Schizzano Mandel analyzes a new French opera (debut in 1988) reported on earlier in *Celestinesca*.

Translation proper is the concern of Dwayne E. Carpenter in "The Sacred in the Profane: Jewish Scriptures and the First Comedy in Hebrew." In this case the Hebrew translation has been lost and only a verse introduction remains, but it forms an intriguing witness to the literary depth of the Italian Jewish community for which it was

⁶ Cf. W.J. Thomas Mitchell. "Against Comparison: Teaching Literature and the Visual Arts," in *Teaching Literature and Other Arts*, ed. Jean-Pierre Barricelli, Joseph Gibaldi and Estella Lauter (New York: Modern Language Assn., 1990), pp. 30-37.

⁷ "La iconografía de tres *Celestinas* tempranas (Burgos, 1499; Sevilla, 1518; Valencia, 1514): unas observaciones" in *DICENDA. Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica*. no. 6 (1987 [1990]): 255-77.

composed. "Kaspar von Barth's Neo-Latin Translation of *Celestina* (1624)" by Theodore S. Beardsley, Jr. is a wonderful unraveling of von Barth's philological meanderings as he tried to prepare a Latin translation for a German audience using French reference tools. Finally, "Five Centuries of *Celestina* Readings: An Overview and an Example from the Nineteenth Century" by Joseph T. Snow recognizes the sharp disparity of canonical "value" between *Celestina* and its countless offshoots. Whether the decidedly modest accomplishments of her children reflect the consummation of the genre from the outset or subsequent authors' anxiety of influence, an instructive history of Spanish letters and tastes can be traced from the diverse reappearances of our favorite bawd.

Some of the other critical assessments of the great dialogue novel can only be noted briefly here. Dorothy S. Severin catalogues the uses of humor in "Celestina as a Comic Figure," although her ear is keen to catch dirty smirks and amusing stumbles among all the characters. Joseph V. Ricapito guides his survey of "People, Characters, and Roles: A View of Characterization in *Celestina*" by the twin stars of psychological realism and the characteristic yammering of stock dramatic (Plautine/Terentian/Humanistic) character types. "Celestina's Laboratory: A Translator's Nightmare" by Enrica J. Ardemagni ponders the danger of betraying Rojas' world in order to bring him into our own, while Nicasio Salvador Miguel in "'De una ave llamada rocho': para la historia literaria del ruj" tells us more than we thought possible about this mythical bird.

One should not quibble with an editorial task carried out so well, although reviewers are clearly commissioned to do precisely that. The essays themselves employ somewhat disparate formal conventions that might have been gently finessed in the editorial process. Some pieces include "Notes" and "Works Cited": others have only the former. The bibliographies are, inevitably, repetitive: a master list of works cited throughout the volume would have been more convenient for the reader and more instructive for the relative outsider wishing to identify major contributors to the discussion. Also vexing is the range of editions of *Celestina* employed by the contributing authors. There is no truly critical edition of Rojas masterpiece, but asking everyone to cite from, say, Marciales' or Severin's editions (or make a case why they should not) would have added uniformity. For that matter, the entire issue of editing the text of *Celestina*, given this subject's historically high profile and heated

nature, is absent from this volume⁸, as are such themes as the *converso* (sub)text(ure) of the book, the supposed tensions between Rojas and the (two?) other author(s), the power of magic, existentialism and nihilism, *Celestina's* generic relationship to the sentimental novel, the problematics of Christian tragedy and others.

If the 1984 celebrations surrounding Alfonso X's 700th anniversary are any indication, a torrent of *Celestina* studies will soon be unleashed on the world and the bibliographical pages of this journal will swell to overbrimming. Fernando de Rojas and *Celestina: Approaching the Fifth Century* will be one of the indispensable companions that *celestinistas* will want to accompany them into the next century.

George D. Greenia

College of William and Mary

Celestina,



Ende is een Tragicoëdie van Calisto
en Melibea, in die welcke Vysen haren gewiech

De la portada de la traducción flamenca
Amberes: Hans de Laet, 1550

⁸ Patricia Botta (Univ. of Rome) was expected at the Purdue Conference to speak on "La edición crítica de *Celestina*" but was prevented from attending.



PREGONERO

Los bienes, si no son comunicados,¹ no son bienes.
Celestina, aucto I

En el *ABC* del 21 de junio de 1993, habla desde Barcelona José Manuel Blecua después de recibir el Premio Menéndez y Pelayo (VIIª edición). En la entrevista le preguntan que qué diría él a los miles de alumnos extranjeros que se interesan por la literatura española, y he aquí la primera frase de su contestación: "Si saben español, les diría que lean la poesía metafísica de Guillen, y les recomendaría, sobre todo, el *Quijote*, el *Lazarillo*, la *Celestina*." Consejos muy sanos, desde luego.

