https://doi.org/10.7203/Celestinesca.3.19493

RHETORICAL TECHNIQUE IN THE PERSUASION OF MELIBEA

Erica Morgan
Worcester, England

In his prologue to the second version of *La Celestina* Fernando de Rojas indicates that it is through rhetoric that he hopes to achieve his objectives in the creation of the work[1]:

> y como sea cierto que toda palabra del hombre sciente
> esta preñada, de ésta se puede decir que de muy hinchada
> y llena quiere reventar, echando de sí tan crecidos
> ramos y hojas, que del menor pimpollo se sacaría harto
> fruto entre personas discretas.[2]

This recognition of the power of rhetoric leads to its extensive use within the fiction itself.[3] We see Rojas' characters persuading themselves and one another, almost always with great success, by eloquent manipulation of the devices of rhetoric.[4]

Without a doubt, the character who indulges most in the use of rhetoric is the old procuress, Celestina. Her speeches reveal Rojas' thorough grounding in the art of persuasion and also serve to question the adherence of classical rhetoricians to Cato's definition of rhetoric ("vir bonus dicendi peritus") and the conviction that goodness is a prerequisite of the true orator, as Quintilian maintains in his *Institutio Oratoria*: "Neque enim esse oratorem nisi bonum virum indico; et fiere etiamsi potest nolo."[5]

One of the objectives of Rojas' abundant use of rhetoric in *LC*, then, may have been to challenge this classical idea of the exclusive use of rhetoric for honourable purposes and for illustration of the truth. The success which Rojas affords his characters in the employment of rhetoric to deceive and entice others into dishonourable actions derides this idea that rhetoric can only serve the truth. He thus offers a counter-definition of Quintilian's description of the true rhetor in the figure of Celestina. Celestina has a very high rate of success in her rhetorical manoeuvering and yet she could hardly be placed within the category of 'vir bonus'. Her intentions are far from virtuous and we shall see how she makes use of irrelevant truths when relevant truths do not serve her

purpose. Rojas is laughing at Quintilian's definition of the classical orator, as will Juan Luis Vives a few years later.[6]

One might question the wisdom of the use of a character like Celestina as the vehicle of such studied rhetorical technique. It is clear that Celestina herself has no academic background other than her incidental contact with priests and friars. Her rhetorical skills have been acquired by experience and cunning and bear witness to the fact that quick wits are just as important as technique. In fact Rojas seems to explore the role of rhetoric as an intrinsic and inevitable part of everyday life rather than as being confined to the cloisters of academic life.

It is perhaps in Celestina's persuasion of Melibea that we see the most prolonged use of rhetorical techniques. Celestina's motive for this persuasion is personal gain. Rojas makes us aware of her underhand intentions at the beginning of the work when she first learns of the possibility of a handsome reward from Calisto if she manages to obtain Melibea for him. Sempronio informs Celestina:

> Así es. Calisto arde en amores de Melibea. De ti y de mí tiene necesidad. Pues juntos nos ha menester, juntos nos aprovechemos; que conocer el tiempo y usar el hombre de la oportunidad hace los hombres prósperos. (I, 58)

This is precisely what Celestina proceeds to do. Her uncanny sense of timing and the advantage she takes of opportunity, together with her innate rhetorical skills, allow her to win over Melibea. Rojas intends the reader to see these skills as intuitive rather than the result of academic preparation. Quintilian had already recognized the influence of innate ability when he pointed out in his *Institutio Oratoria* that technical rules are useless without natural gifts:

> Illud tamen in primis testandum est, nihil praecepta atque artes valere nisi andiuvante natura.[7]

Through Celestina, Rojas shows the importance of quick wits since the rhetor must always be capable of dealing with unexpected developments or interruptions from his audience or the person to whom he addresses himself.

