

CELESTINESCA

EDITOR'S NOTE

The November 1984 number of Celestinesca was a festnummer, "In Honor of Stephen Gilman," prepared by guest editor (and former Harvard student of Prof. Gilman's) Dorothy S. Severin. Stephen Gilman was then about to retire from his teaching post, had published a significant work on Galdós and was at work on a major study of Cervantes. He was, of course, famous in Celestina criticism for several articles and his two major critical studies, The Art of LC (Madison, 1956) and The Spain of Fernando de Rojas (Princeton, 1972), both later translated into Spanish. His views on the dialogic structure of the work--and its consequences--and his approach to the man Rojas and his environment, were painstaking, important and, sometimes, controversial views. It is with sadness that we note that Stephen Gilman passed away in Cambridge, Massachusetts on November 26, 1986. He had recently made a trip to Spain to participate in a homage in Valladolid for Miguel Delibes and had, in the previous month, finished the study on Cervantes (now to be published posthumously). Celestinesca will have a memorial piece on Prof. Gilman in the next issue. We regret his passing for, as so aptly put by Rafael Lapesa, "el hispanismo no fue para él mera profesión ni motivo de frias disquisiciones: sintió intensamente el drama histórico de España, tomó partido en él, y exaltó como pocos las excelencias de las grandes creaciones literarias hispanas" (ABC, December 6, 1986, p. 48).

As far as this issue of Celestinesca goes, it marks the beginning of our second decade. Our commitment to the broadest possible coverage, and the highest quality for the least expenditure, will remain a top priority. We now have official agents for accepting subscriptions in pesetas and pounds sterling (see the inside cover of this issue). The death of Keith Whinnom reduced our "corresponsales" but, beginning with the Fall 1987 issue, Ivy Corfis (University of Pennsylvania) will be joining us, adding her expertise in the critical areas of the sentimental romance and the Celestina comentada (its legal learning) to our board of readers.

I think it augers well for the health of Celestinesca that, with the exception we need make for my own contributions (the PREGONERO and the bibliographical supplement), all the contributors to this debut number of our second decade are new to the pages of this journal. Another curious note is the number of reviews of works on or related to "la celestinesca". For a rather long period most of the new work on Celestina was being shared in the form of articles and monographic studies. A look at the "publications" subsection of the PREGONERO, at the reviews on pp. 41-53 (and I have 4 others assigned), will show that longer studies are in favor. There has been increased activity also in terms of Celestina translations and growing interest in the theatrical aspects of the work. And there is no telling what new

studies the Estudio crítico of Miguel Marciales might foment as time goes by.

I will draw the reader's attention to a few items in this number. First is the very useful (and, I think, correct) assessment of the role that the Spanish translation by Pero Díaz de Toledo of the sententiae of Seneca plays in the structure and configuration of the dialogues of Act IV: the collaboration of B. Riss Dubno and J. K. Walsh has brought this to light. The second study presented, on the use of asides in Celestina, by Chantal C. Moudoud, attempts to show that the asides, which have been shown to function as comic, or didactic, or as indicators of realism, also are used by Rojas to advance the plot, that is, they function dynamically.

The third major piece in this issue is the review-article on the response of Miguel Marciales to Stephen Gilman's The Spain of Fernando de Rojas [1972]. In his reflections on this little-read--because not-widely-circulated--work by Marciales, Nicholas Round brings to bear his erudition as a student of both Spanish literature and history as well as an uncommon grasp of what Gilman and Marciales understood as readers of Celestina, in order to illuminate for us some of the major issues in Celestina criticism today.

I want also to mention the letter that is reproduced on pages 21-23. It was sent to me--for the Celestina archives I am building--by Prof. McPheeters, who thought it unusually insightful and--given its range of topics--concise. I too, thought it fascinating, this recapture of a moment in time. Then it occurred to me that 1962 was exactly 25 years ago! When María Rosa Lida de Malkiel ushered into print her great La originalidad de 'La Celestina' in 1962, it was the product of very long--and frequently interrupted--period of reflection and reading [see Y. Malkiel, Celestinesca 6 ii [Fall 1982]: 3-13]. This letter, written some five years earlier, reminds us keenly, once again, of the invaluable contribution her magnum opus has made: I thought it would make a singularly appropriate way of recognizing its first quarter century.

Once again in closing, I want to thank all the readers and friends of this journal who keep sending me materials, either for publication or for my growing archives on Celestina matters. Much of this gets disseminated in these pages and becomes part of the new public record. I trust they, and others, will continue to perform this act of collegiality and friendship. All comments, communications, and recommendations can be sent to the editorial address of Celestinesca at any time.

Joseph Snow
Joseph Snow