

CELESTINA SECUNDUM LITEM: MIGUEL MARCIALES'
CARTA A STEPHEN GILMAN

NICHOLAS G. ROUND
University of Glasgow

Miguel Marciales, Sobre problemas rojanos y celestinescos [Carta al Dr. Stephen Gilman a propósito del libro The Spain of Fernando de Rojas]. Mérida: Universidad de los Andes, 1983. 169 pp.

Miguel Marciales' death in 1980 tragically interrupted the Venezuelan scholar's emergence as the major presence in international debate about Celestina which his depth of knowledge had long entitled him to be. Neither the major critical edition, then beginning to be known, nor its accompanying Estudio crítico was yet available to the public at large. A foretaste of the latter was provided by the Carta al Profesor Stephen Gilman, which had circulated privately since 1973, and was published in a much amplified, though not vastly more accessible form two years later. It is this latter text which now reappears. An assessment of what Celestina studies had lost by the death of Marciales was published in Celestinesca 5 by that most distinguished of his advocates and admirers, the late Keith Whinnom--and who is there left now to bend that bow?¹

It can be no matter of coincidence--though nobody, so far as I know, has tried to trace what the connections are--that the list of Celestina scholars contains more than its share of large personalities: Castro, Bataillon, Gilman, Whinnom, Russell... Whatever else we may make of Marciales' work, he is sure of his place in that company. Not, by his earliest formation, a professional of Spanish literature, the insights which he brought to bear were first and foremost those of a great reader of Celestina. But his reading was informed by a widely-stocked erudition--sometimes oddly proportioned, yet seldom incomplete--and by reflection, often idiosyncratic, on a world which he experienced as co-terminous with Rojas' own. "Simples y vulgares razones geográficas o topográficas de nacimiento y crianza" (p. 128) is his phrase for the latter element, but his putting it that way was the merest topos of modesty. In practice he speaks confidently, polemically, at times wilfully, out of his own wide experience of letters and of life. The tone which results from this, despite very obvious differences of both rhetoric and subject-matter, is reminiscent of the late Robert Graves, addressing questions of mythology or classical scholarship. It is not always an easy voice to accommodate, but it is not one which we can prudently ignore.

The origins of this particular work lend it a further interest. It began as a commentary on Stephen Gilman's Spain of Fernando de Rojas.² As a piece of historical reconstruction, that book seemed to a number of us at the time to be open to various objections. As an incitement to think about Rojas and his age, and to think about them together, it has done its work, arguably, at least as well as would the

kind of book which we then wished that Gilman had written. When we seek, with the hindsight of a decade and more, to evaluate not now Gilman's contribution as such, but the debates which it made possible, Marciales must be one of our crucial witnesses. His response to The Spain of Fernando de Rojas is sometimes one of sharp dissent. "Hay que decir las cosas con cierto brío," he says, (p. 128) and he certainly lives up to that. But he is also impelled to offer some well-judged alternative views, and some boldly creative, if still unproven hypotheses of his own.

On the vexed matter of what Rojas' converso background meant for his writing, Marciales actually stands closer to Gilman than to the general run of the latter's critics. He does not doubt that the Inquisition could and did achieve the sort of totalitarian sway which must impinge at every point on the life of the New Christian (pp. 80-81). He is perfectly disposed to read quite large parts of the text of Celestina as barbed and sardonic commentary on this state of affairs (pp. 82-89). And he fiercely outdoes Gilman in his dismissal of those "espoliques...del Santo Oficio" (p. 101) who would water down the history of Spanish antisemitism, or those other "cosacos de la ortodoxia" (p. 95) who, on the strength of Rojas' apologetic verses, would pass him off as a pious and committed Catholic believer.

This outlook tends to foster--again in exaggerated form--a contrast which is, in some measure, evident in Gilman's work too. Both critics are sharply aware of the converso issue, and notably well-informed about its many implications; in both cases the wider historical context which gives this information its meaning is less clearly seen. Marciales, indeed, can go quite seriously astray in matters of general historical judgment. He depends too heavily on traditional stereotypes: Enrique IV as a Bad King (p. 87); Fernando the Catholic, the unscrupulous Machiavellian prince, contrasted with pious Isabel (pp. 92-93); Archbishop Talavera--puritan but no bigot--somewhat unfairly bracketed with the "rabinos bautizados," Cisneros and Torquemada (p. 96). His wider-ranging assertions can be disturbingly wild in character. Was the heyday of the statutes of limpieza, though admittedly "asfixiante" (p. 123), so decisively worse than the early Inquisitorial years, through which Rojas had to live? Did Castile in this period really lack "todo lo que justifica la vida humana" (p. 114)? When a Latin-American describes the age of European expansion as "la exportación al resto del pobre planeta Tierra del engaño, el perjurio, el robo y el asesinato" (p. 106), it is for the rest of us to take notice. But we are still unlikely to find it the most fruitful of perspectives from which to confront and interpret the history of Europe in the years around 1500.