Traditionally the art of rhetoric is composed of five basic parts: *inventio* (invention), *dispositio* (arrangement), *elocutio* (style), memory and *pronunciatio* (delivery). Of these faculties it is the second which interests us here for, in spite of the lack of formal training on Celestina's part, we see that, in the persuasion of Melibea, Rojas endows her speech with the traditional structure of a rhetorical speech as set out in the *dispositio*, or faculty of arrangement.[8] Rhetorical textbooks suggest that the first part of the speech, the *exordium*, or *proemium*, be devoted to gaining the goodwill of the audience. One should attempt to evoke the favour and attention of the audience in readiness for the persuasion which they are about to undergo. Celestina's *exordium* rests heavily on the use of pathos. This technique was defined by Aristotle who considered means

of persuasion to be divisible into two groups: that of artistic technique (ethos and pathos) and logical argument, and that of direct evidence.[9] Pathos refers to the technique of evoking certain emotions in the audience. Celestina uses pathos in trying to gain Melibea's sympathy for her as an old woman:

> Que, a la mi fe, la vejez no es sino mesón de enfermedades, posada de pensamientos, amiga de rencillas, congoja continua, llaga incurable, mancilla de lo pasado, pena de lo presente, cuidado triste de lo porvenir, vecina de la muerte, choza sin rama que se llueve por cada parte, cayado de mimbre que con poca carga se doblega. (IV, 90)

Melibea shows surprise at this misery and points out that most people look forward to old age:

> ¿Por qué dices, madre, tanto mal de lo que todo el mundo con tan eficacia gozar y ver desea? (IV, 90)

Bewailing the discomforts of old age, Celestina carefully ignores the fact that she might have been happier if she had had a different lifestyle in her youth. This type of false enthymeme, or incomplete syllogism, is to be seen often in the course of her arguments.[10]

As yet, Celestina has made no mention of the course of action which she is subsequently to persuade Melibea to follow. However, she is preparing the way. By complaining about old age and making it sound so unattractive, she insinuates that one should enjoy life while still young. This point will be helpful later when Celestina wishes the two lovers to come together. The reader is in a position to doubt this insinuation since he knows that it is partly because Celestina enjoyed life rather too much while she was young that she finds herself in such a sorry state now. We later see that Melibea does not consider this point, either through oversight or, and perhaps more likely, because she prefers to ignore any point which suggests that she should not follow her own desired course of action.

Celestina's *exordium* also contains extensive use of *ethos*, the affirmation and proof of the moral character of the speaker. She attempts to gain Melibea's confidence by professing interest only in heavenly riches, and demonstrates complete disregard for wealth:

> Aquel es rico que está bien con Dios. Más segura cosa es ser menospreciado que temido. Mejor sueño duerme el pobre, que no el que tiene de guardar con solicitud lo que con trabajo ganó y con dolor ha de dejar. Mi amigo no será simulado y el rico sí. Yo soy querida por mi persona; el rico por su hacienda. (IV, 91)

The reader can perceive the hypocrisy in this, but Melibea is not in a position to judge.

Frequent invocation of God also help Celestina to project herself as a thoroughly moral person in the eyes of Melibea: e.g. 'Hasta que Dios quiera'. A mutually beneficial fiction, resting on religious commonplaces, is being created.

Speaking of how she has aged, Celestina uses the typical apologia to ingratiate herself with Melibea: 'Que así goce de esta alma pecadora y tú de ese cuerpo gracioso'. (IV, 94) This part of the speech is similar to the *conclusio*, or peroration; both are designed to move the mind and sway the emotions rather than being directed at the understanding. These techniques are continued throughout the other parts of the speech but are most concentrated in these two parts. By employing these techniques, Celestina succeeds in evoking Melibea's sympathy and is rewarded with the gift of a few coins.

Rojas' provision of Celestina with an excellent sense of timing allows her to realise that the moment is opportune to move on to the next stage of the *exordium* which comprises flattery: 'iOh angélica imagen! iOh perla preciosa, y cómo te lo dices!' (IV, 93) She begins with an *exclamatio*, one of the innumerable figures of speech recommended for the ornamentation and embellishment of an argument. She also continues her use of *ethos* to make herself appear virtuous:

> Esto tuve siempre, querer más trabajar sirviendo a otros, que holgar contentando a mí. (IV, 93)

By her apparent selflessness she encourages Melibea to act likewise: "Ha venido esto, señora, por lo que decía de las ajenas necesidades y no mías" (IV, 94). Melibea is only too happy to offer her help, but Celestina continues the flattery until she is sure of her ground and Melibea yet again begs her to ask what she will: "Pide lo que querrás, sea para quien fuere" (IV, 94), and only then does Celestina feel ready to venture into the second part of her speech, the *narratio*. This section, being a statement of the facts, ought to be clear, concise and well-founded. It ought also follow the temporal order of events and be suitably adorned.[11] Celestina's *narratio* is an oratorical narration, as opposed to an historical or poetic one. Only part of the truth is used, those parts which go against the orator's case being omitted.