En el *ABC CULTURAL*, número 100 (1993), Octavio Paz, después de aducir el desprecio a la literatura en lengua española expresado por Edmund Wilson y Vladimir Nabokov, repone: "El primero ... no quiso aprender el español porque no había nada en esa lengua que

¹ Quisiera expresar mis gracias a ciertas personas que se han molestado en comunicarme informes que han sido integrados en este PREGONERO, y son para: E. W. Naylor, F. Maurizi, A. Weber, H. L. Sharrer, B. Taylor, R. Castells, A. Forcadas, G. Orduna, J. Whetnall, D. S. Severin, D. Hook, K. V. Kish, E. Palafox, K. P. O'Donnell, R. Hathaway, y M. R. Prieto de la Yglesia.

valiera la pena leer; el segundo incluyó en el mismo gesto desdeñoso a Cervantes y a Borges. ¿Pero hay que defender al Romancero y a los místicos, al teatro y a la novela picaresca, a la *Celestina* y al *Quijote*, a Góngora y a Quevedo?" (p. 6). Esta selección de obras y autores cuya lectura en lengua original española se puede parangonar con las obras más señaladas de otros países nos parece bien pensada.

Menos literaria es la información contenida en una columna dedicada a los nuevos programas que se estrenan en TV Española—esos programas como "Su media naranja," "Vivan los novios," en donde se discuten públicamente las intimidades de parejas selectas o se preguntan cosas calientes (sin verse) para seleccionar con cuál se va a salir en una cita galardonada por los productores de estos programas. Aquí, lo que nos llama la atención es la metáfora que Ana Rosa Quintana (*ABC*, viernes, 10 de julio, 1992, pág. 94) utiliza para el título de sus comentarios, y que en estas páginas merece una breve mención: "TV: LA GRAN CELESTINA." La ecuación no está nada mal....

Pero no es todo: parece que el teléfono también se ha visto con las mismas funciones de nuestra *Celestina* de carne y hueso (a pesar de sus orígenes literarios. Francisco Unbral, en su columna, "Los placeres y los días," *El mundo* (24 de junio de 1992), pág. 7, hablando de los teléfonos y los servicios sexuales ("estos encuentros a veces puramente verbales"), llega a donde afirma sarcásticamente: "Telefónica, ya que no anda, se ha convertido, al menos, en la gran *Celestina* nacional." La tercería andante, estilo siglo veinte....

Pero la obra de Rojas (y otros) y la obra de Diego de San Pedro evidentemente se siguen leyendo en los pasillos universitarios, como se hace patente en este anuncio público (*El mundo*, 1° de julio de 1992, pág. C8):

Soy un joven universitario y escritor. Pero no soy un triste Leriano cortejando a su angelical Laureola, ni ando amartelado con todas las señoritas llamadas Melibea. No obstante, yo también moriría para realizar una amistad a falta de toda la brujería, pócimas misteriosas y otras tonterías. (firma) *Calisto II*.

Esta noticia cortesía de H. L. Sharrer: El dato publicado es de 1492, pero la inteligencia sin duda es de antes. Antonio de Nebrija, en su

Dictionarium latino-hispanicum de Salamanca y de 1492, como dijimos, en el folio 111 verso, escribe: "**Parmeno. -onis. nombre de un siervo.**" HLS reflexiona, postulando que esta entrada pudiera reflejar la familiaridad de Nebrija con el Pármeno clásico (también siervo). Bien pudiera. ¿Supongo que sería demasiado estrafalario suponer que Nebrija supiera algo (en o poco antes de 1492) del contenido de un esbozo de un primer acto de lo que iba a acabar siendo, primero, *Comedia* y, luego, *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*?

CELESTINA EN LOS CONGRESOS:

Esta que sigue es una lista incompleta de ponencias (algunas con los abstractos proporcionados a nosotros por los mismos autores):

1. **Ricardo Castells** (Miami), "Sobre Juan de Valdés y el 'presto vencer' de Melibea." Congreso del Círculo de Cultura Panamericano, verano 1992.
2. **Ricardo Castells** (Miami), "The Temporal and Spatial Unity of *Celestina*, scenes i and ii." Southeast Conference on Foreign Languages and Literatures (1992).