When dealing with the conversos, by contrast, Marciales does justice to a number of specific points which are all too often overlooked: the genuineness of Pablo de Santa Maria's conversion (p. 107); the millenarian element in fifteenth-century pogroms (ibid); the fact that the doctrinal purging of conversos, far from promoting their assimilation among other Christians, actually impeded that process (p. 110); the relevance of tax-exemption to the pursuit of hidalgo status (p. 115). This same localized sureness of touch makes Marciales less

willing than Gilman to entertain the notion that Rojas' true father was a Toledan Judaizer, also Fernando de Rojas, condemned to the stake in 1488. The evidence for this--the unsupported testimony of a prosecutor in much later limpieza proceedings--is thin in itself. And the story has other implausibilities. It is hard to see how it can be made compatible with the better-attested link between Rojas and the Toledan family of Franco (p. 126), or with the Jewish and converso custom--consistently followed in the Rojas family--of not naming sons after their own fathers (pp. 117-18). As the son of such a victim, moreover, Rojas would not have been allowed to hold public office as he later did (p. 127). Nor could his family, whose property would have fallen automatically forfeit, have paid for his studies at Salamanca (p. 126). Certain counter-arguments are still possible. Inquisitorial confiscations were not always carried through: it did not happen, for example, in the well-known case--admittedly not a capital one--of Rojas' father-in-law (p. 80). And if Marciales himself is right in placing the year of Rojas' birth a decade or so earlier than the date commonly accepted (p. 36), then he could have attended university before the 1488 condemnation. Even so, the balance of the arguments in this area seems to lie with Marciales.

Once that is conceded, his wider dissent from the account given by Gilman of Rojas' probable outlook comes to seem convincing enough. Both Rojas and his neighbors must have been aware of what his lineage was, and of what that meant in their society. But if we reject Gilman's suggestion about his parentage, we are bound to see Rojas' awareness of these matters as less poignant, and theirs as less menacing. The conversion of the Rojas family, it would seem, might well have gone back three or four generations (p. 111). It becomes correspondingly harder, then, to think with Gilman of a long lifetime of self-camouflage, masking either Jewish belief or skeptical despair. Instead, we are invited to consider the possibility that the question of religion as such may not even have been of the first importance to Rojas (p. 95). The text of Celestina--anticlerical, often equivocal, but never directly heretical (p. 90)--might seem compatible with such a cool indifference. Marciales, who envisages the Bachiller as a member of the converso intellectual circle associated with the royal court (pp. 92, 94), suggests that his true passion may have been political: the manifest destiny of Castile, or loyalty to Queen Isabel (p. 96). It was, perhaps, the death in 1497 of the Infante Juan, a few weeks after his teenage marriage to Margaret of Austria, which moved Rojas to write, in that same city of Salamanca, in deep and skeptical dispraise of human love (pp. 41-42; 96).

These are, for the most part, reasonable conjectures, but they are little more than that. We might well agree that Rojas' religious attitude is unlikely to have matched any of the more obviously available polarities: believing or unbelieving, Catholic or marrano. But recent treatments of the converso issue, like the "theological approach" advocated by John Edwards, might offer more likely profiles for Rojas than the political zealot envisaged by Marciales.³ As for the sudden death of the Infante, nobody who was in Salamanca at the time could escape the resulting sense of shock and loss. Celestina's bleakness of outlook could very well owe something to this mood. But when

contemporaries interpreted the Prince's death as a sign of the perils of love, they had in mind specifically the hazards to health supposedly attendant on early marriage.⁴ However tragic its outcome, this royal union, duly blessed by the Church, can hardly have been the direct occasion of Celestina's warning against extramarital blasphemy and bawdry. The Infante's "muerte de amor," if such it was, is not convincingly figured either in Calisto's accidental death or in Melibea's suicide.

It might be added that the attempt to prove a textual link with Juan del Encina's Epicedio a la dolorosa muerte del principe is unconvincing (pp. 40-41): where Encina clearly follows Valerius Maximus, the wording of Rojas' Act XXI⁵ can be fully accounted for in terms of its Petrarchan source.⁶ This does not, of course, invalidate Marciales' placing of Rojas among writers of broadly related outlook and overlapping experience (pp. 42-44). The overlap may have less to do with a converso background than is implied here--Whinnom's doubts about Diego de San Pedro are a case in point⁷--but the literary context is surely the right one. It is with Encina and San Pedro, with Cota and Pulgar and Fray Iñigo de Mendoza that Rojas belongs. But that perception carries no necessary corollaries for his life-history. When Marciales contends that Rojas was actually of an age with Encina (p. 39), and had spent the years between graduation and writing Celestina mainly at court, before returning to Salamanca (p. 18), he is taking a further step in the direction of pure conjecture.

