

RESEÑAS

Fernando de Rojas, Celestina: Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea. Ed. Miguel Marciales. Al cuidado de Brian Dutton y Joseph T. Snow. Illinois Medieval Monographs-I. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985. 2 vols. I: Introducción (xxii+372 p.); II: Edición Crítica (x+306 p.).

With the impressive two-volume work of Miguel Marciales (1919-1980), Celestina studies now has what it has long awaited: a critical edition of Rojas' Tragicomedia. After J. Homer Herriott's initial work towards a critical edition of Celestina, progress in that area seemed deterred with no significant advance on the critical problem until now. Marciales' painstaking and laborious research is impeccable and sets forth the Celestina witnesses' variant system and stemmatic relationship, by means of which he establishes the text of the Tragicomedia. Also to be applauded is the care with which Brian Dutton and Joseph T. Snow have prepared the posthumous publication of Marciales' work. As the Preface states: "Esta edición es, pues, el resultado del esfuerzo y dedicación de muchos aficionados y expertos. El estímulo principal, que nos inspiró a todos, fue la misma obra genial de Miguel de Marciales" (p. vi).

The contents of the first volume (Introducción) consists of a description of the inception and progress of Marciales' project which began in 1965; a description of the graphics of the Celestina texts; the need for the critical edition; and a meticulous description of the witnesses consulted--Comedia and Tragicomedia editions, the Celestina comentada manuscript, the metrical version by Sedeño, and translations. Marciales sums up the purpose of the introductory volume as follows:

La Introducción que acompaño a la Edición Crítica es necesaria para comprender ésta plenamente y es quizá la más extensa tentativa que se ha hecho a esta fecha para ensamblar orgánicamente un gran conjunto de datos ciertos, en busca de las mejores o de las más plausibles conjeturas sobre los muchos puntos oscuros que aún se dan. (p. xvii)

Marciales has divided the text of the Tragicomedia into the following parts: Esbozo de Rodrigo de Cota (Auto I - Auto II, cena 1), Continuación de Fernando de Rojas (Auto II, cena 2 - Auto XIV, cena 8; Auto XVI; Auto XIX - Auto XXI; Octavas), Tratado de Centurio de Sanabria (Auto XIV, cena 8; Auto XV; Auto XVI--Auto de la Iza; Auto XVII - Auto XVIII; Auto XIX, cena 1). On the basis of this division, Marciales then proceeds to analyze the filiation and stemmatic relation of the editions

and manuscript (Celestina comentada, which Marciales wisely includes as a witness to the textual tradition).

For each text, Marciales provides a punctilious description of the witness, physically as well as graphically, and a careful scrutiny of the variants to show how the text fits into the family of editions. The stemma that Marciales establishes (summarized on p. 268) originates from two manuscripts (January - April 1499) deriving from a first manuscript (December 1497 - September 1498). From the two manuscripts a direct line descends through the editions of Salamanca 1500 (Edition B) and 1503 (E1); Toledo 1504 (E); Valencia 1508 (J1), 1514 (J), 1518 (M), 1523 (T1), and 1529 (T). Also from the two manuscripts derive three other families: I. Burgos 1499 (A); II. Toledo 1500 (C); and III. the direct line of Sevilla 1501 (D), 1502 (D1), 1508 (G1), 1511 (H), 1513 (I), 1518 (L), 1522 (Q1), 1525 (Q), 1528 (S), 1536 (Z), and 1539 (Dd). Marciales' evidence for the filiation seems solid indeed.

At various junctures in his analysis, Marciales discusses other areas of interest outside, although pertinent and related to the bibliographical, filial description of the editions. With regard to the argumentos, Marciales rejects the work of Keith Whinnom and Clara Louisa Penney on the filiation of the texts. According to Marciales (p. 45), the variants of the argumentos in Comedias A (Burgos 1499), C (Toledo 1500), and D (Sevilla 1501) are proportionally greater than that in the text of the autos. His collation of the argumentos show them not to be as similar as Penney suggests and therefore cannot be used as evidence of filial relationship between the editions.