En la Université de Caen, Basse-Normandie, la profesora **Françoise Maurizi** dirigió un Coloquio europeo convocado exclusivamente a *Celestina*, los días 29-30 de enero, 1993. Aquí los trabajos según el programa:

3. **Henri Ayala** (Univ. de Rennes), "Se acabó el primer acto."
4. **Peter E. Russell** (Oxford), "El problema de lo inconsecuente textual en la *Celestina*."
5. **Mercedes Blanco** (Univ. de Reims), "Le paratexte de la *Célestine*."
6. **Alan Deyermond** (Londres, Quen Mary & Westfield College), "Hacia una lectura feminista de la *Celestina*."
7. **Emilio de Miguel** (Univ. de Salamanca), "La unidad de autoría en la *Celestina* desde el diseño de los personajes."
8. **Françoise Maurizi** (Univ. de Caen), "El tratado de Centurio."

9. **Helios Jaime Ramírez** (Univ. de Bretagne occidentale), "Le cōmos dans la dramaturgie de la *Célestine*."
10. **Jeanne Battesti** (Univ. de Aix-en-Provence), "La rhétorique dans la *Célestine*."
11. **Marie-Claire Zimmermann** (Univ. de Paris IV-Sorbona), "Le dire dans la *Célestine*."
12. **Angel Iglesias** (Univ. de Orléans), "Ensayo de identificación de refranes y frases proverbiales en la *Celestina*."
13. **Angel Gómez Moreno** (Univ. Complutense-Madrid), "A vueltas con *Celestina* bruja."

En una conferencia celebrada en la Univ. de Calgary (Canadá) sobre "La letteratura di Napoli" en la sección de Estudios Italianos, el 12 de marzo de 1993, se leyó la ponencia siguiente:

14. **Alberto Forcadas** (Univ. de Alberta), "Italian Connections in la *Celestina*: Caterina Sforza."

Se celebró en Londres, en la Universidad de Londres (Queen Mary & Westfield College), los días del 25-26 de junio, 1993, el V Colloquium on XVc Literature. 5 de los 17 trabajos leídos tenían que ver con *Celestina*, y (con resúmenes) eran éstos:

15. **Rafael Beltrán** (Univ. de Valencia), "El 'mal de costado': *Arcipreste de Talavera*, *Celestina* (auto IV) y la muerte de Tirant lo Blanc."
"En la comunicación trato de poner en relación los textos citados, partiendo de la hipótesis de que el 'mal' o 'dolor de costado' podría tener como denominador común en todos ellos la referencia a una situación paródica o humorística presumiblemente relacionada con la censurable o incontinente actividad sexual de los enfermos."
16. **Patrizia Botta** (Univ. de Roma), "La *Celestina* de Palacio en sus aspectos materiales."
"El reciente hallazgo de un ... fragmento manuscrito [de *Celestina*] plantea varios problemas ...: un análisis material del MS (estado de conservación, confección codicológica, estudio paleográfico, etc.) pone de relieve que éste está compuesto por

dos partes netamente diferentes, copiados por dos amanuenses distintos. (...) el descuido de la copia no quita la importancia genalógica del testimonio [que] resulta ocupar un puesto muy alto el el *stemma* y colocarse en los albores mismos de la redacci[on del texto."

17. **Jacobo Sanz Hermida** (Univ. de Salamanca), "'Una vieja barbuda que se dice Celestina': notas acerca de la primera caracterizaciónd e Celestina."

"...La presente comunicación intenta reflexionar sobre este calificativo, alrededor del cual ambulan una serie de connotaciones y referencias explícitas que, en nuestra opinión, han pasado inadvertidas a la crítica celestinesca. Reflexiones en todo caso, que redundan en la idea de Celestina como hechicera..."

18. **Dorothy S. Severin** (Univ. de Liverpool), "Celestina: Sorceress or Witch?"

"According to Christine Lerner's definitions of witchcraft and sorcery, 'compact witchcraft', or a pact with Satan, blurs the distiction between black (harming) and white (healing) witchcraft, while sorcery (incantation and the manipulation of objects) is frequently harmless, even when its use for *maleficium* is truly witchcraft. Celestina's conjuration (Act III) strays from the realm of sorcery into witchcraft (its pact with Plutón). The characters, indeed, refer to her as *hechicera* or sorceress: they would not relish the accusation of consorting with a *bruja* or witch."

19. **Joseph T. Snow** (Michigan State Univ.), "The Role of the Second Melibea in Rojas's Dramatic Art."

"I will try to show that the Melibea who leaps from the tower is a psychologically different (or second) Melibea from the one we meet in the opening scene of Act I. The realization of this dual role takes place in Act X and is accomplished before our eyes and with our complicity. The leap from the tower allows us to perceive the fully-realized female she has become alongside the other—who lives on in Pleberio's world--she has rejected. For her there is no going back, no going forward: we understand this even as Pleberio can not."