He is led to do so less through anything which is known about Rojas' circumstances than through his own experiences in reading the text. He contends that "todas las reminiscencias en el texto de Rojas tiene [sic] cierta pátina de años" (p. 29). He can show by experiment that the claim to have completed the Comedia in "quince días de unas vacaciones" [DSS, 36] is most unlikely to have been true (pp. 30-32); the image of a Rojas still in his student days is, he argues, inseparable from that claim (p. 33). Above all, he insists that the Comedia "no es obra de un aprendiz" (p. 36). Yet the first of these arguments is wholly subjective. The second is logically flawed. If Rojas was not a student, certainly, it would be less appropriate--though not quite out of the question--to think of him as writing the Comedia in "unas vacaciones". But a Rojas who took longer than a fortnight to do it could perfectly well have been a student or--as his introductory Carta seems rather to imply--a fairly recent graduate. Marciales' third argument, indeed, might find an echo with a great many readers; yet the case has been made for seeing Rojas as still, in some respects, immature.⁸

Nor is Marciales uniformly convincing in his suggestions as to how an older Rojas might have occupied his time since graduation. It is, for example, doubtful whether he spent any of it reading the Archpriest of Hitá (p. 38), of whose influence his own work offers no significant trace, or studying the "imitaciones ya en castellano de las comedias humanísticas" (ibid), of which there were probably none in existence. The incomplete Act I of Celestina is likely, as Jeremy Lawrance has observed, to have been the very first.⁹ The evidence for Rojas as translator--presumably within this period--of Aeneas Sylvius' Historia

de Duobus Amantibus (pp. 44-48) does not go beyond similarities of style.¹⁰ Marciales himself remarks, rather wistfully, that any documentary evidence on this point "sería de mucha importancia" (p. 48). But the fact remains that there is no record whatever of Rojas' presence or activities either at Salamanca or about the court during the supposedly missing years.¹¹ Marciales' hypotheses, as he is able to prove, are not contradicted by any of the known facts about Rojas' marriage and later life. But they are not confirmed by any of that evidence either.

Much the same might be said of the claim that two pictures appearing alongside the words "el autor" in the Valencia edition of 1518 are actual portraits of Rojas himself (pp. 22-26). The assumption is that he had gone to Valencia to visit his sister-in-law (who certainly lived there), and that an engraver working for the printer Juan Jofré made these likenesses of a man perhaps in his forties, robed as a lawyer or magistrate, and carrying his wand of office. In the next Valencia printing (1529) the two corresponding pictures show a much younger man, dressed as a student. The changes, Marciales believes, were made because Rojas was unhappy about the publication of his true likeness. The hypothesis here will cover some otherwise baffling data, but doubts remain. Why should this magistrate of Talavera have had his picture drawn, complete with official robes and vara, in a city so far removed from his own jurisdiction? Why, having done so, should he have been at pains to suppress the portrait? Did he, in fact, visit Valencia in 1517-18 at all? Marciales, when all is said, offers no positive evidence to that effect (pp. 24; 131).

There is, as might be expected, a more solid foundation to those sections where Marciales deals directly with early editions of Celestina. Here his unique depth of knowledge lends a special authority to his views. He accepts the priority over other surviving editions of the Burgos 1499 Comedia, though he identifies certain passages in this as additions to an earlier--possibly manuscript--state of the text (pp. 141; 155). He makes a basic division of early printings into a "Valencian" and a "Cromberger" group--the latter covering Sevillian, Italian, and certain other editions (p. 26). His detailed list (pp. 155-162) includes nine conjectural items, and much useful comment on the relationships of the 33 others surveyed up to 1541.¹² Yet the total import of all this is still oddly provisional--a mere suggestion of what was to go into the critical edition. It does not even enable us to reconstruct Marciales' own stemma. Reasons of space, no doubt, played their part in this, but the impression remains that Marciales, at this stage, did not wish to disclose more.

About the development of the text towards its completed state he is more forthcoming, though his justification of some claims is postponed, pending a fuller treatment in the Estudio crítico. He does not explain, for example, why he is so certain (pp. 18; 77) that the initial fragment continued by Rojas was the work of Rodrigo Cota, and that this incomplete original extended down to the end of the second speech in Act II [DSS, 74]. But the first of these views is both traditional and colourable; nor is it difficult to find arguments of textual coherence in favour of the second. Much more controversial is

Marciales' attitude towards the additional material of the Tragicomedia. For him the essential Celestina is Rojas' expansion of the original fragment into the 16-act Comedia (p. 77); the greater part of what is added in the 21-act version is inferior work, and by another hand (p. 49). In broad terms, this echoes the view taken years ago by Julio Cejador, and rejected by most critics since, on a variety of counts.¹³ Chief among these is the author's statement in the prologue to the Tragicomedia that he has added to the text himself "en el proceso de su deleite de estos amantes" [DSS, 43-44]. This claim would appear to be confirmed by the imaginative quality of some of the additional matter (Act XVI; the garden-scene), and by Gilman's analysis of the Arguments. It has been shown by other scholars that the Tragicomedia is a homogenous text in matters such as verb-usage and Petrarchan quotation. It is a formidable array of objections which Marciales has to meet, and he meets it with a wholly characteristic mixture of resourceful distinctions and provocative argument.