Celestina introduces her petition: "Yo dejo un enfermo a la muerte" (IV, 94). This is only a partial truth. Calisto is sick, or so he wants us to believe,[12] but his sickness is love. Celestina makes no mention to Melibea of the nature of his illness since this could jeopardise her plan. She proceeds with the utmost care, testing the ground with ambiguities, and always leaving herself an escape route. It is here that we see a repetition of the use of a double deceit, as in the case of Celestina's tricking Lucrecia to gain entry to Melibea's house. She tells Melibea that one word will heal her patient and encourages her with flattery:

> Que no puedo creer que en balde pintase Dios unos gestos más perfectos que otros, más dotados de gracias, más hermosas facciones; sino para hacerlos

> almacén de virtudes, de misericordia, de compasión, ministros de sus mercedes y dádivas, como a ti. (IV, 94)

The abundance of references to God is an attempt to appeal to Melibea's apparent piety, and seems to succeed. Celestina employs also a series of false analogies. She presents a series of universal truths, having already referred to the particular truth of Calisto's illness. With a rhetorical question she suggests a common course of action for the two:

> El pelícano rompe el pecho por dar a sus hijos a comer de sus entrañas. Las cigüeñas mantienen otro tanto tiempo a sus padres viejos en el nido, cuanto ellos les dieron cebo siendo pollitos. Pues tal conocimiento dio la natura a los animales y aves, ¿por qué los hombres habemos de ser más crueles? ¿Por qué no daremos parte de nuestras gracias y personas a los próximos, mayormente, cuando están envueltos en secretas enfermedades y tales que, donde está la melecina, salió la causa de la enfermedad? (IV, 95)

This superb passage is riddled with ambiguity. The suggestion that one should give one's "gracias" and "personas" to others is an overt reference to the sexual relationship which Celestina wishes Melibea to indulge in with Calisto, and the "secretas enfermedades" to the nature of Calisto's illness, love-sickness (his "secreto dolor" of the first scene) which has its cause in Melibea. However, none of these things is said openly. Celestina is cleverly laying a false trail. Here rhetoric is serving a dual purpose --one side of the coin is false and the other is true. If, when Celestina finally mentions Calisto's name, Melibea refuses to have anything to do with the plan, she can interpret the "secretas enfermedades" as toothache and make her entire enterprise seem innocent and harmless. When Calisto's name is in fact mentioned, Melibea flies into a rage. But, Celestina knows from experience that it is useless to try to tackle Melibea in her anger. As Aristotle says: "Men grow mild when they have exhausted their anger upon another."[13] So Celestina allows Melibea to vent her rage and, as Shipley points out, it does not lead to Melibea's banishing Celestina from her presence, but rather to a demand for an explanation of such audacity.[14] This, then, suggests a desire on Melibea's part to find another, more decorous, even fictious, level of communication. Later, when she is again calm, Celestina puts Melibea's outburst of rage to good use.

Melibea knows, after the garden scene of Act I, that Calisto is trying to woo her, and in her rage she assumes that he is trying to seduce her, thus giving Celestina the chance to embarrass her by revealing the trumped-up "real reason" for her visit. Truth and falsity are reversed:

> 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 Jerusalén. Aquel caballero, que dije, pena y muere de ellas. Esta fue mi venida. (IV, 97)

Celestina pleads ignorance of any previous encounter between Calisto and Melibea. But she has achieved one important aim. She has elicited from Melibea the admission that she failed to denounce Calisto's advances in the garden to her parents. Celestina can deduce from this that Melibea is not so opposed to Calisto's advances as her rage suggested.

The next part of a rhetorical speech, the proposition, may be included or omitted according to its convenience for an argument at hand. This forms the statement of the actual concern of a speech. The actual concern of Celestina's speech is, of course, to arrange the liaison between Calisto and Melibea. Therefore the proposition, in this case, is not only unnecessary but, if included, would almost certainly prove detrimental to her cause at this stage. Thus the proposition does not appear in this speech.

There follows the *confirmatio*, the defense of the argument, and the *refutatio*, the dismissal of any opposing argument which might arise. These two parts are integrated in Celestina's speech.