20. "La '*Lozana andaluza*' y la literatura celestinesca." **Bruno Damiani** (Catholic Univ.), en los cursos de filología hispánica de la Univ. de Valladolid, semana del 5 al 9 de julio, 1993.
21. "Humanismo y Renacimiento en España." **Angel Gómez Moreno** (Complutense de Madrid), en los cursos de filología hispánica de la Univ. de Valladolid, semana del 9 al 13 de agosto, 1993.
22. **Ricardo Castells** (Miami), "*El cortesano* de Castiglione y la representación del amor sensual en *Celestina*." American Assoc. of Teachers of Spanish & Portuguese, Phoenix (USA), 12-14 de agosto de 1993).

Las IV Jornadas de Literatura Española Medieval, celebradas en Buenos Aires en la Universidad Católica, los días 19 y 20 de agosto de 1993, incluyeron dos intervenciones celestinescas:

23. **Eric W. Naylor** (Univ. del Sur, Tennessee, USA), "La onomástica en *Celestina*."
"Mientras los nombres de la mayoría de los criados se derivan directamente de la comedia latina, los de las criadas y de Alisa son originales, reflejando el hecho de que sus tipos son ajenos al teatro latino. Los nombres de Pleberio, Calisto, Melibea y Celestina son claramente significativos y comentan directa o irónicamente la personalidad del personaje."
24. **Alfonso Vermeyleen** (Univ. Católica de Lovaina), "*La Celestina*, objeto de una emocionada sospecha de judaísmo."
"Las palabras de Sempronio, 'Mira a Bernardo,' contrariamente a lo que pretende A. M. Forcadas, no implican ... rencor judaico en contra de la veneración cristiana de la Virgen María. A pesar de otra identificación (E. M. Gerli) de este Bernardo, Forcadas obstina a mantener su sospecha y embiste contra Gerli. Muestra su falta de conocimiento de la religión cristiana, y argumenta a partir de ... interpretaciones ... inválidas de algunos lugares de la obra, como veremos."

En la Univ. de Illinois, los días 24-25 de septiembre, 1993, se celebraron las reuniones del Ninth Annual Medieval Association of the Midwest, con tres aportaciones celestinescas:

25. **Linde Brocato** (Univ. de Illinois), "Cutting Commentary: Fernando de Rojas and the Subversive Gloss."

26. **Catherine Brown** (Univ. de Michigan), "Dismembering la *Celestina*: Literary Operations and the Body of the Text."

27. **Eloisa Palafox** (Washington Univ.), "La poética de la 'noble conversación': retórica, oralidad y erotismo en la *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* de Fernando de Rojas."

"The recreation of the theatrical qualities of the spoken word in the text of the *Tragicomedia* allows the author to introduce the theme of eroticism into his text and employ it throughout as an element which transgresses the learned discourse of the elite... the emblem of this degraded oral word is Celestina who uses her linguistic and histrionic talents to satisfy private and egotistical interests, the same desires which motivated the actions of the learned elite who shared Rojas' world. Celestina's intimate relationship with the forces of evil provides clear examples of the immorality of her abuses of power, an immorality which contaminates those she manipulates. The discursive mark of this contagious immorality is eroticism, a force that eventually consumes its own initiator. Ironically, this same force is transformed into a liberating force which blossoms above all social restrictions."

* * * *

28. **Isidro J. Rivera** (Univ. de Kansas), "The Stimulation of the Visual in the Early Printed Editions of *Celestina*." Mid-America Conference on Hispanic Literatures, San Luis, Misuri, 14-16 de octubre de 1993.

29. **Robert L. Hathaway** (Colgate Univ.), "Fernando de Rojas' *Celestina*: The Pessimistic Life Stages of Women on the Margin." CEMERS (Binghamton NY), «On the Margins» 15-16 octubre de 1993.

30. **Isidro J. Rivera** (Univ. de Kansas), "Reading the *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* (Burgos 1499?)." South Atlantic Modern Language Association, Atlanta, GA, 4-6 de noviembre de 1993.

[Sobre los grabados de la edición.]

31. **Alison Weber** (Virginia), "*Celestina* as a History of Private Life." en el Mid-Atlantic Medieval & Renaissance Seminar (College of William & Mary), November 13, 1993.

"The purpose here is two-fold: to examine the mimesis of class conflict in *Celestina* and to evaluate the ideological implications of such mimesis. I argue that Rojas' treatment of domestic servants is historically relevant; indeed, its verisimilitude is confirmed by recent archival research. Yet it is not as specific chronologically as Maravall had proposed. Rather, the ambiguity of a relationship which is at once paternalistic and contractual is a recurrent feature of domestic servitude in widely different historical periods. Focussing on the servants' erotic resentment in *Celestina*, I conclude that the extensive mimesis of the subordinate group's subjectivity is not equivalent to ideological endorsement of that group. On the contrary, both in its conscious design and the unconscious anxieties it evokes, *Celestina* calls for the repression of the servants' desires for economic and erotic autonomy. Nonetheless, a utopian vision of a non-hierarchical society is fleetingly traced. Paradoxically, Rojas' conviction that sexuality entailed a deeply shameful exercise of power allowed him to imagine a subordinate group's 'right' to privacy and freely chosen intimacy."