He accepts, in the first place, that the extension of the love-story was, indeed, Rojas' own work. The prologue refers specifically to this (p. 48), and its emphasis is confirmed in the title given to the Italian Tragicomedia of 1506: "novamente aggiuntovi quello che fin a qui mancava nel processo de loro innamoramento" (p. 50). This element, as it happens, covers all the main literary highlights of the Tragicomedia additions. Yet most of the new matter is not concerned with the lovers, but with Celestina's prostitutes, Calisto's servants, and the braggart Centurio. This too finds its acknowledgment in an early tradition of Tragicomedia titles: "nuevamente añadido el Tratado de Centurio" (p. 51). Marciales attributes this latter element not to Rojas, but to the author responsible for Celestina's last and least convincing textual accretion, the Auto de Traso (pp. 69-78).¹⁴ This first appears as an interpolated Act XIX in the Toledo edition of 1526, though Marciales deduces that there must have been an earlier edition in this form, also published in Toledo, in 1515 or a little earlier. The Auto de Traso is presented there as being "sacado de la comedia que ordenó Sanabria," and it is this "comedy" which Marciales identifies as the original of the Tratado de Centurio. He accounts for the continuity of linguistic habit in the Tragicomedia by assuming that Rojas and Sanabria were of much the same age and came from the same area (p. 52)--an assumption which may readily be granted, given that we know nothing whatever about this Sanabria.¹⁵ Other Rojas-like features in the Centurio material can be explained by supposing that Rojas undertook some cursory revisions of Sanabria's text (p. 50). As for the case in favour of undivided authorship which Gilman deduced from his study of the Arguments, that too can be refuted if it can be shown that the additional Arguments were not by Rojas after all. Marciales contends that they were not: he argues that they are too inconsequential and too linguistically inept even to be the work of Sanabria (pp. 64-69).

On this basis he offers his own reconstruction of events (pp. 48-51; 143). The first Celestina to depart significantly from the 16-act Comedia was a Salamanca edition, now lost, of 1502 or 1503. This embodied all those changes made by Rojas in the Comedia text which were to find their way into the tradition of Tragicomedia printings. It also completed the "proceso" of the love-affair by introducing three

additions of greater substance. In Act XIV, instead of Calisto falling to his death, the text now continued, as in the Tragicomedia, to the end of his long soliloquy [DSS, 196]. There followed what is now Act XVI, and then--though probably not as a separate act--that part of Act XIX which begins with Calisto's entry into the garden [DSS, 200]. The two concluding acts made up a 17-act Celestina--the only version to reflect Rojas' own conception of the work in its expanded form. At this point Sanabria appeared with his Tratado de Centurio, a continuous text with a strongly-defined "estructura retabular" (p. 144). It encompassed seven brief scenes: a conversation between Sosia and Tristán (now the conclusion of Act XIV); the present Act XV; a comic scene, now lost, of Centurio in the brothel; the seduction of Sosia (now Act XVII); the present Act XVIII; the Auto de Traso; finally, the opening scene of Act XIX, with Tristán and Sosia again (pp. 49; 75; 144). Rojas, attracted by the lively caricature of Centurio, took over most of this, but not the brothel-scene or its companion-piece, the Auto de Traso. He went on to insert his already-existing Act XVI in its present place, and to add a few other touches of his own, including sentences in Acts XV and XVII from a favourite source, the Index to his Latin Petrarch of 1496 (p. 54). The printers supplied the extra Arguments, Rojas himself a new prologue, and the resulting volume made its appearance in 1504, in either Salamanca (p. 143) or Toledo (p. 156), as the editio princeps of the Tragicomedia. In the lost Toledo edition of 1515 or thereabouts the Auto de Traso was reunited with the rest of Sanabria's material.

It is a coherent account, and not easily refuted. Some phases of its argument, like Marciales' bibliographical proof of the existence of the lost Toledo edition (pp. 70-74), are impressive. Others seem rather more doubtful. The alleged symmetry of the Tratado de Centurio is largely an illusion, based as it is on a third scene that is wholly suppositious, and a flawed correspondence between the two halves of the piece.¹⁶ Once that aspect is questioned, the separate existence of the Tratado seems less obviously a fact. It may not have seemed so to Rojas either: it is in the Valencian editions, with which he is thought to have had most to do, that the very phrase Tratado de Centurio disappears from the work's title (p. 51). Marciales' explanation for this is that Rojas wanted to conceal the separate status of this material. But it makes just as much sense to think that, having written it himself, he saw no reason for treating it as separate at all. Again, if he was concerned to raise Sanabria's tone by inserting a few sentences from Petrarch, why did he not address himself to the Tratado's other blemishes--which, according to Marciales, are many and blatant? It is, if anything, simpler to suppose that these alleged flaws were, for good or ill, Rojas' own work. Above all, one is bound to ask why the 17-act Celestina, unlike either the Comedia or the Tragicomedia, should have left no direct trace of its existence. One straightforward answer to that would be that it never did exist.