She speaks of "mi limpio motivo" and proceeds to labour the virtue of compassion. The flattery which we have observed in the preceding parts of Celestina's speech continues undiminished:

> Compasión de su dolor, confianza de tu magnificencia ahogaron en mi boca al principio la expresión de la causa. (IV, 97)

To make Melibea ashamed of her anger, and to encourage feelings of compassion which will lead her to surrender the girdle, Celestina uses biblical quotation and animal imagery:

> No semejes la telaraña que no muestra su fuerza sino contra los flacos animales. No paguen justos por pecadores. Imita la divina justicia, que dijo: el ánima que pecare, aquella misma muera; a la humana, que jamás condena al padre por el delito del hijo ni al hijo por el del padre. (IV, 98)

Before continuing, Celestina wishes to ensure that any anger on Melibea's part will not fall on her since she is merely (in the fiction) an intermediary helping a sick man. She finally convinces Melibea that she had only good intentions: 'Tanto afirmas tu ignorancia, que me haces creer lo que puede ser'. (IV, 98) And Melibea tries to explain her now embarrassing burst of rage:

> No tengas en mucho ni te maravilles de mi pasado sentimiento, porque concurrieron dos cosas en tu habla, que cualquiera de ellas era bastante para

> me sacar de seso: nombrarme ese tu caballero, que conmigo se atrevió a hablar, y también pedirme palabras sin más causa, que no se podía sospechar sino daño para mi honra. Pero pues todo viene de buena parte, de lo pasado haya perdón. (IV, 98-99)

This same escape route which Celestina uses becomes an excuse for Melibea who is beginning to allow her passions to overcome her initial indignation.[15] She justifies sending her girdle to Calisto by its being an act of charity to a man suffering from toothache:

> Que en alguna manera es aliviado mi corazón, viendo que es obra pía y santa sanar los apasionados y enfermos. (IV, 99)

Celestina realizes at this point that her case is nearly won, since it seems likely that Melibea will submit to Calisto after little further coaxing. She moves on to the *conclusio* to neatly tie up all the stray ends of her previous work, beginning with an *indignatio*:

> ¡Y tal enfermo, señora! Por Dios, si bien le conocieses, no le juzgases por el que has dicho y mostrado con tu ira. (IV, 99)

She leads into praise of Calisto using extrinsic topics of the nature of man as described by Cicero in his *Topica*. Conviction can be won, Cicero says, by exemplifying virtue in two ways: by comparison of the subject to the gods who are by nature virtuous, and to men famous for their virtue achieved by hard work. Celestina uses both:

> En Dios y en mi alma, no tiene hiel; gracias, dos mil; en franqueza, Alejandre;en esfuerzo, Héctor; gesto, de un rey; gracioso, alegre; jamás reina en él tristeza. De noble sangre, como sabes; gran justador, pues verle armado, un San Jorge. Fuerza y esfuerzo, no tuvo Hércules tanta. La presencia y facciones, disposición, desenvoltura, otra lengua había menester para las contar. Todo junto semeja ángel del cielo. Por fe tengo que no era tan hermoso aquel gentil Narciso, que se enamoró de su propia figura, cuando se vido en las aguas de la fuente. (IV, 99)

This enumeration of Calisto's qualities, building him into a superhuman being, has its ironic side. First, Celestina does not know Calisto well enough to know whether he embodies these qualities. In any case, any recommendation from a dubious character like Celestina must be suspect. Secondly, this presentation of Calisto leads us to regard him as much less than a hero when we see him play-acting and assuming the role of the courtly lover. Calisto's heroic qualities, as described by Celestina, are now thrown into stark contrast with the pathetic little ailment which she now says has him incapacitated: 'Agora, señora, tiénele derribado una sola muela, que jamás cesa [de] quejar. (IV, 99) From here onwards it is

Melibea who is doing the work. Celestina has roused her curiosity and Melibea gives her the chance to tell her more about Calisto to secure her favour: "¿Y qué tanto tiempo ha?" (IV, 99) It is not quite clear whether the subsequent misinterpretation by Celestina is intended by Melibea or not, but either way it provides Celestina with the opportunity to give Calisto's age.