32. **Linde Brocato** (Univ. de Illinois), "'Gran filósofo era': La *Celestina* and the Translation of Platonism." «Translation and Cultural Transference» The Virginia Medieval Symposium, Fredericksburg VA, 18029 de noviembre de 1993.

CELESTINA EN LAS TABLAS:

LONDRES. ¿Una producción, con música de ritmos latinos, de *Celestina*?

Pues, sí, señor (para una reseña, ver *Celestinesca* 17.1, págs. 135-138). **Lou Stein**, el director, lo presenta como un encuentro entre su lectura de la obra de Rojas y una beca para subvencionar experimentos en el teatro. Luego, con un equipo de profesionales, y su amor al ritmo de la salsa, llegó al escenario en el Palace Theatre de Watford (en los arrabales del gran Londres) esta "Salsa *Celestina*." Con Orquesta 'La Clave,' y dividida en dos mitades, y adecuada la acción a un club nocturno cubano moderno, el truco es que la

anfitriona es descendiente de la Celestina de Rojas y una vez al año hay una conmemoración de este parentesco. Reparto: **Dollie Henry** en Celestina; **Jason Riddington** en Calisto; **Marie Theodore** en Melibea; **Omar Okai** en Sempronio; **Paul Medford** en Pármeno; **Debra Michaels** en Elicia; **Linda Mae Brewer** en Areúsa; y con **Flip Webster** en Lucrecia. La coreografía (¡qué de bailes espectaculares!) de **Nelson Batista González** y el decorado de **Rae Smith** eran impresionantes. La temporada era del 11 de junio hasta el 3 de julio de 1993.

INGLATERRA: Es ésta una *CELESTINA* adaptada por **Max Hafler** y **Nick Philippou** y dirigida por este último: utilizan la versión en inglés de **James Mabbe**. La compañía es **Actors Touring Company** (de Londres), en una gira para marcar su XV° aniversario. Sólo se usan seis actores: en Celestina aparece **Ann Firbank**; el papel de Calisto lo hace **Sebastian Harcombe** (cuando no hace de **Pleberio**) y Melibea es **Lucy Whybrow** (quien también hace de **Areúsa**). En Sempronio (y Sosia) aparece **Ross Dunsmore** y en Pármeno **Ben Albu** (que dobla de **Tristán** y **Centurio**), con **Mia Soteriu** haciendo tanto de Elicia como de Lucrecia. El decorado es de **Moggie Douglas**. Música original de **Mia Soteriou**. Esta producción se estrenó en octubre en Edimburgo, y se vio también en la festival de Belfast. La semana del 25 al 30 de octubre de 1993 estuvo en el **Salisbury Playhouse** de Chichester. Pasó al teatro **LYRIC HAMMERSMITH** en Londres para verse en una breve temporada, desde el 30 de noviembre hasta el 11 de diciembre.

Sinópsis y comentario del gerente de la compañía: "One day while hawking, the young lord Calisto spies a beautiful girl and falls deeply in love. It should be the perfect match. But her parents have locked her away in a high-walled garden. So Calisto engages Celestina, a worldly-wise witch with peculiar charms, to woo his love. And that is where the fairytales end"

La radio BBC de Escocia comenta: "The production relies on the skill of the actors, the teller of the tale, which they pull off magnificently ... **Ann Firbank** as Celestina is wonderful ... the music uplifts the action ... the language sounds fresh and believable."

ARGENTINA. Buenos Aires. Con estreno la noche del 23 de septiembre de 1993 en la sala Casacubierta del Teatro San Martín de Buenos Aires, *Celestina--Graciela Araujo--* subió de nuevo a las tablas,

en una producción dirigida por **Oswaldo Bonet**. Araujo había aparecido en la obra una vez antes--hace 26 años--como *Melibea*, en la puesta de escena de **María Rollo**, con **Iris Marga** en *Celestina*. En esta, colaboran **Laura Novoa** (*Melibea*) y **Santiago Ceresetto**, **Fabio Mancini**, **Juan Palomino**, **Leandro Regúnaga**, **Pablo Ribot**, **Mónica Santibáñez**, **Márgara Alonso**, **Dora Prince**, **Adriana Filmus** y **Pablo Finamone**. La adaptación es de **Jorge Goldenberg**, y tiene música original de **Jorge Valcárcel**. [Información de la sección de "Espectáculos" de *La Nación* (jueves 23 de sept., 1993, pág. 1), un reportaje por **Pablo Zunino**, con foto de **Graciela Araujo**. Agradecemos al colega **Germán Orduna**, el envío de la misma.]