In listing the argumento's variants Marciales not only gives the notables (or substantive) differences on which he is basing his calculation, but also the accidentals. One could debate the accidentals as true variants since the latter are technically common errors and not merely graphic variations. One could also question the necessity of such a long list (fifteen three-column pages of eight-point type) which adds little to the discussion except to show the exacting nature of Marciales' textual labor. This style of abundant documentaion is typical throughout the Introduction.

In the discussion of Comedia C (Toledo 1500), Marciales enters into the question of the author of the Esbozo. From the beginning of the Introduction, the reader is aware that Cota is claimed as the author of the first act. Marciales explains in detail his reasons for taking this stand, which seems reasonable given his analysis which is based on textual and historical information (summarized in IV.B.3). Marciales maintains that the reason for Rojas hiding the identity of the author of the first act was not because Rojas did not know who the author was but because of some conflict between the two--Cota and Rojas--both professionally and/or socio-culturally (i.e., the judaizante reputation of the Cota family).

In IV.B.1.d ("El Esbozo de Cota y su empalme con la Continuación"), Marciales gives additional reasoning for his claim that Cota is the author of the text which Rojas found. Since Rojas was the one who interpreted the first act and invented the pretext of the lost

falcon, Marciales observes that Rojas might have come to the conclusion that Melibea is in a garden and that Calisto jumped over the garden walls because in another of Cota's texts, Diálogo entre el Amor y un Viejo, Amor enters a garden in such a manner. While there is a circular argument here--(that is, Rojas knew the author was Cota, therefore he drew upon another text by Cota, thus proving the first author to be Cota), the comparison does stand and presents a plausible explanation as to why Calisto is later referred to as "saltaparedes."

Elsewhere in Marciales' discussion of the transition from the Comedias to the Tragicomedias (IV.B), "El descuadre inicial del Esbozo" (IV.B.1.f.b), Marciales attempts to explain why Melibea calls Calisto's love "ilícito" in the first scene when he has not actually proposed anything illicit at that point. Marciales' solution to the enigma is that Melibea is a married woman. He discredits the "pensamiento sicalíptico-victoriano" of Gerald Brenan and others, who Marciales says present "las más hilarantes y grotescas interpretaciones" of openly sexual dialogue and actions in the first scene (p. 85). However, with little or no more textual evidence to prove his own theory, Marciales proclaims that the "única solución es la que he propuesto y es la única lógica, sin violentar ni forzar el texto: en la concepción primera de Cota Melibea era una mujer casada, una segunda Lucrecia de la Historia de duobus amantibus" (p. 85). According to Marciales, in Cota's text Melibea was married to "Pléber o Pléberis o Plebero" and Calisto was another Pamphilus o Eurialus (p. 85). Marciales maintains that Rojas understood perfectly well the allusion to Seleucus and Erasistratus but preferred not to turn Melibea into another Fiammetta or Lucretia. Thus Rojas reduced the conflict of illicit love to that of "amor y desamor."

While this theory is a possibility, for we have little extra- and intra-textual information on which to base a definitive judgment, Marciales does not leave room for compromise: "No hay otra interpretación" (p. 86). One would, however, tend to disagree with this last statement since the courtly-love code (also overlooked in Marciales' discussion of Melibea's speech on marriage [IV.B.1.ff] could offer up other possibilities equally feasible without forcing the text to accept either implicit sexual misconducts or postulated marriages.

