Celestinesca 37 (2013): 27-48 https://doi.org/10.7203/Celestinesca.37.20157

Readers and Comedy in *Celestina*

Ivy A. Corfi
University of Wisconsin–Madison

As Jauss and Iser describe, readers are part of the literary endeavor, where their interpretative response to the work enters into «a dialectical process of production *and reception*» (Holub 57), with their horizon of expectations determined by individual experience, historical moment, social context, and understanding of the world and literature (Jauss 39).[1] Given the importance of the reader's response in the interpretation of texts, it is essential to distinguish between reading publics and their expectations. While the author may have an intended public in mind upon writing the work, they are only a subset of the possible/actual readers. The general readership may differ from the implied readers in social or historical context, and therefore their understanding of the text may differ from the author's intention or the implied reader's reception. The general reader may overlook encoded clues of form, genre, or meaning that the author embeds in his writing to guide its interpretation. Thus, text and readers together produce meaning, and reception theory places them squarely within the literary process. *Celestina* clearly bears witness to this in the creation of the *Comedia* and its revision as *Tragicomedia de Calisto de Melibea*.

The Prologue to the *Tragicomedia* offers insight into how the *Comedia* was approached and read. Since it is clear that the world is filled with conflict and strife, as Rojas describes, basing his reasoning on Petrarch, he then states that «no quiero maravillarme si esta presente obra ha seýdo instrumento de lid o contienda a sus lectores para ponerlos en differencias, dando cada uno sentencia sobre ella a sabor de su voluntad» (Rojas 200).[2] Some read the work for plot, to pass the time, not taking advantage of any particular value or meaning stemming from the story; while others enjoy the proverbs and pleasing sayings without applying the wis-

1.– I would like to thank Professors Joseph T. Snow and Pablo Ancos for reading an earlier draft of this article. Responsibility for content is mine alone.

2.– On Petrarch in *Celestina*, see works by Deyermond 1961 and Russell (108–11). All quotations from *Celestina* are taken from Russell's edition; however, I do not reproduce his use of italics to indicate the *Tragicomedia* material added to the *Comedia*.

dom of those words to any particular good; while still others understand the work in a more fulsome manner, going beyond the story to see the work's goodness and truth and enjoy the comic moments yet remember the *sententiae* and proverbs within the dialogue to use later as appropriate (Rojas 201). Chartier describes the third type of reading, the more expansive understanding, as the «correct, profitable reading … that grasps the text in its complex totality without reducing it to mere episodes of a plot or a collection of impersonal maxims»; this, for Chartier, «clearly indicates the central tension of every history of reading» (1989: 155).

It must be remembered that the author, too, was a reader, and what caught his attention and inspired him to continue the «papeles del antiguo autor» was precisely its «estilo elegante … no sólo ser dulce en su principal ystoria o fición toda junta, pero aun de algunas sus particularidades salían delectables fontezicas de filosophía; de otr[a]s, agradables donayres; de otr[a]s, avisos y consejos contra lisongeros y malos sirvientes y falsas mugeres hechizeras … la gran copia de sentencias entrexeridas» (Rojas 185).[3] The author followed in the Antiguo Autor's footsteps and continued the sententious style in the *Comedia*.[4]

The readers' reaction to the *Comedia* brings to fore the old adage, «you can't please all the people all the time», something Juan Manuel showed his readers in the 14th-century *Conde Lucanor* (i.e., Exemplo II), but in *Celestina* the topos applies to the specific context of literary writing. In particular, two specific reactions to the *Comedia* caused the author to take up his pen and revisit the text.

> Otros han litigado sobre el nombre, diziendo que no se avía de llamar comedia, pues acabava en tristeza, sino que se llamasse tragedia. El primer autor quiso darle denominación del principio, que fue plazer, y llamóla comedia. Yo, viendo estas discordias, entre estos estremos partí agora por medio la porfía, y llaméla 'tragicomedia'. Assí que, viendo estas conquistas, estos díssonos y varios juyzios, miré a donde la mayor parte acostava, y hallé que querían que se alargasse en el processo de su deleyte destos amantes, sobre lo qual fuy muy importunado. De manera que acordé, aunque contra mi voluntad, meter segunda vez la pluma en tan estraña lavor y tan agena de mi facultad, hurtando algunos ratos a mi principal estudio, con otras horas destinadas para recreación, puesto que no han de faltar nuevos detractores a la nueva adición. (Rojas 202–03)

3.– On Rojas as reader, see, for example, Snow 1995.

4.– On the topic of *sententiae* and proverbs in *Celestina*, see, among other studies, the work by Cantalapiedra (esp. vol. 3).

The author's response to the readers' reaction underscores the work's importance as a printed book. Only in the age of printing, with multiple copies available simultaneously, would readers so quickly be able to voice a collective response, and only in the age of printing would the author have the possibility to address the comments in a revision that will reach a wide audience in less than 2–3 years.[5] There are questions regarding the author's response that we may never be able to answer conclusively. Did the author's act of revision stem from a desire to find favor and prestige among the reading public? Was the idea to revise the text the author's or the printer's, stemming from an economic desire to sell more copies?[6] Was the person to make the changes the *Comedia* author or someone else? Recent studies by critics such as Di Camillo (2010), Canet (2007, 2008), and Cantalapiedra (vol. 1), working off previous arguments made by Stamm, Marciales, and Miguel Martínez (1996), among others, have revisited the question of who took up the pen and when (that is, at what stage of composition). For the purpose of this article, the «who/how many» is less important than the «why», and I will refer to «Rojas» as the author without entering into the thorny debate of who was the author of the *Comedia* or *Tragicomedia.* This study is more concerned with the readers and their reading than with the identity of the author(s).

The first question to be faced when considering the readers' reaction to the text is: who were the readers? In the paratextual matter, the author identifies for whom he is writing. In the title and subtitle to both the *Comedia* and *Tragicomedia*, we find

> Comedia de Calisto y Melibea: la qual contiene, demás de su agradable y dulce estilo, muchas sentencias fil - sofales y avisos muy necessarios *para mancebos*, mostrándoles los engaños que están encerrados en sirvientes y alcahuetas. (Rojas 181, from *Comedia*, Toledo 1500; emphasis mine)
>
> Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea: nuevamente revista y emendada, con addición de los argumentos de cada un auto en principio. La qual, contiene, demás de su agradable y dulce estilo, muchas sentencias filosofale

5.– Three years, that is, if we assume that readers began to react to the *Comedia* shortly after a publication date ca. 1499 and that the *Tragicomedia* then was printed ca. 1502.