Of course, Marciales was not obliged to offer proof of his hypotheses; argument about Celestina is seldom like that. But it is still worth asking what evidence made him think it necessary to offer a hypothetical account in these terms, and how compelling or otherwise that necessity in fact is. In the event, it is his reflective experience as a reader of the Centurio material which seems to have

disposed him against accepting it as genuine. The outcome of that experience is offered to us here in two distinct but related forms. There are general statements about the analyses which he has made of vocabulary and sentence-making in Celestina (pp. 12; 48; 50). And there is a mass of more specific comment on those passages which he regards as suspect (pp. 53-69). Within the restricted compass of this book he is able to offer little more than a few summaries of his more general findings; it is scarcely possible, then, to arrive at any definitive view of them. They will, presumably, have both the force and the vulnerability of all such stylistic and statistical approaches; as such, they will be more or less reliable according to the quality of Marciales' more detailed critical discrimination. That quality is more directly attested by his more localized comments on the Tratado de Centurio and its Arguments. A closer examination of these establishes his view of the Tratado as tenable, but hardly inescapable.

He argues, for instance, that these additions cannot be attributed to Rojas because of their inexplicable "inversion" of the characters of Elicia and Areusa, their failure to develop the figure of Crito from Act I, and their contradictory time-scheme (p. 52). Yet Rojas' 16-act Comedia itself anticipates all these faults--if that is what they are. There is similar "inversion" of roles in Pármeno's development from being Sempronio's moral superior to outdoing him in cynicism and rash aggression. There is a total neglect of Crito. And the time-scheme--though arguably to some creative purpose--is notoriously at odds with itself. Marciales also makes much of Elicia's curse in Act XI [DSS, 201] which seems to anticipate details of the garden-scene, as this was finally revised by Rojas (pp. 52-53). He argues from this that Rojas could not have written the curse unless he had already revised Act XIX, or--just as improbably--unless he knew "de memoria" what he was going to write when he did revise it. But none of this follows: a general notion of what he meant to do would have served Rojas just as well.

In addition to these broader objections, Marciales takes issue with more than forty specific expressions in the Tratado de Centurio which he regards as "chuecas y tuertas" (p. 53), and hence as incompatible with Rojas' authorship. He also castigates a score of items from the Arguments on broadly similar grounds. Clearly, a point-by-point discussion of all these comments would be out of the question here; only a handful of fairly representative examples can be reviewed. Yet even these will be enough to show that the case about authorship is very far from being closed. For all Marciales' vast and wide-ranging linguistic experience, a number of his objections can still be contested on grounds of language alone:

Act XV [DSS, 200]: "vian la fe quebrada de su mayor esperanza."

Marciales (p. 53) regards this as both vacuous and stylistically offensive. Yet the meaning of "promise" for fe--not too uncommon in the fifteenth century--at least offers a clear enough sense.

Act XVII [DSS, 211]: "no querría verte morir mal logrado como a tu compañero."

The use of a here, indicating a personal direct object, leads Marciales (p. 55) to protest that this is as if Areusa had herself been present at the execution. But this is gratuitous; ver in this figurative sense is commonplace enough.

Act XVIII, Argument [DSS, 213]: "escúsase, como en el proceso parece."

Marciales (p. 67), observing that Centurio has no excuses to offer, concludes that whoever wrote the Arguments could not handle the Latinism excusar. Yet the same use appears in the text (p. 217): "quiero pensar cómo me excusaré".

Other passages turn out to be defensible in terms of the fiction itself:

Act XV [DSS, 200]: "Ya oíste dezir, hermana, los amores de Calisto..."

This, says Marciales (p. 53), is to talk as if Areusa knew nothing of events so far. But there is a good practical reason why she should need to be brought up to date on what has been going on: unlike Elicia, she has not been living under Celestina's roof.

Act XVIII [DSS, 215]: "Todo el negocio de sus amores sé..."

Marciales enquires (p. 62) why, if Centurio knows so much already, Areusa has had to pump Sosia for information. To this there are some obvious answers: Centurio is not a reliable source; also, she needed specific details of time and place. That her information about Calisto's "dos moços" does not appear to derive from Sosia is, indeed, puzzling, and may reflect authorial haste. But it does not exclude Rojas as author.

Act XV [DSS, 202]: "y ella [Melibea] muy ufana en ver sangre vertida por su servicio."

Act XV, Argument [DSS, 197]: "las muertes que sobre los amores de Calisto y Melibea se avían ordenado".