NORTH CAROLINA. Greensboro (Univ. de North Carolina). Como para redondear una exploración académica sobre *Celestina*, la clase de la profesora **Kathleen V. Kish** presentó (ante un pequeño público y con vestuario apropiado) unas escenas de la adaptación de **Manuel Criado de Val**, *Melibea* (una obra estrenada en Hita en junio de 1962). Esto ocurrió el 15 de diciembre de 1993, con la misma profesora **Kish** en *Lucrecia*.

CELESTINA EN LA ACADEMIA:

He aquí abstractos de tres tesis doctorales recientes:

- 1) **Luis Pérez**. "A Computational and Linguistic Analysis of *La Celestina* (The Catholic Univ. of America, Washington DC, 1993). Director: **J. Solá-Solé**.

"The purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to a better understanding of the field of Statistical Linguistics by means of a practical application of its devices to *La Celestina*. Concretely, this study revolves around two specific issues: the question of the work's authorship and the question of social stratification of character discourse.

A model was developed dividing the text into six parts with two levels of language, which was then subjected to a system of forty-one linguistic variables. These were chosen in function of a discriminatory criterion. This model was subjected to a statistical analysis of search of quantificational results susceptible to an interpretation characterized by maximum objectivity. The basic assumption is that a writer's style is consistent in certain aspects

which can be detected by the computer, especially the unconscious stylistic decisions.

[Two analyses--univariate and multivariate-- were carried out: the procedures allow for interpretation of the accumulated data.] The results of both analyses coincide in that there is significant difference (at 1% significance level) between the means. That is, the text of *Celestina* is not homogeneous, it does not constitute a unit. The results indicate a significant difference between the "First Act" and the "Continuation." The "Additions," although indicating more moderate differences, remain midway between the "First Act" and the "Continuation." Notwithstanding, no difference was detected between the "Continuation" and the "Tratado de Centurio." For its part, the "Auto de Traso" demonstrated an anomalous pattern at variance from the rest of the work.

Insofar as the levels of social stratification of character discourse is concerned, the univariate analysis failed to produce and difference between elevated and popular discourse. Notwithstanding, the multivariate analysis did find differences. The "Discriminant Analysis" made it possible to select the most discriminating variables, forming a statistical model with a significance at the 1 per thousand level.

If it is assumed, as is generally agreed, that Rojas wrote the "Continuation," the results indicate that it is also very probable that he also wrote the "Additions" and, above all, the "Tratado de Centurio" (as maintained by Criado de Val). In the "Additions," however, there may be influences from other authors (as asserted by Lida de Malkiel). This study supports the view that the "First Act," notwithstanding, is of a different style, confirming the opinion of the majority of critics employing quasi-objective methods of statistical analysis as well as the testimony of Rojas himself. One may not discard the possibility, as some critics hold, that the differences may be as a function of Rojas's own later stylistic maturation as a writer. Our study limits itself to determining the more objective question concerning whether differences of style indeed exist in the work rather than with the more speculative question concerning the possible causes of the differences."

* * * *

- 2) **Eloísa Palafox Morales.** "Oralidad, autoridad y retórica en la *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* de Fernando de Rojas" (Michigan State University, 1993). Director: J. T. Snow.

"El objetivo de esta disertación es explicar cómo Fernando de Rojas utiliza su concepción idealizada del saber oral para implementar una crítica alegórica al poder letrado que, debido a la reciente invención de la imprenta, acababa de adquirir una nueva capacidad de expansión.

En la *Tragicomedia*, las ideas en torno a los postulados que rigen la existencia del saber se enfrentan estratégicamente a una visión corrosiva y pesimista de lo que es el universo de la letra escrita.

Dicho enfrentamiento da como resultado una recreación de la creencia, de origen oral, en el 'potencial mágico' del lenguaje. Esta recreación, que es la base del proceso de recepción y escritura que dio lugar a las distintas etapas de formación del texto (cap. 2), sirve para entender el porqué de la tendencia a la literalización de los contenidos verbales, que afecta a quienes los usan abusiva e irresponsablemente (cap. 1).

Valiéndose del personaje de Celestina, relacionado críticamente con la escritura, el autor invierte las imágenes de continuidad y coherencia que aluden a la función social del saber oral (cap. 3). Asimismo, identifica negativamente la idea de la teatralidad, que es inherente al proceso de transmisión oral del saber, con el ejercicio corrupto del poder (cap. 4).