6.– Di Camillo believes the rewriting of the *Comedia* «may be due more to early marketing strategies than to the literary aspirations of specific authors» (2010: 96). He states the same regarding the change in title (2005: 60). In a similar vein, speaking of the Carta, he maintains that «la Carta representa la primera innovación que impresores y libreros introducen para vender sus ediciones. Son ellos los que, siempre atentos a los cambios ideológicos y al gusto de los lectores, toman la iniciativa de hacer su producto más atractivo añadiendo, en competición con otros impresores, material que adorne cuantitativa y cualitativamente el texto de la obra» (2001: 118).

> y avisos muy necessarios *para mancebos*, mostrándoles los engaños que están encerrados en sirvientes y alcahuetas. (Rojas 181, from *Tragicomedia*, Valencia 1514; emphasis mine)

The *Comedia* further identifies the intended public in «El autor a un su amigo»:

> me venía a la memoria, no sólo la necessidad que nuestra común patria tiene de la presente obra por la muchedumbre de *galanes y enamorados mancebos* que posee, pero aun en particular *vuestra mesma persona*, cuya juventud de amor ser presa se me representa aver visto, y de él cruelmente lastimada, a causa de le faltar defensivas armas para resistir sus fuegos, las quales hallé esculpidas en estos papeles, no fabricadas en las grandes herrerías de Milán, mas en los claros ingenios de doctos varones castellanos formadas. (Rojas 184–85, emphasis mine)

The work states that it is written for the moral edification of young men and lovers, of whom the author's friend is one: that is, men of Rojas' own age, if we take him at his word that he wrote the *Comedia* during his vacation from university studies.[7] These young men and friends would most likely be of a similar university class. Thus the readers whom the author has in mind —that is, the intended public— would be of a certain level of learning. However, there would seem to be a distance between the implied readers of *galanes y mancebos*, and the actual readership that raise objections to the *Comedia*. One of the readers' criticisms points to a concept key to understanding the difference between the intended and actual readers: that of comedy.

Many scholars have discussed the debt of *Celestina* to the humanistic comedies: e.g., Menéndez y Pelayo, Lida de Malkel (esp. 37–50), Casas Homs (151–65), Castro Guisasola, Whinnom (1993), Fraker, and Russell (45–52). Canet Vallés studies *Celestina*'s debt to humanistic comedy and proposes that the work circulated «originariamente manuscrita y con una extensión muy breve, al decir del «Autor a un su amigo», lo que equival-

7.– Again, for this discussion I am not entering into the debate of authorship and who wrote what. I am taking the text at its word and assuming the Carta was written by the author and not by another person. Regarding the intention of the work, Di Camillo noted that: «the stated objective is unmistakably that of a *Remedia amoris*» (2010: 141). The text as *remedia amoris* has also been studied by other critics, principally among them, Lacarra (2003). Canet Vallés links the reproach of love to Paulist philosophy, important in the period, which influences *Celestina*'s condemnation of carnal acts (see, for example, Canet Vallés 2010). Di Camillo also discusses the Carta as similar to Piccolomini's letter to his teacher Sozzino, used to introduce the *Historia de duobus amantibus* (2010: 141). See Whinnom (1981) on Rojas' motivations for writing the *Comedia*.

dría aproximadamente a la primera cena o auto» (2008a: 85), perhaps as a complete work, and certainly reflecting the university environment and philosophical debates of the period (2007: 35). Di Camillo posits that the original *comedia* of the Antiguo Autor may have been a translation of a Latin work composed by someone intimately familiar with the texts and philosophic debates of the Italian Quattrocento —a proposition that, as Di Camillo himself notes, still lacks documentary evidence (2010: 133).[8]

In spite of the many theories surrounding the intention, circumstances, and identity of the Antiguo Autor, few critics would deny the importance and influence of the Latin humanistic comedies on the Papeles and *Comedia*.[9] Yet the absence of a «final feliz» in the Castilian work has been an argument against the *Comedia* as «comedy», a reaction expressed by Rojas' early readers. Nonetheless, Fraker has shown that the definition of «comedy» did not always mean «happy ever after» (26–31, 47–49); and, moreover, it has been documented that decorum and a moral lesson are fundamental attributes of comedy, both in the works of Terence, as Fraker states, and in the later humanistic texts (Canet Vallés 1993: 20–26), thus making *Celestina* «rogue only in that it is written in a vernacular» (Fraker 23).

As Fraker reminds us, not all the humanistic comedies had an overtly happy ending: chief among these being *Paulus* and *Philogenia*. In Vergerio's *Paulus* (ca. 1390), the malevolent servant Herotes encourages his young master's decadent and self-indulgent lifestyle. The young student Paulus, who is easily manipulated, falls victim to Herotes' wiles and squanders his life and money on hedonistic pursuits. In the end, Herotes shows that he will continue to take advantage of Paulus' lack of self-responsibility and always dupe his masters and lead them to ruin. No true «happy-ever-after» concludes the work, only a cycle of vice, moral decadence, and abused women.

Ugolino Pisani's *Philogenia and Epiphebus* (1437–38) also shows an unhappy seduction, where a young woman runs away from her father's house to follow her lover Epiphebus. Her father, Calisto, takes a rather objective, distanced stance regarding his daughter's flight and does not wish to cause open scandal by searching for her. However, her absence is soon noticed, and Epiphebus shifts her from one male friend's house to

8.– Di Camillo dates the composition of the text that inspired the *Comedia* from the 1490s (2010: 144).

9.– It should be mentioned that Di Camillo does not accept the linkage between *Celestina* and humanistic comedy: «De los muchos problemas serios que plantea la identificación de la obra con la comedia humanística, el más obvio y el que lleva implícito repercusiones específicas con respecto a la autoría de la obra es la ausencia total de una tradición de comedias neolatinas o humanísticas en la Castilla del siglo XV y en España en general» (2005: 66). On the other hand, Canet Vallés, disagreeing with Di Camillo, shows the coincidence between *Celestina* and humanistic comedies like *Poliscena* (2007: 35–36; 2008b) as well as *Poliodorus* (2008b).

another, to avoid her being found by the authorities. As the young woman is passed from man to man, each new host takes his pleasure with her, and she supposedly accepts being scurried away to new locations all for love of Epiphebus. It is also clear, in the end, that the young woman's initiation into the world of sexual pleasure has not been repulsive to her. While confessing her sins to the priest Prodigius, she says: «I was seduced by clever flattery and abducted from my home, wretch that I am; I was naïve, as all of us young girls are. That's why I had to service the lust of so many men». Prodigius then explains: «This, then, is no sin. For any action to be called virtuous or vicious, it has to be voluntary. So if is wasn't your own will but necessity that forced on you this shameful act, I say that you are innocent». To which she replies in an aside: «Well, thank God I was always able to satisfy my passion without doing anything wrong!» (Pisani 257, 259).