Overall, Marciales seldom qualifies his conclusions. He has no doubts about his analysis or there being any other correct conclusion than the one he draws. Yet, for the same confidence that he so often displays, he criticizes the work of others such as María Rosa Lida. Quoting from the Originalidad artística de "La Celestina", Marciales adds the following annotations:

"Según el prólogo [p. 26] Rojas volvió a meter la pluma en su obra para satisfacer a la mayor parte de sus lectores que reclamaban más escenas de amor [subrayo porque no es exacto: lo que reclamaban era la prolongación del deleite, en que pudo haber o darse la segunda escena de amor]. De ser esta la única razón [subrayo y pregunto ¿por qué no? ¿cómo sabe la señora de Malkiel que Rojas tuvo otras razones?] le hubiese bastado agregar al acto XIV, enriquecido con el monólogo introspectivo, el acto XIX,

dejando morir a Calisto en la segunda noche de amor, (?) tal como en la Comedia moría en la primera." (p. 146)

The names of scholars who fall under Marciales' scrutiny form an impressive roster: María Rosa Lida, Menéndez y Pelayo, Gilman, Samonà, Whinnom, to name a few. Otis Green comes under review in IV.B.2.c regarding the Minerva/Vulcán reference. Marciales criticizes Green's use of the spelling Vulcán, saying that Vulcán is not a Castilian form. Rojas would have used Vulcano. Also, Marciales affirms that Rojas could not suppose an illicit relationship between Minerva and Vulcan from the sources Green cites. Marciales admits, however, that he does not know what name to substitute for Minerva and the question remains obscure even to him: "las otras conjeturas que se me ocurren me parecen tan cojas como la de Green" (p. 115).

His opinion of the work of English-speaking Hispanists is thinly veiled, as for example in the discussion of "comedor de huevos assados": "Esta expresión ha 'vejado' el ingenio de los hispanistas de habla inglesa y sobre ella se han escrito las más divertidas necesidades" (p. 115). However, neither do the Peninsular critics escape his judgment: "Los comentaristas españoles pasan sobre todo esto como gatos escaldados, pero aquí no hay dudas posibles porque las expresiones iguales o paralelas están más que vivas en el habla vulgar de amplias zonas de Hispanoamérica" (p. 115). Marciales does admit in a footnote, though, that he is not certain of this vulgar use of "huevos" in Peninsular slang, which shows that Marciales, too, has limits to his knowledge. Later in IV.C.1 (p. 222), Marciales twice maintains that to establish an edition of a text one must be a native speaker of that language.

Sometimes Marciales' theories seem to be based on conjecture, although they are presented as hard fact. For example, in IV.B.3, discussing edition E (Toledo 1504), he maintains:

La edición E está ciertamente relacionada con el amigo toledano de Rojas, destinatario de la Carta que nos ha llegado, por primera extante, en C. Este amigo es el esponsor o patrocinador del misterioso Sanabria [Marciales' candidate for author of the Tratado de Centurio] y en consecuencia, del Tratado de Centurio. Para el momento Rojas debe de estar ya más del lado de Toledo que de Salamanca, es decir, debe de haber comenzado a menudear los viajes y los contactos con Toledo y su circuito, los que finalmente lo llevaron a casarse y a establecerse en Talavera de la Reina (hacia 1507). (pp. 122-23)

The reader wonders where this information about the friend came from but is never given any foundation supporting the relationship between the friend and the edition except the Toledo connection. One could have hoped for more explanation.

With respect to the authorship of the additions to the Tragicomedia, Marciales decides, on the basis of the variants, that the "Gran Adición" (Autos XIV, cenas 5 and 6; XVI; and XIX, cenas 2, 3, and

4) as well as the minor additions and the majority of the substitutions are Rojas' own. On the contrary, few of the suppressions nor the Tratado de Centurio are Rojas'. From the modifications and problems of the Esbozo (IV.B.2.c) in El (Salamanca 1502?, 1503), Marciales concludes that "en términos generales debe admitirse que en el Esbozo no se pueden dar las supresiones, cosa que por lo demás es lógica, dado que Rojas y amigos respetaron escrupulosamente el texto de Cota. Las supresiones de una palabra, que mejoran el texto, aunque puedan ser de Rojas, pueden aceptarse, v.gr. I.6; las que dañan el texto o no tienen el apoyo de It son erratas, v.gr. I.12, I.18" (p. 111). The qualification of improving or worsening the text seems a bit vague since deciding whether the change is for better or worse is generally subjective.