There is, Marciales insists, no substance in the first of these claims and no logic in the second: they illustrate how damagingly inconsequential the whole revenge-plot is (pp. 54-55). But Rojas has already shown, in Act IX, that the two prostitutes have an irrational hatred of Melibea; that hatred is here further deformed by the passion of grief. That the logic of that passion could encompass such a proposition as "If it were not for Melibea, none of this would have happened" was something which Rojas knew very well: Pleberio's reasoning

in Act XXI [DSS, 236] is of this kind. However, the Argument to Act XV makes no such claim. Nor does it deny the obvious fact that it was the law, not the lovers, which "ordered" the deaths of Pármeno and Sempronio. It merely states that these deaths happened "sobre" the love-affair--which is true in the wholly straightforward sense that they arose out of it.

There remain a handful of what seem to be palpable discontinuities in the Tratado de Centurio. Yet even these are open to some debate:

Act XVII [DSS, 211]: "...cuánto daño vino a Pármeno y a Sempronio de lo que supo Celestina".

Marciales (p. 58) points out that this is untrue: the servants were executed for murdering Celestina in a quarrel over money. But when, at the climax of that quarrel, she warns Pármeno to lower his voice, her words also carry a clear threat of exposure: "No me hagáis salir de seso. No queráis que salgan a plaza las cosas de Calisto y vuestras." [DSS, 183]

Act XVII [DSS, 212]: "Ni menos avía de ir cada noche, que aquel oficio no çufre cotidiana visitación ... en un mes no avemos ido ocho vezes".

Marciales (p. 58) contrasts Act XVI [DSS, 206]: "Y después, un mes á, como as visto que jamás noche á faltado sin ser nuestro uerto escalado como fortaleza, y muchas aver venido en balde, y por eso no me mostrar más pena ni trabajo." He sees this as a hint on Rojas' part that Melibea's menstruation has interrupted the lovers' sexual contact, but not the series of visits. But if that is the case, is Sosia now lying? If he is, can we still believe in his supposed naivety? If he is not, then the contradiction between the two passages remains. A possible solution would be to take Sosia's remark about the "oficio" as confirming the physiological hint, and "no avemos ido ocho vezes" as meaning "there were eight nights that we missed." If so, "venido en balde" in Act XVI would imply that Melibea had had to send Calisto away on these occasions. Even this would seem to force the sense a little.

Act XVIII [DSS, 216]: "Las [muertes] que agora estos días yo uso..."

In Act XV [DSS, 198] Areúsa calls Centurio "manco de la mano de la espada"; does he, then, do all this with his left hand? To make matters worse, she now wishes him "buena manderecha" [DSS, 217]. (His crony Traso turns out to be lame.) Marciales (p. 63) protests that such broad farce is unworthy of Rojas. It would still be possible, though, to read Areúsa's taunt in a less literal sense, as meaning that Centurio is not much of a fighter. She has, after all, bought him "espada y broquel"--strange gifts for a one-armed bravo.

Act XIV, Argument [DSS, 189]: the revised Argument omits any mention of the dialogue of Tristán and Sosia with which this act now ends. This is, indeed, an oddity. Its effect is to highlight the final phrase of the Argument: "restaurar su deseo". If, like Marciales (pp. 65-66), we find this wording inept, the emphasis placed upon it makes matters yet worse. But if we follow Gilman in finding the choice of language here sharp and perceptive, and a sign of Rojas' authorship, the effect may well seem both deliberate and justifiable.¹⁷

None of these examples is anything like conclusive in itself. Nor do they and the others like them, even when taken all together, come near to disproving the notion that Rojas was, after all, the author of the Tratado de Centurio. At the most, they might demonstrate a certain linguistic falling-off in the Tratado, and more particularly in its Arguments. The attribution of the Centurio material to Sanabria is consistent with this, as it is with the rest of Marciales' views about Celestina. But it is not thereby made necessary. Even those incongruities of tone which are most apt to trouble a modern sensibility may well have been matters of relative indifference to Rojas himself. However caricaturesque a figure Centurio may cut now, that could have seemed to Rojas--as it evidently did to those who bought the successive editions of the Tragicomedia--wholly in place within the "terenciana obra" which he and they took Celestina, first and foremost, to be. Most of the apparent discontinuities of substance in the Tratado are capable of being explained. Even the linguistic flaws which Marciales detects in the new set of Arguments could well be the result of Rojas having to compose these in no very willing spirit, as the prologue quite strongly hints may have been the case.¹⁸ The real value of this whole phase of Marciales' argument lies less in its conclusions, which remain optional, than in its informed, searching, and often provocative interrogation of Celestina's text.

It is, above all, that example which makes this an important book. Certainly Marciales has insights and discoveries of real significance to offer, as well as this intricate knitting-together of hypotheses. But it is the quality of his commitment to Celestina which lingers most in the mind, and makes the larger claim on us. In the days when most students of that work knew of his contributions only by hearsay, there was a tendency to think of him as the scholar who, coming from outside, would resolve all the problems attaching to Rojas' book. That was never his role; nor, on this evidence, was it his view of himself. The Carta abierta does not set itself up magisterially to refute Gilman's Spain of Fernando de Rojas, but rather to argue with it, and to promote argument in its turn. In both books there is an element of risk-taking, inseparable from each author's particular kind of creativity. So it comes about that Marciales, whose life's work it was to establish a text, seems a less reliable witness to Celestina's literary wholeness, while Gilman, with his urgent awareness of historical circumstance, is actually the more vulnerable of the two on specific issues of converso history. Yet just as The Spain of Fernando de Rojas demanded that those who rejected its answers address themselves the more purposively to its questions, so too Marciales' book challenges us, time and again, to a sharper, more informed reading of Celestina. We shall not be the worse

for that. Omnia secundum litem fieri¹⁹--we have all glossed the tag so many times, we tend to forget that fieri is the word that matters. This is how understanding comes to be.

MIGUEL MARCIALES

**SOBRE PROBLEMAS
ROJANOS
Y CELESTINESCOS**

[Carta al Dr. Stephen Gilman a propósito del
libro *The Spain of Fernando de Rojas*]

**UNIVERSIDAD DE LOS ANDES
INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES LITERARIAS
"GONZALO PICON FEBRES"
CONSEJO DE PUBLICACIONES
MERIDA-VENEZUELA
1983**

NOTES

¹Keith Whinnom, "Miguel Marciales," Cel 5, ii (1981), 51-53. The Estudio crítico and critical edition are now available as Illinois Medieval Monographs, 1-2 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985).

²Stephen Gilman, The Spain of Fernando de Rojas: The Intellectual and Social Landscape of "La Celestina" (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972). For the controversies see reviews by Whinnom, BHS 52 (1975), 158-61; P. E. Russell, CL 27 (1975), 59-74 and N. G. Round, MLR 70 (1975), 659-61; also Gilman, "Sobre la identidad histórica de Fernando de Rojas," NRFH 27 (1977), 154-58 and George A. Shipley, "Reflections on the Shield: Stephen Gilman's The Spain of Fernando de Rojas," JHP 3 (1978-79), 197-238.

³John Edwards, "The Conversos: A Theological Approach," BHS 62 (1985), 39-49; "Mission and Inquisition among conversos and moriscos in Spain, 1250-1550," Studies in Church History 21 (1984), 148-51. For the theoretical basis of a quite different (Marxist-sociological) mode of definition see J. M. Monsalvo Antón, Teoría y evolución de un conflicto social. El antisemitismo en la Corona de Castilla en la Baja Edad Media (Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1985), pp. 29-48.

⁴See J. N. Hillgarth, The Spanish Kingdoms 1250-1516, II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 585-6; cf. Pietro Martire d'Anghiera, Epistolario, trans. J. López de Toro, I (Madrid: Imprenta Góngora, 1955), Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de España, IX, 334-5 (medical anxieties before the marriage). Even this aspect, however, goes tactfully unmentioned in Peter Martyr's account of the Prince's last days and death (*ibid*, 344-47).

⁵Fernando de Rojas, La Celestina, ed. Dorothy S. Severin (Madrid: Alianza, 1969), p. 243. On grounds of both accessibility and reliability, I have used this edition (hereafter cited as DSS) for all page-references, even though it employs a modernized orthography, not favoured by Marciales.

⁶Rojas agrees only once with Encina as against Petrarch, De Rebus Familiaribus, 12: "Paulo Emilio," contrasted with the latter's "Aemilius Paulus". But this is sufficiently explained by the Index to Petrarch's Latin works in the edition of Basle 1496, habitually consulted by Rojas. There, the reference is given as "Pauli Aemilii constantia;" see Alan D. Deyermond, The Petrarchan Sources of "La Celestina" (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 42.

⁷See Keith Whinnom, "Was Diego de San Pedro a converso?" BHS 34 (1957), 187-200.

⁸Keith Whinnom, "Interpreting La Celestina: The Motives and the Personality of Fernando de Rojas" in Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies on Spain and Portugal in Honour of P. E. Russell, ed. F. W. Hodcroft et al. (Oxford, Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and

Literature, 1981), pp. 66-67--part of a study in other respects much influenced by Marciales' views.

⁹J.N.H. Lawrance, "Nuevos lectores y nuevos géneros: apuntes y observaciones sobre la epistolografía en el primer Renacimiento español" in Actas de la VII Academia Literaria Renacentista. Idea del Renacimiento Español: conceptos y periodos (Salamanca: Universidad, in press).

¹⁰See Keith Whinnom, "The Historia de duobus amantibus of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and the Development of Spanish Golden-Age Fiction" in Essays on Narrative Fiction in the Iberian Peninsula in Honour of Frank Pierce, ed. R. B. Tate (Oxford: Dolphin, 1982), p. 245n.