Pero la lengua teatralizada y retórica condenada por Fernando de Rojas es también la materia de que está hecho su discurso transgresor: de ahí la aparición, en el marco de las escenas eróticas del texto, de las imágenes de cohesión y armonía asociadas con la existencia del saber oral (cap. 5)

Por último, si letra escrita es el arma de que se sirve la élite letrada, para imponerse autoritariamente al resto del mundo, la destrucción del universo de la obra puede ser explicada como una recreación de los efectos desintegradores que provoca, en las comunidades orales, la difusión de la escritura (cap. 6).

Irónicamente, las consideraciones negativas con respecto al saber letrado repercuten además en la concepción del quehacer del propio escritor, puesto que él mismo era parte de esa élite letrada a la que critica a lo largo de su obra."

* * * *

- 3) Kathleen Palatucci O'Donnell, "*Sentencias y Refranes in La Celestina: A Compilation, Analysis, and Examination of Their Function*" (Univ. de California, Los Angeles, 1993). Director: Joaquín Gimeno.

"Many readers recognize the existence of a substantial quantity of proverbial expressions in LC, but so far, a comprehensive listing of all the sayings, along with important information such as which character uttered the saying, who was listening, whether it is first found in the initial *comedia*, or in the later, expanded *Tragicomedia* has not been available. Without such information, it is difficult to conduct a thorough exploration of how the sayings function in the work.

This study lists a total of 543 *sentencias* and *refranes*, along with the information described above. In addition, the sayings are organized by the character that said them, and a cross-reference to other lists is provided.

An examination of the definitions of the words *sententia* and *refran*, and related vocabulary, is attempted, as Rojas implies that they belong to different categories, and in order to be certain that only *sentencias* and *refranes* are included.

Whereas a list of all the *sentencias* and *refranes* in LC may provide much information, we analyze them so as to be able to understand how they are distributed in the work, by act, speaker, theme, and so on. As we examine the role of paremiological speech, it becomes evident that the sayings have a functional, rather than a merely decorative or didactic role in the events of the dramatic story. In fact, this material is used in many ways—to illuminate character, to help in plot construction, to create irony, and to provide a background of sober, didactic wisdom with which to contrast the folly of the characters.

Finally, we consider the tradition of *iauctoritas*, and its role in a work dominated by a figure like *Celestina*. Whereas one might doubt Rojas' purpose in including and extolling didactic material such as *sentencias* when the characters who refer to their wisdom are condemned to death and damnation, we find that the true problem is a rejection of the God-centered moral order, resulting in a chaotic, non-transcendental world in which wise sayings are not reliable. For his readers who do not live in this perverse moral structure, however, the guidance of the *sentencias* is invaluable, and they should be remembered."

RESEÑAS DE ESTUDIOS CELESTINESCOS

1. El libro, *Fernando de Rojas y 'La Celestina'* (Barcelona: Teide, 1991), de **Antonio Sánchez** y M^a Remedios Prieto, se reseña en un artículo llamado, "Los tres autores de 'La Celestina'," en *El observador* (Barcelona) (14 de mayo de 1992), secc. Filología, página IV, por Joan Estruch Tobella. Hay otra reseña del mismo libro en *El Norte de Castilla* (Valladolid) (15 de febrero de 1992), secc. Letras, página II, por J. M. Balcells.
2. De D. S. Severin, ed. Fernando de Rojas. *Celestina* (Tr. James Mabbe). Hispanic Classics, Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1987. Por Ivy Corfis en *Romance Philology* 46 (1992-1993): 221-223.
3. La ed. de *Celestina* en Clásicos Castalia (1991) preparada por Peter E. Russell, reseñada por **F. Lázaro Carreter**, en *ABC Internacional* (15/21 de enero de 1992): 21.
4. Se reseña brevemente la edición de *The Text and Concordance of the 'Comedia o Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea'*. Zaragoza 1507 (en microficha) por **D. S. Severin** en *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 16.3 (1991-1992): 332.
5. Reseña extensa es la que aporta **Marta Ana Diz** a *Speculum* 68 (1993), 776-779, a **Charles F. Fraker** y '*Celestina*': *Genre and Rhetoric* (Londres 1990).
6. Otra reseña extensa, en este caso de **Louise Fothergill-Payne**, *Séneca y 'Celestina'*, aparece en *Romance Philology* 47 (1993-1994), págs. 264-269, firmada por **John S. Geary**.

ESTUDIOS EN PRENSA

Estamos esperando en *PMLA* el estudio de **Olga Lucía Valbuena**, "*Proceso and Pleasure: The Inquisition of Linguistic Sorcery and Celestina*."