Regarding the Tratado de Centurio, Marciales proposes:

El Tratado de Centurio originario formaba un bloque sin división en autores, o sea, una simple sucesión de cenas, algo casi como de la longitud del Esbozo de Cota. Este Tratado estaba formado por el actual XV, el Auto de la Iza, los actuales XVII, XVIII y el Auto de Traso. Según esta hipótesis Rojas conoció el Tratado originario en manuscrito, en la ciudad de Toledo y en 1504. Le fue mostrado por su autor, el misterioso Sanabria, y/o quizás por intermedio o agencia del amigo joven y noble a quien Rojas dirige la Carta (C.) [...] No sabemos quién fuera ese misterioso Sanabria; si estoy en lo cierto, no puede ser el bachiller Sanabria que el profesor Gilman en su libro The Spain of Fernando de Rojas menciona en varias partes. (p. 167)

Marciales makes a positive case for Sanabria as a possible author of the Tratado.

In IV.B.3.b, Marciales discusses the unity of the text --as it has been traditionally conceived--and believes that one cannot study the text or characters as a whole since, as Marciales maintains, there exists a plurality of authors and thus multiple texts and characters. His strong conviction as to the plurality of both text and analysis shows through in a style typical of Marciales, one in which he either rewrites (or rewords) parts of Celestina (p. 175) or creates hypothetical dialogues:

la actitud [...] apriorística clarifica el oficio del crítico, más o menos como la ley del encaje ilumina el oficio del juez. Lo que sigue es un auténtico logógrifo. Los italianos cuando dicen cosas ciertas son más claros que ni los franceses, pero cuando quieren engañar o decir cuquerías suelen ser sutilísimamente oscuros. Esa visión estética que es como un espejo de alinde donde se refleja el examen estilístico, ¿qué diablos tiene que hacer con lo que sigue? Todo parece dicho por Cantinflas, el célebre cómico mejicano: 'vea usted, manito, porque como el examen del estilo se me refleja aquí en el espejo de la visión estética, si usted me despedaza la unidad del estilo, me va a seguir comprometiendo la unidad de la poesía y va a acabar

negándome la existencia mesma de toda la comedia, ¿entendió, manito?' Es claro que no toda la crítica 'idealista' y teticabrana llega a estos extremos de falta de seriedad. Pero este es un ejemplo edificante y precavente. (p. 145)

Marciales' enthusiasm for his topic reveals itself in a dramatic presentation of the arguments.

The Introduction ends with a study of the pronunciation and language of the period and with a discussion of the graphs and orthography of the witnesses and of those adopted for the critical edition. Lastly he presents the criteria of the critical text, complemented with a Bibliography (limited mostly to textual studies of Celestina) and Indices.

The second volume contains the critical edition itself, preceded by a list of the texts collated and their corresponding abbreviations. The critical apparatus is presented at the bottom of each corresponding page of the edition. The notes consist mostly of variant information with an occasional linguistic or literary comment. The paucity of the latter, however, is not to be criticized since such is not the purpose of the edition. The edition is critical: that is, a presentation of the variant and stemmatic information and critical formulation of the text set forth with an exacting apparatus which allows the reader to evaluate the textual decisions of the editor.

Notwithstanding the problematic areas of the Introduction, Marciales' meticulous collation and reconstruction of the text and careful editorial work in the second volume can not be faulted, and the vast quantity of variant information, even more complete than necessary in some cases, presents the reader with a detailed vision of the textual transmission of Celestina. Even if the reader should disagree with Marciales' choice of reading, the fact that one has the information available to make that decision is a great advance for Celestina studies. With Marciales' edition of the Tragicomedia, fifteenth-century Hispanic studies in general and Celestina research in particular have been well served.

IVY A. CORFIS

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA