

CELESTINESCA

Celestina. Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea por Fernando de Rojas. Estudio preliminar, notas y vocabulario de Regula Rohland de Langbehn. Buenos Aires: Ed. Abril, 1984. Paper, 309 pp. (Clásicos Huemul, 41).

Many are the student editions that appear--or are re-edited--each year, and some detailed account of them has been made, an account shortly to be augmented.⁵⁵ As frequently happens in ventures destined for consumption by the general populace, these "ediciones estudiantiles" will borrow the best features of previous editions, with one or two small innovations of format, design and even, though it happens less frequently than it ought to, with really new and valuable adjustments to the ways in which the new reading audience will view the work. Thus, the Clásicos Castellanos two-volume edition still is in wide circulation, not so much for the notes provided by its editor, J. Cejador y Frauca (badly in need of updating), but more because the texts used for the edition (Burgos 1499 and Valencia 1514) have proven time and time again to be the more trustworthy. A more "correct" edition (in modernized Spanish) is in Dorothy S. Severin's Alianza volume, with its introduction by Stephen Gilman, first printed in 1969 but re-issued at last count some eleven times. It has fewer notes but is more up-to-date and is therefore also in wide circulation. With more notes and a fuller bibliographical coloration reflected in them, is the edition prepared by Humberto López Morales (Planeta, 1976; also reissued subsequently); this edition treats the printing of the text more conservatively.

This new *Celestina*, while it seems destined for the local Argentine market, and perhaps a wider Latin American market beyond that, merits attention as I believe that it reflects a certain amount of all the new activity taking place that will affect the future reception of Rojas' work. First things first: the title is *Celestina*, a voluntary return to the common practice of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions in Spanish,⁵⁶ as convincingly demonstrated by Keith Whinnom (*Celestinesca*

⁵⁵ In "Un cuarto de siglo de interés en LC, 1949-76: Documento bibliográfico," *Hispania* 59 (1976), 610-660. Others have been noted in regular bibliographical supplements, since 1977, appearing in *Celestinesca*. These editions, and others dating back to 1930 (and earlier ones that were re-issued in the target years 1930-1985) will all be incorporated into one conjoined section of a book-length conflation of all these sources, to be ready for the printers by the end of summer, 1985.

4, ii, 1980: 19-21). The editor generously recognizes the role this journal has played recently in *Celestina* studies, takes into account all of the relevant recent bibliographic surveys (Schizzano Mandel, Siebenmann, Snow-Schneider-Lee) which many "modern" editions fail to do, even as a reader service, and alludes, I think for the first time, to the forthcoming critical study and edition of *Celestina* (2 vols) by Miguel Marciales, a work which promises to be one of the most innovative and controversial items in "la celestinesca" to see the light of day in the past decade.⁵⁷ Too, while other editions still blindly speak of the Criado de Val-Trotter *Tragicomedia* edition (1965 and ss.) as being of Seville 1502, almost twenty years after F. J. Norton showed that it was Seville, 1518-20, Rohland de Langbehn realizes that it forms part of a group of Cromberger texts from a later period (although her memory fails her when she identifies it as 1511, pp. 9, 26, 27). The rest of the introductory essay is very up-to-date with current scholarship but is wisely limited to what a first-time reader might profitably want to know, i.e., topics that will affect the reading of the text at hand. Here, as in the notes, there is a clear preference for information on "sources" or earlier occurrences of ideas, *sententiae* that have entered into Rojas' compositional scheme. The selected bibliography, while admitted by the editor to be insufficient for reasons not of her own making, reflects mostly works published in the 1970s and early 1980s, but includes as well some earlier "monuments."

My purpose here is not to comment on the edition--for which generous acknowledgement is paid to Severin--or the notes (debts also acknowledged) for, as often happens, the editor has been betrayed by her printers. What is praiseworthy here is the move to present the edition, yes, as a "clásico español," but also to orient the general reader, student or not, to a more current state of affairs in terms of the critical work lavished on *Celestina* by scholars from around the world. My own preference for an "ideal" edition to use in the classroom would be one better printed than this but which, like it, has a timely and forward-looking point of view in its *presentación* of the text.

J. T. Snow

University of Georgia

⁵⁶ Some of the foreign-language translations from this period, however, did begin to use the article with the name of the bawd in the title (unlike the Spanish printings which first picked up on this "modern" usage with León Amarita's edition of 1822). See the forthcoming study of the titles of Rojas' work, to appear in *Celestinesca* (Fall 1985): Erna Ruth Berndt-Kelley, "Peripecias de un título: En torno al nombre de la obra de Fernando de Rojas."

⁵⁷ To appear in *Medieval Monographs*, a new series from the University of Illinois Press, and expected now in Autumn of 1985.