Melibea finally creates a reason for Celestina to return, to collect the prayer and begs her not to tell Calisto of her rage lest he should think her uncharitable and thus form an unfavourable opinion of her character:

> Pues madre, no le des parte de lo que pasó a ese caballero, porque no me tenga por cruel o arrebatada o deshonesta. (IV, 100)

All that Melibea says here, and the comments from Lucrecia, bear witness to the efficacy of Celestina's rhetoric:

> ¡Ya, ya, perdida es mi ama! ¡Secretamente quiere que venga Celestina! Fraude hay; más le querrá dar, que lo dicho! (IV, 100)

And effectively this is what Melibea promises:

> Más haré por tú doliente, si menester fuere, en pago de lo sufrido. (IV, 100)

Celestina's final *pièce de résistance* is the subtle revelation of the real motive of her visit and the intention behind the display of rhetoric. This series of commonplaces which Celestina cleverly links to the still thinly veiled objective of an amorous liaison also serves the purpose of providing Melibea with a means of justification for any further steps she might take regarding Calisto. Referring to the ambiguous nature of Calisto's illness as she had described it earlier, she says:

> Porque, aunque [las palabras] fueran las que tú pensabas, en sí no eran malas; que cada día hay hombres penados por mujeres y mujeres por hombres, y esto obra la natura y la natura ordenóla Dios y Dios no hizo cosa mala. (IV, 101)

As a student of Law, Rojas would perhaps have been more familiar with judicial rhetoric than with deliberative or encomiastic.[16] However, the rhetoric in *LC* can be considered to be of the deliberative type since it is used as "counsel to persuade or dissuade the audience" [in this case on two levels: (1) the fictional characters, and (2) the reader], with respect to a particular course of action.[17] Thus in *LC*, Rojas shows his competence in rhetoric outside his own specialized field. It is not particularly surprising that Rojas should do this, in spite of his claim in 'El autor a un su amigo' that this type of writing was outside his own field, since, as P.E. Russell points out, "it is often too readily assumed that

legal studies then were as divorced from humane letters as they tend to be in modern universities."[18] He goes on to say that "the link between legal and humane studies was substantially restored towards the end of the fifteenth century [. . .] There is no reason to doubt that such influence also affected the law faculty at Salamanca at the time Rojas was a student there" (192)

The first audience of *LC* was probably composed of students at Salamanca University. Such an educated audience, familiar with the precepts of logic and rhetoric, could easily perceive the underlying subtleties which Rojas suggests. Instead of the author presenting a direct rhetorical argument, in the hope of swaying his audience, he takes them one stage further. They become the onlookers who witness rhetoric at work in another world, the world of fiction--a world, however, to which they can relate. It is this relationship which made the work popular for a much wider and less highly-trained public. The readers too can be, and undoubtedly will have been, subject to rhetoric, and now they see their fictional counterparts undergoing the same process. As objective onlookers, freed momentarily from their own self-interest, they can see the process clearly and are able to perceive the deceit in Celestina's adept manipulation of rhetorical techniques.

Occasionally, however, Rojas encourages the reader to identify himself with the characters within the fiction, thus making him aware that he too shares the same problem of clouded vision as the characters, when he is personally involved in the situation and is subject to his own emotions and desires. Rojas points out that even the rhetor himself is in danger of falling under his own spell, as in the case of Celestina who produces arguments which, though false, convince even herself at times.[19]

Alisa, llamada a la casa de su hermana, deja lugar oportuno a Celestina para que practique su arte retórico con Melibea. Auto X, Comedia (¿Burgos, 1499?)

NOTES

[1] Colbert Nepaulsingh, "The Rhetorical Structure of the Prologues to the *Libro de Buen Amor* and the *Celestina*", *BHS*, 51 (1974). In his study of the rhetorical structure of the epistle-preface and prologue to *LC*, Nepaulsingh notes that we sometimes find the author himself prefixing the answers to his work as an introduction. Certainly here Rojas indicates one of his objectives--the illustration of the power of rhetoric.

[2] Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, ed. Dorothy Severin, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, S.A., 1971), p. 40. All references are to this edition.

[3] Carmelo Samonà, *Aspetti del retoricismo nella Celestina*, Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Roma, 1953 (Studi di letteratura spagnola, Quaderno 2), makes an extensive study of the combination of rhetorical tradition and real life in the mouths of Rojas' characters.
Also considering language and rhetoric in *LC*: Malcolm Read, "*La Celestina* and the Renaissance Philosophy of Language", *PQ*, 55 (1976), 166-77.