En *Letters and Society in Fifteenth-Century Spain. Studies Presented to P. E. Russell on his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. A. Deyermond, and J. Lawrance (Dolphin Books, 1993), los siguientes estudios: 1) **Jeremy Lawrance**, "On the Title *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*," y

Donald McGrady, "Calisto's Lost Falcon and Its Implications for Dating Act I of the *Comedia*."

En *Studies in Medieval Hispanic Literature in Honor of Charles F. Fraker*, ed. M. Vaquero, L. López Grijera, y A. Deyermond (Madison: HSMS, en prensa), estos artículos: Ivy Corfis (Penn State Univ.), "Judges and Laws of Justice in the *Celestina*"; Alan Deyermond (Queen Mary & Westfield College, Londres), "Keith Whinnom's *Celestina* Book"; Joseph Snow (Michigan State Univ.), "Fernando de Rojas as First Reader: Reader Response Theory and *Celestina*"; Carlos Vega (Wellesley College), "Hagiography and the *Celestina*."

En *Romance Notes*, otro de Ricardo Castells, "On the *cuerpo glorificado* and the *visión divina*." [Ha aparecido ya, en el no. 34 (Fall 1993): 97-100.]

En *Hispanófila*, en prensa está Guillermo Schmidhuber, "Elementos biográficos en una comedia desconocida de Sor Juana: *La segunda Celestina*."



Valencia 1514. Grabado del 19^o aucto (2).

CELESTINESCA

is available in the USA to individuals at \$3 per annum, and to libraries and institutions at \$10 per annum.

Outside of the USA, rates are the equivalents of \$7 per annum for individuals and \$15 for libraries and institutions.

Back issues are currently available for all volumes, 1-17.

Editor, CELESTINESCA
Dept. of Rom. & Classical Langs.
Michigan State University
E. Lansing MI 48824-1112
USA

EDITORIAL POLICIES

CELESTINESCA accepts articles and notes, bibliographic studies, and book reviews for publication. It is a journal with an international readership and its principal goal is to keep subscribers and other readers abreast of the scholarship and general-interest matters which continue to define the phenomenon of "la celestinesca."

Submissions for articles longer than 35 pages (text + notes) are not encouraged. In special instances, prior consultation with the Editor may determine a special need for an extended study. Notes and brief studies should treat well-defined points concerning either the text or the interpretation of *Celestina*, its imitations, continuations, translations, theatrical adaptations, et cetera. We welcome items dealing with literary, linguistic, stylistic, and other concerns. Specialized bibliographic items will be considered for publication, if suitable to the aims of *Celestinesca*.

Original submissions (two copies) should be hard copy, double spaced, with notes at the bottom of the page. All submissions will have at least two readers. If the review process leads to acceptance of the work, then a diskette with the final draft (including any changes, revisions, additions, deletions, etc) will be requested. *Celestinesca* can accept documents in either 3 1/2" or 5 1/4" diskettes, written in WORDPERFECT 5.1 for DOS or lower, and with the font set to "Courier 10" . A new hard copy must accompany the diskette. Please make sure that complete address and a telephone number are part of the work submitted.

Book Review Policy. *Celestinesca* does review studies relevant to the stated aims of the journal. The Editor will assign for review books, adaptations, translations, and other noteworthy materials. Should a reader wish to review a specific item, prior approval must be obtained from the Editor.

Unsolicited materials will not be returned unless accompanied by return postage.

All queries, manuscripts, and other submissions should be sent to: Editor, *Celestinesca*, Dept. of Romance & Classical Languages, Michigan State University, East Lansing MI 48824-1112 (USA).

CELESTINESCA

ISSN 0147-3085

VOL 17, NO 2

CONTENIDO

Noviembre de 1993

STUDIES FOR PETER E. RUSSELL ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

PRESENTATION, Julian Weiss 1-7

ARTICULOS

Dorothy Sherman Severin, *Celestina* and the Magical Empowerment of Women 9-28

Louise Fothergill-Payne, *Celestina* "As a Funny Book": A Bakhtinian Reading 29-51

David Hook, Transilluminating Tristan 53-84

Jeremy N.H. Lawrance, *The Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* and its 'Moralitie' 85-110

James F.Burke, *The Mal de la Madre* and the Failure of Maternal Influence in *Celestina* 111-128

Keith Whinnom, *The Form of Celestina: Dramatic Antecedents* 129-146

RESEÑAS

Estelle Irizarry, "Tres autores en '*La Celestina*': Aplicación de la informática a los estudios literarios", Granada: Colección Romania 147-150

George D. Greenia, "Fernando de Rojas and *Celestina*: Approaching the Fifth Century", Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies 151-158

PREGONERO 159-173

ILUSTRACIONES 8, 26, 28, 52, 78, 104, 126, 158, 173