The end, however, is far from happy. The young woman is married off to a country bumpkin, to spend her days as a farmer's wife, debased in social and economic status, but accepting the situation because her lover Epiphebus has promised to visit her as often as possible. It is clear, of course, that the young man has no intention of following through on the promise and comments to a friend at the end of the work that since this has been such a successful tryst and he has come out of the affair free from any obligation to the young woman, who is now successfully married off, that this is a model for future amorous adventures, and that perhaps such repeated scenarios even might prove economically lucrative. There is no happy ending for the young woman, exiled to the country and separated from her lover, with Epiphebus ready to deceive other women in a similar manner.

It is not known if the humanistic comedies provided inspiration for the *Comedia*'s ending, but, as Fraker suggests, that the work ends sadly does not alienate it from the definition of comedy. It is through the concept of decorum that Terence and the humanistic comedies portray the unhappiness of foolish people as comic, since either they bring about their own ruin or their death is viewed as unimportant or deserved. It is through such a moral framework that Morón Arroyo views *Celestina*: «[T]he characters bring about their own downfall as a result of their sin … In this way, the didactic intention is linked to the generic condition of the text as comedy» (12).

Lawrance takes a slightly different stance on the matter. He sees the principals of comic decorum present in the work of the Antiguo Autor, where the first act represents «fictional stories about mediocre characters with trivial or happy endings», as Donatus describes (1993: 85); but given «the unprecedented twist given to the play by the sombre genius of Fernando de Rojas», the idea of comic decorum does not seem to apply to Rojas' work, where something darker evolves (Lawrance 1993: 86).

Lawrance discusses how even the title *Tragicomedia* was an ironic touch on Rojas' part:

> his newly-coined generic term did the opposite of what it appears to do: it granted the point about tragedy, but highlighted the retention of comic element. Faced with the argument that the 'trágico fin' demanded a change from *comedia* to *tragedia*, Rojas demurred and insisted instead on inventing a term (in itself grotesque and comic) which indicated that the play was not a tragedy, but a burlesque tragedy; or, as we might say today, a black comedy. (1993: 87)

Lawrance masterfully shows how Rojas continued to stress comic elements in his work, but in a new way: going beyond comedic decorum in the «tragicomedy» to create something totally different. Rojas, as Lawrance shows, prepares the reader for the tragic ending from the beginning through the *Argumento* and preliminary matter, anticipating the laughter as well as deaths in a dark comedy that does not surprise the reader in the end (1993: esp. 90–92 for conclusions). Lawrance's insights into the title and Rojas' art does not negate the humanistic comedies' influence on the work. That *Celestina* is of a piece with comedy, in the tradition of humanistic comedy, is documented, but the darkness is different and important.

With the discovery of the Palacio manuscript (MP), we have a glimpse into the *Comedia*'s early form prior to the first-known printing (Faulhaber, Botta, Lobera Serrano, Canet Vallés [2011], Conde). As Botta and Michael point out, with the presence of two hands in MP, it is unlikely that the fragment represents Rojas' autograph text. Setting that point aside, Conde summarizes that to date MP has been defined in various ways: as the Papeles del Antiguo Autor with revisions by Rojas in his own hand (Faulhaber 1991); Rojas' own work (Garcia); or a manifestation of an early stage of the *Comedia* tradition (Botta 1993; Lobera Serrano). In practical terms, «en uno y otro caso nos hallamos ante un testimonio de la mayor importancia por transmitirnos por vez primera noticias relativas al estado textual de los primeros estadios de vida de la *Celestina*» (Conde 184–85). The variants of MP, viewed against the printed texts, reflect an earlier draft of the first act, which would be reworked in the printed *Comedia*; and, although we may never know for sure, the reading and reception of the *Comedia* manuscript tradition may have played a part in shaping the work that comes down to us through printed editions today.[10]

10.– Again what constituted the manuscript tradition and if a manuscript version of the 16-act *Comedia* circulated is unknown. However, it seems unlikely that no manuscript existed and circulated amongst the author's circle of friends prior to printing; but, again, that is my supposition and at present we do not know.

Severin has posited that MP may have been a draft circulated by Rojas amongst his friends (201–05). The original work by Rojas that expanded the Papeles of the Antiguo Autor was destined, thus, for a community of Rojas' Salamanca peers, who, through their university training and experience, would have recognized its debt to the humanistic comedy. When the work was printed and fell in the hands of a wider reading public, things became more complicated. Rojas, in his prologue, casts the blame for the textual ambiguities at the readers' feet and underscores the didactic intent of the work (Rojas 201, 202–03, cited above; Severin 201). Severin concludes:

> it is fairly certain that after his two weeks of vacation, Rojas would have had a draft of the text to show to his student friends at Salamanca, making it possible that everyone might suggest how to improve especially the first act, and that they might help make the changes, as María Rosa Lida suggested many years ago. Perhaps the Palace manuscript is a testimony to that process of revision of a text which circulated in various manuscript versions among the Salamanca students before finally being prepared for print some time later … Rojas is an author who is aware of his multiple functions as author of his own text, reviser and editor of another's text, and finally as rewriter of his own text. (205

However, we have no definitive, concrete information as to who the readers were or how they reacted to MP or other manuscript(s) that might have impacted the printed version. We do know that the title *Comedia*, according to the author, was given to the original work by the Antiguo Autor, and the changes between MP and printed witnesses would suggest that the title «Comedia» did not pose a concern to the manuscript readers at that point. The use of «comedia» remained in the title. The concern was raised later, it would seem, with the spread of the printed text.[11] This would suggest that the circle of friends, peers, or students reading the manuscript(s) was different from those reading the printed work. Canet Vallés understands the manuscript *comedia* of the Antiguo Autor as intended for a university audience (2008a: 104; 2010: 70). The same could be posited for the manuscript tradition of its continuation, whose intended readers were within the academic sphere —perhaps Rojas' university acquaintances and colleagues, as Severin suggests; the *galanes* whom Rojas mentions in «El autor a un su amigo». These readers' expectations included Donatus' definition of Terentian comedy and were perhaps more ac-

11.– Again, this presumes that a manuscript of the 16-act version circulated. If not, and only the first act or an extended first with «final feliz» circulated, then the readers never saw a version of the *Comedia*, as we know it, in manuscript.

cepting of «less-than-happy endings», given their acquaintance with Roman and humanistic comedies. They perhaps had a better appreciation of Rojas' generic maneuvering from the comedy of the Papeles to the *Comedia*. These readers understood comedy more broadly than did the later readership that thought in term of «happy» and «sad».[12]

As Lawrance has indicated, Rojas knew from the start that he was creating something different: «Rojas was fully conscious of what he was doing long before tragicomedy became the dominant mode of literature» (1993: 92). The *Comedia* itself was already combining «dark undertones» (Lawrance 1993: 89) of which the reader was alerted with the «opening admonitions about 'trágico fin'» (Lawrance 1993: 89). Yet Rojas saw the work as a comedy with a tragic tone rather than a tragedy with comic elements, as witnessed by the title *Tragicomedia* rather than «comitragedy» (Lawrance 1993: 87). However readers of the printed *Comedia* focused on the tragic and did not seem to understand the title as Rojas intended it to be «read»: that is, as «in itself grotesque and comic» (Lawrance 1993: 87). Nor did they seem to note the irony of the changes or how Rojas may have had the last laugh, since the author did not make the work «tragic», either in content or title, but rather insisted on the comic (Lawrance 1993: 87).

As suggested above, prior the work's publication, in manuscript form, the title did not seem to be a concern. The problem arises with the printed book. A dual readership, one of a manuscript tradition and another of printed texts, follows a description of early readers put forth by Chartier:

> La imprenta sustituyó a las audiencias separadas y especializadas de la edad del manuscrito por un nuevo público, en el cual se mezclaban los estamentos, edades y sexos … Al crear un nuevo público, gracias a la circulación de los textos en todos los estamentos sociales, los pliegos sueltos contribuyeron a la construcción de la di-

12.– It is important to note that Canet Vallés (2007) has proposed that the printed *Comedia* was destined for an academic audience and used, at some point, as a university text. If he is correct in that assumption, then the intended readers were, without doubt, of a certain level of learning. However, if the text was read mainly by university students, that calls into question who criticized the comedic form. Canet Vallés believes that «[l]a justificación de Rojas para alargar la obra a causa de la presión de los lectores para gozar más de los 'deleites destos amantes', no es ni más ni menos que la interrelación entre el autor y el lector de su época en un ambiente universitario, porque no ser así no se explicaría el cambio genérico que implica la modificación del título de *comedia* a *tragcomedia*» (2008b: 37). Canet Vallés sees the change in the humanistic comedy in Salamanca from a «simple ejercicio escolar a una nueva fórmula literaria liderada por ciertos profesores (me refiero a los que cuestionaban la enseñanza tardía medieval) y el estudiantazgo, escogiendo los esquemas básicos de la comedia humanística pero modificándolos sustancialmente» (2008b: 38). Lawrence (1993), cited above, also believed Rojas knew he was creating something very new. Yet, that the complaint about the title came from university readers would mean that they did not accept/understand the ideas of comedic decorum outlined by Donatus or as incorporated in the humanistic comedies. That the concern sprang from more lay readers, not Rojas' academic circle, would seem more likely.

> visión entre el «vulgo» y el «discreto lector».[13] … Entre 1480 y 1680, la construcción de la nueva figura del lector se remitió a una paradoja. Los lectores letrados y doctos, que acogieron las nuevas obras y las nuevas técnicas intelectuales, siguieron fieles a los objetos manuscritos y las prácticas de la oralidad. Al revés, fueron los lectores «populares», que no pertenecían al mundo de los humanistas y que participaban plenamente en una cultura tradicional oral, visual y gestual, a quienes las innovaciones editoriales constituyeron como un nuevo público de lo impreso. (2003: 148–49)

Rojas himself recognized the diversity among his readers. He states that those who express concern over the printed *Comedia* «[da] cada uno sentencia sobre ella a sabor de su voluntad» (Rojas 200); and, as cited above, Rojas acknowledged that different readers make different use of the text through different types of reading. Chartier reiterates that in *Celestina*: «Abilities and expectations are … differentiated according to the highly distinct uses readers make of the same text» (1989: 155).

Lawrance and Chevalier have described readers and readerships in the late 14th through 15th (Lawrance 1985) and into the 16th centuries (Chevalier), and it would seem that the impact of lay literacy clearly played its part in reading the *Comedia*. Chevalier states that: «en la lista de los compradores del libro existe cierto equilibrio entre caballeros cultos y lectores doctos, el mismo equilibrio que hemos observado en el público de la épica» (141), which would indicate a wider sector of the reading public than that of university students and academics. Chevalier discusses how the 16th- and 17th-century writers who mention *Celestina* focus mainly on the character of the bawd and the morality of the literary work —or its lack thereof (162–66). In the first 100 years of *Celestina*'s publication, the range of readers represents a varied social class.

Severin also comments on Rojas' readers:

> some of the ambiguities of Rojas' letter and prologue can be explained by the change of readership. He may well be aware that the text is incendiary if not to say obscene; he commends the didactic aspect to the general reader. When he sees just how ambiguous the text is and how no one can agree about what it means he is frankly appalled. On the one hand he ups the obscenity quotient in his additions to the text, but on the other he has to escape dangerous criticism. A palpable hit was a mixed blessing for a *converso* in early sixteenth-century

13.– With regard to the *pliegos*, Chartier cites the work by Infantes (1992).

> Spain. Rojas could not resist the urge to capitalize on his success, but he took the opportunity to blame the ambiguities of his text on the multifold readers with their many backgrounds and reactions. (200–01)

The Prologue's emphasis on proper reading distances the work from the superficial, licentious interpretation that some readers may take from their reading.

In the readers' reaction to the work, the literary model of the original Papeles and the *Comedia* becomes crucial. Beyond the *Comedia*'s use of character names found in Terentian and humanistic comedies (Pármeno, Calisto, etc.), which bespeak a common lore, the idea of comedy as presenting ordinary people and events (e.g., a world of young lovers and servants and even at times go-betweens) link the Castilian text to comedic form in content as well as rhetoric, as Fraker has discussed (17–66). For those versed in the university curriculum, who knew the comedies, the *Comedia*'s characters, content, and ending would not have caused any serious concern. The author was constructing a comedy, which he assumed the implied readers, most likely an academic group, would read in the manner in which he intended. It would seem the manuscript readers responded to the text in such a way, since at that stage no change in the title occurred. The general reading public of the printed *Comedia*, or at least those who expressed concern, seem unaware of the definition of comedy and did not recognize the embedded structures that would have clued them to read the work as «comedic»: structures such as an ordinary world of ordinary characters, dialogue, asides, and a moral message. As Di Camillo concludes with regard to the printed text's readership: «la ingenuidad de su juicio crítico parece indicar un conocimiento dramatúrgico, adquirido, posiblemente, a través de muy pocas e inciertas lecturas o simplemente de oídas» (2005: 61). They understand comedic form in a less academic and more second-hand manner, which required a happy ending. Di Camillo also maintains that the readers are «grupos de distinta orientación cultural. Carente de modelos dramatúrgicos análogos a los que dieron forma a *La Celestina*, el lector español … asoció la obra con el género literario que mejor conocía, … leyendo la comedia como si fuera efectivamente una novela» (2005: 65). The expectations of the early 16th-century reading public perhaps interpreted the text through the lens of popular farce and focused more on plot, as if they were reading a romance rather than a dramatic text; and their understanding was certainly far removed from that of Roman and humanistic comedies known to university circles.[14] Chartier's (2003) description of manuscript and print-

14.– While I agree with Canet Vallés that the humanistic comedy was known and important in the formulation of *Celestina*, and thus disagree slightly with Di Camillo on that point, I believe Di Camillo's remarks on the readership are important. These readers were not familiar

ed-text readerships, mentioned above, underscores the difference in expectations found between various readers of the *Comedia.* The academic peers that Rojas originally envisioned as his implied readers turned into a larger general public that read the text with different abilities and expectations (Chartier 1989: 155). With the printed text accessible to a greater lay reading public, the author seems to lose control of the work, not just to the printers with their «punturas, poniendo rúbricas o sumarios al principio de cada auto, narrando en breve lo que dentro contenía—una cosa bien escusada según lo que los antiguos scriptores usaron» (201–02) but also to the readers. The general readers of the printed text did not recognize the humanistic form begun by the Antiguo Autor and continued by Rojas and could not understand how the work could be comic. Rojas addressed the complaint —either of his own volition or of the printers'— adjusting the title, as well as adding more acts to extend the plot.

The addition of more material is also a fascinating aspect of Rojas' creation of the *Tragicomedia*. The author tells us that the readers wished to have more content centered on the lovers (Rojas 202–03). The desire for more information on the affair may simply reflect the portion of the plot that most appealed to the audience, or a desire for more information to make Melibea's suicide more believable after the night of love. Palafox speaks to some of these matters, especially with regard to Melibea and Calisto. As she points out, and as will be underscored below, the author responded not so much by prolonging the love interest as by rewriting the plot to encompass a variety of new thematic threads: material that was not essential to the reader's request to extend the «deleyte», which the author say he does «contra mi voluntad» (Rojas 203).[15]

When we examine what was added in the five additional acts, there is only one new episode between the two lovers in Act 19. While this is an important love scene and has more erotic elements than in Act 14 and adds a courtly air, opening with *cancionero* love songs, the amatory interest does not represent a majority of the material in Acts 14–19. By the end of the 21-act work, although the lovers have been together for a month, we do not see too much more of their «deleyte». We do, however, have more insight into Calisto through his soliloquy in Act 14,

with humanistic comedy or the academic forms of comedy and therefore their reaction points to them as non-academic readers who focus more on plot and expect a happy-ever-after ending. Di Camillo's observation regarding MP is also intriguing: that its very initial word «comiença» may suggest a type of farce (2010: 131n71), thus underscoring comedic aspects.

15.– Palafox cites Miguel Martínez (2000: 33) and Stamm (26, 175) as well as other critics who have noted that the additional acts do not necessarily provide more of the love affair that the readers wanted. Rather what is added in the extended time are circumstances pertaining to and surrounding the affair (Palafox 211n4). Palafox shows how the added material provides more information regarding Celestina since, after her death, the characters speak about her and her role in Calisto and Melibea's love. There is also more insight into Calisto and Melibea through their speeches and dialogue in the added acts.

which in addition to his speech from the *Comedia* in Act 13, provides more depth to his character. We also understand more of Melibea's view of love and marriage through her speech in Act 16. Then there is the added intrigue of the two prostitutes Areúsa and Elicia, especially Areúsa who seeks revenge against the young lovers.[16] Yet, overall, it could be said that Rojas did not truly address the readers' request for more information about Calisto and Melibea's love affair. What he principally did was change the cause of Calisto's death from an arbitrary fall (clumsily falling off the ladder) to a death brought about by the prostitutes' vengeful plotting. It is interesting that even a 19th-century bibliographer noted that, in his opinion as reader, the added material lent little to the work, and Bernard Quaritch comments that the *Comedia*, «[the author's] first labour was the best», and «differences of a minor kind, here and there, between the first edition and those that followed, are so numerous that it ought to be reprinted» (*Bibliotheca Hispana. Catalogue of Books in Castilian, Catalan, Portuguese or otherwise of Spanish Interest* [London 1895], 31–32, cited in Di Camillo 2005: 249–50n17).[17] What is interesting in Quaritch's reading of the added acts is that he believes them to be added «not for the better, and protracted the end unnecessarily» (Di Camillo 2005: 250n17). Quaritch is, in effect, one of the «nuevos detractores a la nueva adición» to whom the Prologue alludes (Rojas 203).[18]

If we accept that the Prologue is written by the author and we take him at his word that he adds material to the *Comedia* in reaction to the readers' concerns, and that the material, in addition to interpolations, is the *Tratado de Centurio*, it is notable that the added acts do not seem to center on the readers' wishes that «se alargasse en el processo de su deleyte destos amantes» (Rojas 202–03). Rather the acts provide Rojas the oppor-

16.– See Parrilla on the creation of Areúsa from a mere mention by the Antiguo Autor in Act 1 to her presence, beauty, and strong independence in the *Comedia*, and her role in Calisto's death in the *Tragicomedia*, all of which, in the end, stems from her portrayal in Act 1 and the re-reading and re-writing of the *Comedia*. See also Snow (2005) on how Areúsa's words in Acts 15 and 17 provide additional insights into her character, especially as portrayed in Act 7.

17.– In his description of the 1499(?) edition, Quaritch, in *Bibliotheca Hispana* (1895), compares the *Comedia* to the *Tragicomedia*: «Calisto goes home safe, soliloquieses half remorsefully, and sleeps. New characters are introduced in the substituted fifteenth act, a scheme of vengeance upon Calisto is prepared by the daughter [sic] and friends of Celestina (who had been murdered by her associates in the intrigue); in the sixteenth, there are projects of a marriage for Melibea by her parents; in the seventeenth and eighteenth the vulgar plot is strengthened; in the nineteenth, Calisto is again in Melibea's garden, and the scene of love is repeated more voluptuously than before, as though the author had forgotten the events of the fourteenth act. Then Calisto hears his servants attacked by the bravos, rushes to the wall, falls from the rope-ladder [sic], and is killed. Finally the twentieth and twenty-first acts contain the same matter as the fifteenth and sixteenth of the original edition» (quoted in De Camillo 2005: 250n17).

18.– I am grateful to Professor Joseph Snow for bringing to my attention Quaritch's role as one of the new readers mentioned in the Prologue.

tunity to create a tale with more intrigue and deeper, darker motivations on the part of the secondary characters. True, it also provides further development of principal characters, as mentioned above, but more than anything, it brings to fore secondary characters. There is the appearance of Sosia, who is only mentioned briefly in Act 2, then appears in Act 13 after the death of Sempronio and Pármeno, and becomes pivotal in the *Tragicomedia* as part of Areúsa's plot to seek revenge against Calisto and Melibea. There is Pleberio and Alisa, hardly seen previously, discussing Melibea's possible marriage in Act 16. Tristán, who only appears in Act 13 after Sempronio's and Pármeno's death in the *Comedia* and reappears in Act 19 of the *Tragicomedia*. Then, new secondary characters emerge; e.g., Centurio and the silent, and mostly invisible, Traso.[19]

What is also interesting is that the one character that would become part of the title, Celestina, is not part of the Gran Adición, except in reminiscences of the past. After the deaths in Act 12, the *Comedia* leaves that action fairly much at a close. The fact that Rojas adds the new material after the deaths is striking. He could have added additional love scenes directly after Scene 8 of Act 12, after Calisto's interview with Melibea at her garden gate at midnight. The author could have made the original first night the last night, not the last the first, and in that way increase Celestina's role in the *Tragicomedia*, but he did not. As it stands, while the interpolations and added acts contribute to Celestina's characterization, as Palafox indicates (212–14), in the main the *Tratado de Centurio* focuses on the lovers and, more importantly, highlights the minor players. With the primary exception of the love scene in Act 19, the additional action shifts to the secondary characters or creates new secondary characters.

So although the readers «querían que se alargasse en el processo de su deleyte destos amantes» (Rojas 202–03), the author responds to the request but does not fulfill it *per se*. The *Tratado de Centurio*, with the accentuated role of the prostitutes and their revenge, constructs a clear moral lesson against the «locos enamorados» who become entangled in the «engaños de las alcahuetas» and «malos y lisonjeros sirvientes» (Rojas 205). Noble courtly lovers die as a direct result of their connection with the lower social class, and they fall because of their lack of reason and good judgment and their self-absorption. In the *Tragicomedia*, more than in the *Comedia*, Calisto's association with Celestina and her cohorts brings the young lover to his inevitable death.[20]

19.– On invisible characters, see Deyermond 1997 (on Traso, see pages 25–26 of Deyermond's article).

20.– Lacarra remarks on the increasing importance of the world of prostitution in the *Tragicomedia* and the interpolations, accentuating the prostitutes as well Celestina and Claudina's world and the judge's debt to Calisto and his family (1993: 47–50). Whinnom (1981) includes remarks on Rojas' possible critique of the noble class.

On the one hand, then, the author loses control of the text and is forced to add material that he says he does not wish to add (and which at least one 19th-century reader does not consider an improvement); on the other, upon revising the work, the author takes the opportunity to rewrite it in ways that the readers do not explicitly envision. The question is, then, what does the additional material (Melibea's anti-marriage speech, Calisto's soliloquy, the prostitute's plot, etc.) add to the work? There is no single answer, and as Palafox has suggested, the new acts provide additional insights into both principal and secondary characters; but one clear result is that the two lovers, even more than in the *Comedia*, create their own fall (both literal and figural). Melibea's rejection of marriage on the basis of chivalric, courtly ideals; Calisto's lack of reason in his discourse in Act 14; all highlight morally destructive choices. Ironically, if we look at the academic definition of comedy, with ordinary characters in an ordinary world providing a moral reading, the additions in the *Tragicomedia* make the text even less tragic and more comedic. Centurio himself represents a typical Terentian figure, and the lovers' deaths are more clearly the result of their own ill-thought actions and, thus, carry moral overtones. All this brings us back to comedy and decorum. As Canet Vallés reminds us in his discussion of humanistic comedy vis-à-vis the Papeles del Antiguo Autor and *Celestina*'s manuscript tradition (2007: 35–36), the first act may have been close to a complete work. Humanistic comedies such as *Poliscena* end very quickly after «boy gets girl». There is not much «alargarse el proceso de deleyte» in the humanistic works, which may be one of the reasons the author was «importunado» upon having to extend it. It was not part of the model he had in mind when he continued the Papeles or extended the *Comedia* to the *Tragicomedia*.

Palafox alludes to the idea of comedy at the end of her study: «la concesión que hizo a sus lectores se tradujo en una ampliación de la parte relativa al 'plazer', es decir, de lo que más bien podría considerarse su elemento 'cómico'» (224). She concludes that: «una de las funciones principales de los actos y párrafos añadidos a las versiones de veintiún actos es la de dar más sentido al final trágico de la historia» (224); but more than just adding «plazer», which falls within the realm of the comic, and making the final deaths more believable, the additional acts underscore how the characters, through their own choices, bring about their own demise. There is no arbitrary attack of fortune or undeserved, untimely death. The prostitutes' plotting; Melibea's embracing love without marriage; Pleberio and Alisa's ironic thoughts of marrying Melibea when it is too late; all of these new threads to the plot highlight the characters' choices that lead them into blind inaction (in the case of Pleberio and Alisa), contact with a world of bawds and thugs (in the case of Calisto), or

illicit desire (Calisto and Melibea), all of which will bring them to a sad, but not tragic, end.[21]

While the author changed the title to *Tragicomedia* to appease the readers, he in fact maintained the work as he originally envisioned it as a comedy; and central to it all are Calisto and Melibea, whose fall takes on greater moral dimensions in the 21-act *Tragicomedia*. Although the character of Celestina becomes associated with the title, which as Lawrence indicates may have been an accident of printing, and yet another testament to how printing participated in the creation of *Celestina* as we know it today; and while her name does become part of the Spanish title with the ca. 1518–20 edition, *Libro de Calixto y Melibea y de la puta vieja Celestina*, the author christened his text, as he himself says, *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*.[22] The work was about the young couple, as the title and focus of the added material bears out. The author's nod to the readers' reaction, changing the title to *Tragicomedia*, did not mean that the author accepted the readers' criticisms. Ironically, in the end, the work's comedic form only grew stronger, focused on Calisto and Melibea as well as the prostitutes, in the *Tragicomedia*. The author reacted to his changing readership but stayed true to his original form.

21.– In the last note to the last paragraph of her study, Palafox suggests how the added material explains and points toward the deaths: «Esta idea de entender los actos añadidos como una preparación del desenlace (y en especial de la muerte de Melibea) explicaría el hecho de que en ellos proliferen también los anuncios proféticos de lo que será el final de la obra» (225n18). Palafox cites the work of Shipley, among others, for this conclusion.

22.– See again on the matter of the title Lawrence 1993: 79–82.

Works cited

Actas del Simposio Internacional 1502–2002: Five Hundred Years of Fernando de Rojas' «Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea» (18–19 de octubre de 2002, Departamento de Español y Portugués, Indiana University, Bloomington). (2007). Ed. Juan Carlos Conde. Spanish Series 137. New York: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.

Botta, Patrizia. (1993). «La *Celestina* de Palacio en sus aspectos materiales». *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 73: 25–50.

—. (1997). «El texto en movimiento (De la *Celestina de Palacio* a la *Celestina* posterior)». In *Cinco siglos de Celestina*. 135–59.

—. (2007). «El paso de la *Comedia* a la *Tragicomedia*». In *Actas del Simposio Internacional 1502–2002*. 91–113.

Canet Vallés, José Luis, ed. (1993). *De la comedia humanística al teatro representable*. Col·lecció Oberta. Textos Teatrales Hispánicos del siglo xvi. UNED. Sevilla: U de Sevilla; Valencia: U de València. 11–89.

—. (2007). «*Celestina: 'sic et non'*. ¿Libro escolar-universitario?» *Celestinesca* 31: 23–58.

—. (2008a). «La *Celestina* en la 'contienda' intelectual y universitaria de principios del s. xvi». *Celestinesca* 32: 85–107.

—. (2008b). «Género y dramaturgia en la *Celestina*». *Theatralia. Revista de poética del teatro.* 10: *La dramaturgia de «La Celestina».* Eds. José María Ruano de la Haza y Jesús G. Maestro. Vigo: Editorial Academia del Hispanismo. 27–42.

—. (2010). «La *Celestina* y el paulinismo». In «*De ninguna cosa es alegre posesión sin compañía*». 69-90.

—, ed. (2011). *Comedia de Calisto Melibea*. Textos Parnaseo 14. Valencia: U de València.

Cantalapiedra Erostarbe, Fernando, ed. (2000). Anónimo/Fernando de Rojas. Tragi*comedia de Calisto y Melibea. V centenario: 1499–1999.* 3 vols. Teatro del Siglo de Oro. Ediciones críticas 104. Kassel: Reichenberger.

Casas Homs, José María, ed. (1953). J. de Vallata. *Poliodorus. Comedia humanística desconocida*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto «Nicolás Antonio». 5–170

Castro Guisasola, F. (1973). *Observaciones sobre las fuentes literarias de «La Celestina»*. *Revista de Filología Española* Anejo 5. Rpt. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas

«La Celestina» 1499–1999. Selected Papers from the International Congress in Commemoration of the Quincentennial Anniversary of «La Celestina». New York, November 17–19, 1999. (2005). Eds. Ottavio Di Camillo and John

O'Neill. Spanish Series 133. New York: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.

Chartier, Roger. (1989). «Texts, Printing, Readings». In *The New Cultural History.* Ed. Lynn Hunt. Studies on the History of Society and Culture. Berkeley: U of California P. 154–75.

—. (2003). «El concepto de lector moderno». In *Historia de la edición y de la lectura en España. 1472–1914*. Eds. Víctor Infantes et al. Biblioteca del Libro. Madrid: Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez. 142–49.

Chevalier, Maxime. (1976). «*La Celestina* según sus lectores». In *Lectura y lectores en la España del siglo XVI y XVII*. Madrid: Turner. 138–66.

Cinco siglos de «Celestina»: aportaciones interpretativas. (1997). Eds. Rafael Beltrán and José Luis Canet. Valencia: U de València.

Conde, Juan Carlos. (1997). «El manuscrito II–1520 de la Biblioteca de Palacio y la *Celestina*: balance y estado de la cuestión». In *Cinco siglos de «Celestina».* 161–85.

«De ninguna cosa es alegre posesión sin compañía». Estudios celestinescos y medievales en honor del profesor Joseph Thomas Snow. (2010). Ed. Devid Paolini. Vol. 1: Estudios celestinescos. Spanish Series 144. New York: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.

Deyermond, A.D. (1961). *The Petrarchan Sources of «La Celestina»*. Oxford Modern Languages and Literature Monographs. Oxford: Oxford UP.

—. (1997). «How Many Sisters Had Celestina? The Function of the Invisible Characters». *Celestinesca* 21.1–2: 15–29.

Di Camillo, Ottavio. (2001). «La péñola, la imprenta y la doladera. Tres formas de cultura humanística en la Carta 'El autor a un su amigo' de *La Celestina*». In *Silva. Studia philologica in honorem Isaías Lerner*. Eds. Isabel Lozano-Renieblas and Juan Carlos Mercado. Madrid: Castalia. 111–26.

—. (2005). «Consideraciones sobre *La Celestina* y las instituciones dramatúrgicas del humanismo en lengua vulgar». In *«La Celestina» 1499–1999*. 53–74.

—. (2010). «When and Where Was the First Act of *La Celestina* Composed? A Reconsideration». In «*De ninguna cosa es alegre posesión sin compañía*». 91–157.

Faulhaber, Charles B. (1990). «*Celestina* de Palacio: Madrid, Biblioteca de Palacio, MS 1520». *Celestinesca* 14.2: 3–39.

—. (1991). «*Celestina* de Palacio: Rojas's Holograph Manuscript?» *Celestinesca* 15.1: 3–52.

Fraker, Charles F. (1990). *«Celestina»: Genre and Rhetoric*. Colección Támesis, Serie A, Monografías 138. London: Tamesis.

Garcia, Michel. (1994). «Consideraciones sobre *Celestina* de Palacio». *Celestinesca* 18.1: 3–16.

Holub, Robert C. (1984). *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New Accents. London and New York: Methuen.

Infantes, Víctor. (1992). «Los pliegos sueltos poéticos: constitución tipográfica y contenido literario (1482–1600)». In *En el Siglo de Oro. Estudios y textos de literatura áurea*. Scripta Humanistica 88. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica. 47–58.

Iser, Wolfgang. (1974). *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

—. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

Jauss, Hans Robert. (1982). *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Intro. Paul de Man. Theory and History of Literature 2. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.

Lacarra Lanz, Eukene. (1993). «La evolución de la prostitución en la Castilla del siglo xv y la mancebía de Salamanca en tiempos de Fernando de Rojas». In F*ernando de Rojas and «Celestina»: Approaching the Fifth Centenary*. Eds. Ivy A. Corfis and Joseph T. Snow. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies. 33–78.

—. (2003). *«Ars amandi» vs. «Reprobatio amoris». Fernando de Rojas y «La Celestina».* Biblioteca Crítica de las Literaturas Luso-Hispánicas 4. Problemas Históricos y Estética. Madrid: Ediciones del Orto, U de Minnesota.

Lawrance, J. N. H. (1985). «The Spread of Lay Literacy in Late Medieval Castile». *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 62.1: 79–94.

—. (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*. Eds. Alan Deyermond and Jeremy Lawrance. Llangrannog: Dolphin. 79–92.

Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. (1962). *La originalidad artística de «La Celestina».* Teoría e investigación. Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires.

Lobera Serrano, Francisco J. (1993). «El Manuscrito 1.520 de Palacio y la tradición impresa de *La Celestina*». *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 73: 51–67.

Manuel, Juan. (1971). *El Conde Lucanor o Libro de los enxiemplos del conde Lucanor et de Patronio*. Ed. José Manuel Blecua. Clásicos Castalia 9. 1969. Madrid: Castalia.

Marciales, Miguel, ed. (1985). Fernando de Rojas. *Celestina. Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Prepared by Brian Dutton and Joseph T. Snow. Vol. 1. Illinois Medieval Monographs 1. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P.

Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. (1943). *Orígenes de la novela*. Vol. 3. Madrid-Santander: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas [Aldus]

Michael, Ian. (1991). «*La Celestina* de Palacio: el redescubrimiento del MS. II–1520 (sign. ant. 2.A.4) y su procedencia segoviana». *Revista de Literatura Medieval* 3: 149–61.

Miguel Martínez, Emilio de. (1996). *«La Celestina» de Rojas*. Biblioteca románica hispánica. Estudios y ensayos 398. Madrid: Gredos.

—. (2000). «Melibea en amores: vida y literatura. '*Faltándome Calisto, me falte la vida*'». In *El mundo como contienda: estudios sobre «La Celestina»*. Ed. Pilar Carrasco. *Analecta Malacitana*. Anejo 31 de la *Revista de la Sección de Filología de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras*. Málaga: U de Málaga. 29–66.

Morón Arroyo, Ciriaco. (1994). «*Celestina* and Castilian Humanism at the End of the Fifteenth Century». Occasional Papers 3. Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies. Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies.

Palafox, Eloísa. (2007). «El 'nuevo' mundo sin Celestina: reflexiones en torno a la ética y la estética de los actos añadidos». In *Actas del Simposio Internacional 1502–2002*. 209–25.

Parrilla, Carmen. (1999). «Leyendo a Areúsa». *Ínsula* 633 (Sept): 18–19.

Pisani, Ugolino. (2005). *Philogenia and Epiphebus*. Ed. and Trans. Gary R. Grund. *Humanist Comedies*. I Tatti Renaissance Library. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 170–283.

Rojas, Fernando de. (1991). *Comedia o tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*. Ed. Peter E. Russell. Clásicos Castalia 191. Madrid: Castalia.

Russell, Peter E., ed. (1991). Rojas. 11–178.

Severin, Dorothy Sherman. (2005). «*Celestina*'s Audience, from Manuscript to Print». In *«La Celestina» 1499–1999*. 197–205.

Shipley, George A. (1973–74). «*Non erat hic locus*; the Disconcerted Reader in Melibea's Garden». *Romance Philology* 27.3: 286–303.

Snow, Joseph T. (1993). «Fernando de Rojas as First Reader: Reader-Response Criticism and *Celestina*». In *Studies on Medieval Spanish Literature in Honor of Charles F. Fraker*. Eds. Mercedes Vaquero and Alan Deyermond. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1995. 245–58.

—. (2005). «Lo teatral en *Celestina*: el caso de Areúsa». In *«La Celestina» 1499–1999*. 207–17.

Stamm, James R. (1988). *La estructura de «La Celestina». Una lectura analítica*. Acta Salmanticensia. Estudios Filológicos 204. Salamanca: U de Salamanca.

Vergerio, Pier Paolo. (2005). *Paulus*. Ed. and Trans. Gary R. Grund. *Humanist Comedies*. I Tatti Renaissance Library. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 2–69.

Whinnom, Keith. (1981). «Interpreting *Celestina*. The Motives and the Personality of Fernando de Rojas». In *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies on Spain and Portugal in Honour of P. E. Russsell*. Eds. F. W. Hodcroft et al. Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literatures. 53–68. Rpt. in *Medieval and Renaissance Spanish Literature. Selected Essays*. Eds. Alan Deyermond et al. Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1994. 176–90.

—. (1993). «The Form of *Celestina*: Dramatic Antecedents». Ed. Alan Deyermond. *Celestinesca* 17.2: 129–46.

Corfis, Ivy A., «Readers and Comedy in *Celestina*», *Celestinesca* 37 (2013), pp. 27-48.

RESUMEN

Este artículo investiga el papel de los lectores en la continuación de la *Comedia* a la *Tragicomedia*. Se analiza el género de comedia a base de varias preguntas: ¿quiénes eran los lectores?; ¿cómo reaccionó el autor a la crítica de los lectores de la *Comedia*?; y ¿qué impacto tenían los lectores en la *Tragicomedia*? La conclusión que propone el artículo es que no sólo la *Comedia* sino la *Tragicomedia* forman parte del género cómico, según las formulaciones de la comedia romana y la humanística.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Celestina*, comedia humanística, lectores.

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the readers' role in the *Comedia*'s continuation as *Tragicomedia*, posing the questions: who were the readers?; how did the author react to the readers' response as he continued the *Comedia* as the *Tragicomedia*?; and what impact did the readers have on the work? Evidence would point not only to the *Comedia* but also the *Tragicomedia* as comedy, in the style of the late Roman and humanistic genre.

KEY WORDS: *Celestina*, humanistic comedy, readers.