¹¹It is curious, for example, if Marciales' suggestion that Rojas was personally close to the Queen (p. 94) is correct, that there is no reference to him in her household accounts for the period; see A. and E. A. de la Torre, Cuentas de Gonzalo de Baeza tesorero de Isabel la Católica (Madrid: CSIC, 1955-56). An alternative suggestion, less stressed here, is that Rojas was living in Seville during these years (p. 19).

¹²Marciales' list of conjectural editions, with his own sigla, is as follows:

A1. Salamanca? 1499. 16 acts; no Arguments; lacking some passages added in Burgos 1499 (see pp. 141; 143).

B. Salamanca 1500. 16 acts. Deduced from colophon in Valencia eds.

D1. Seville 1502. 16 acts. Deduced from surviving "Cromberger" eds.

E1. Salamanca 1502 or 1503. The only 17-act Celestina. Necessary for Marciales' account of the emergence of the Tragicomedia text.

E. Salamanca 1504 (p. 143) or Toledo 1504 (p. 156). The princeps of the 21-act Tragicomedia.

J1. Valencia 1508. 21 acts. Deduced from other Valencia eds.

G1. Seville 1508. 21 acts. The source for standard text-lengths and illustrations.

R1. Toledo 1515. 22 acts. The princeps of the Auto de Traso eds.

Bb1. Toledo 1532 or 1533. 22 acts. Deduced from other 22-act eds.

Of these, A1, E, and G1 are also posited by J. H. Herriott (as A, E, and F). On p. 143 Marciales takes A1 to be the princeps; on p. 155 he

describes it as probably a MS only. This apart, he accepts the Burgos 1499 Comedia as what it purports to be.

Five more early editions must now be added to his overall list: those of Valladolid 1526-40 (C. Griffin, MLR 75 (1980), 562-65); Venice 1525, Venice 1535, Venice 1541 (J. L. Laurenti and A. Porqueras-Mayo in Aureum Saeculum Hispanicum. Festschrift für Hans Flasche (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1983), p. 166); Seville 1535 (I. Gallo and E. Scoles, Cultura Neolatina 43 (1983), 107).

¹³Fernando de Rojas, La Celestina, ed. Julio Cejador y Frauca, I (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1955; originally Madrid: La Lectura, 1911), xvi. Cejador regarded the whole body of added material as inferior, and was inclined to attribute it en bloc to Alonso de Proaza. Contrast Stephen Gilman, "The Arguments to La Celestina," RPh 8 (1954-55), 71-78; M. Criado de Val, Indice verbal de "La Celestina", Anejos de la RFE, 64 (Madrid: RFE, 1955); Deyrmond, The Petrarchan Sources of "La Celestina", and many others.

¹⁴For some different views on the Auto de Traso see David Hook, "The Genesis of the Auto de Traso," JHP 3 (1978-79), 107-20.

¹⁵If his work was available to Rojas shortly after 1500, he cannot easily be identified with the Bachiller Sanabria, converso and magistrate of Almagro in the mid-1550s, whom Gilman thinks a likely author for the Auto de Traso; see The Spain of Fernando de Rojas, p. 84 and n.

¹⁶Marciales (p. 144) summarizes the sequence of subject-matter in the Tratado as follows:

a1: Calisto's servants; b1: Areúsa/Elicia/Centurio; c1: Centurio and whores [now lost]; d: seduction of Sosia; b2: Areusa/Elicia/Centurio; c2: ruffians and whores [Auto de Traso]; a2: Calisto's servants.

But a truly symmetrical order would have to run: a1, b1, c1, d, c2, b2, a2. If c1 and c2, which do not figure in the main Tragicomedia tradition, were left out, symmetry would be achieved, but the connection with Sanabria would be lost.

¹⁷Gilman, "The Arguments to La Celestina," 78. Marciales insists that restaurar must mean "fulfil once more," citing "Sanabria, o quien fuese" in Act XV [DSS, 202]: "un hijo que nace restaura la falta de tres finados". But contrast Act XIV [DSS, 190]: "Guarte, señor, de dañar lo que con todos los tesoros del mundo no se restaura" for Rojas' acceptance of the sense "restore; renew," here rejected by Marciales.

¹⁸DSS, 43: "una cosa bien excusada, según lo que los antiguos escritores usaron." Marciales (p. 65) takes this as supporting his view that Rojas wrote none of the Arguments himself. But a Rojas who had just written the additional Arguments under protest--and perhaps also under pressure of time--at the printers' behest could well have written in this strain. Such a hypothesis would account for both the thematic

aptness in these Arguments which so impressed Gilman, and the linguistic shortcomings of which Marciales complains.

¹⁹Petrarch, De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae, II, Praefatio; cf. also DSS, 40. See Deyermond, The Petrarchan Sources of "La Celestina," p. 52.



FERNANDO DE ROJAS
Grabado de la Edición de Valencia, 1518 (M)