[4] Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas, *Literatura, historia, alienación* (Barcelona: Labor, 1976), points out the emphasis placed on human communication in *LC* and the potential of speech as a means of deception: "Pero la palabra puede también ser engañosa, y servir para lo que idealmente debe ser utilizada. Los diálogos de los personajes de *LC* así lo prueban: la vieja--y no sólo ella--maneja habilmente la palabra para engañar a sus semejantes, incluso a sus más cercanos seguidores [. . .] La palabra, [. . .], utilizada perversamente, desvirtuada, puede convertirse así no en un instrumento de comunicación auténtica, sino de confusión y de engaño" (pp. 153-54).

[5] "I hold that no one can be a true orator unless he is a good man and, even if he could be, I would not have it so." *Quintilian*, Vol. I, translated by H.E. Butler in the Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1963), pp. 40-41.

[6] Antonio Martí, *La preceptiva retórica española en el siglo de oro* (Madrid: Gredos, 1972), pp. 23-24.

[7] "There is however one point which I must emphasise before I begin, which is this. Without natural gifts technical rules are useless" (I, 18-19).

[8] *Dispositio* in its turn is divided into six parts: 1) *exordium* (introduction), 2) *narratio* (narration), 3) *propositio*--also known as *divisio* or *partitio*--(the proposition, subject of the speech), 4) *confirmatio* (proof), 5) *refutatio*--otherwise known as *confutatio* or *reprehensio*--(refutation of opposing arguments), and 6) *conclusio* (peroration, conclusion).

[9] George Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 114 and 221.

[10] Celestina implies the syllogism 'old age is uncomfortable, I am old, therefore I am uncomfortable'. The enthymeme is false since old age is not, of itself, necessarily uncomfortable. In this case Celestina may be considered to be partly to blame for her own discomfort.

[11] José Rico Verdú, "Resumen de las doctrinas retóricas en el siglo de oro", in his *La retórica española de los siglos XVI y XVII* (Madrid: CSIC, 1973), p. 258.

[12] George A. Shipley, "Concerting through Conceit: Unconventional Uses of Conventional Sickness Images in *La Celestina*", *MLR*, LXX (1975), 324-32. Shipley refers to Calisto's reliance on the cliches of love-sickness for the expression of his frustration: "*Pena, afligido, dolor, remedio,* and a dozen related words become key parts of a complex image system from which Calisto derives considerable satisfaction, his verbal substitute for the apparently inaccessible pleasures of Melibea. Insistently in the first acts the lover imposes the same language on all those who must deal with him. His servants repeatedly object to the exaggeration in his speech [. . .], and their alienation from the purveyor of such scarcely personal images is shared by the reader (who may be taken aback by the discovery of his solidarity, in questions of stylistic decorum, with lackeys, prostitutes, and procuress [sic])" (p. 324). Shipley points out the way in which sickness imagery, initiated by Calisto, is manipulated by all parties concerned and turned to their advantage, particularly by Celestina, as we see her do here. He also attributes rather more awareness to Melibea in the establishment of the false level of communication centred on Calisto's invented toothache.

[13] Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, translated by John Henry Freese (London: William Heinemann, 1959), p. 189.

[14] "Concerting through Conceit", p. 327.

[15] M.K. Read, "Fernando de Rojas' Vision of the Birth and Death of Language", *MLN*, XCIII (1978), 169-70: "Such is the oddity, incongruity and disparity between the standard meaning of the words used by the old bawd and the nature of the situation in which they occur that they signal to Melibea that she is to interpret them accordingly. This she does ("¿Piensas que no tengo sentidas tus pisadas e entendido tu dañado mensaje?") and though the language of innuendo inhibits her retaliation, it also allows her to indulge in deceit with apparent impunity ("Es obra pía é santa sanar los passionados é enfermos.")

[16] As Cicero explained in his *Topica*, translated by H.H. Hubbell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 453, there are three kinds of rhetorical speeches: judicial, the aim of which is to achieve justice; deliberative, the end of which is advantage; and encomiastic, the aim of which is honour.

[17] Lee A. Sonnino, *A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968), p. 243.

[18] P.E. Russell, "The *Celestina comentada*" in *Medieval Hispanic Studies Presented to Rita Hamilton* (London: Tamesis, 1976), pp. 175-93, at p. 191.

[19] The author is most grateful to Professor A.D. Deyermond, Dr. Dorothy Severin, Professor J. Snow and Dr. Robin Carter for their invaluable advice and corrections during the preparation of this article.

La 'furia' de Melibea. Auto I, escena primera de la obra. De la traducción alemana de C. Wirsung (1520).