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"CALLE IT GENTILESSE":

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO

MEDIEVAL GO-BETWEENS

Deborah Ellis

Pandarus in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and Celestina in Fernando de Rojas's *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* are possibly the two most famous go-betweens in medieval literature. Pandarus' name has long been associated with the technique of procurement, and Celestina's name has become synonymous with the literary stereotype of the crafty bawd. In many ways they are defined by the same conventions, and they perform the same functions within the structure of the two works. Both are motivated by professional pride and vicarious lust. As panderers, they act as the major catalysts in the love stories. Their centrality and complexity justify the study of their characterizations as a lens through which to focus on the ambiguities, tensions and assumptions of each work. To this end, the interplay between the go-between and the spatial imagery in the *Troilus* and the *Tragicomedia* will be compared in order to place their actions in a meaningful context. The activities of Celestina and Pandarus, as defined by the boundaries of each go-between's house, provide an insight into the structural similarity of these panderers' roles and reveal as well the fundamental disparity of vision between Rojas and Chaucer. While both authors employed the same panderer-bawd literary type, that type is
transmuted by the context. Celestina, then, reflects the decay and insecurity of her society, much as Pandarus reflects his world’s greater stability, and so her actions ultimately appear more potent.

Initially, Celestina is a very different type of go-between from Pandarus. She is a professional alcahueta (procurer, bawd), renowned throughout the city for her dealings in women, cosmetics, witchcraft and the patching of maidenheads. She is motivated by a combination of greed, vicarious lust, and her professional code of honor. She accepts a commission to procure Melibea for Calisto, and she succeeds through her cunning and courage. Ironically, she dies unaware of Calisto’s ultimate success, as she is unaware of the four additional deaths which her activities brought about. As a morally repulsive but dramatically captivating character, Celestina is the focus of the work. She is ragged, lecherous and alcoholic; no one is more outwardly unlike Pandarus, a nobleman who persuades his niece Criseyde to yield to his friend Troilus, so that, as he himself says, “we may ben gladed alle thre.” Yet Pandarus shares many of Celestina’s professional characteristics. Although he is apparently motivated by his friendship for Troilus, he derives personal satisfaction from his skill as a go-between, and, like Celestina, he throws himself fully into his work.

“Melibea is beautiful, Calisto is crazy and generous; it won’t hurt him to spend nor me to trot.” In this succinct comment, Celestina sums up the essential quality of the professional go-between. Given an appropriate victim, Celestina needs no further help in her manipulations of the lovers. She can play two parts, what María Rosa Lida de Malkiel calls “la alcahueta seductora y la alcahueta engañadora” (“the seductive bawd and the deceiving bawd”). This first term applies most prominently to the scene in which Celestina approaches Areúsa (where the old woman uses sexual importunity); the second to her scenes with Melibea (where she uses flattery and manipulation); and both to her scenes with Pármeno. The scope of Celestina’s skills of persuasion is impressive. She is adept at taking advantage of any situation, and she is also mistress of a substantial repertoire of ploys that makes her capable of adapting to most circumstances.

Before Melibea, Biblical citations, reflections from Petrarch, examples from the bestiary are unfolded in order to move the maiden to pity . . . . But in order to persuade Areúsa, she makes use only of sayings, vulgar and picturesque comparisons . . . .[,] the old woman’s erudition, then, is an aspect of her stylistic adaptation to her interlocutor, through which she insinuates herself into the soul of those who deal with her.
She tries various approaches to Pármeno: sentiment, the memory of his mother, philosophy, love. As her speech draws closer to its climax, it takes on a different rhythm, and she begins urging Pármeno in short, sharp phrases: "por bien . . . por provecho . . . por deleite . . ." ("for good . . . for profit . . . for delight . . .") I, p. 70). The last word of this extended speech is the most powerful of all: "Areúsa." The rhythm and force of her phrasing echo and recreate the images she is transmitting with a verbal sexual force. The battle is not over, but the effect of her rhetoric is to sweep Pármeno along on the level she has established in her "Pláceme, Pármeno" speech (I, p. 65). Using every technique at her disposal, Celestina here is both seducer and deceiver.

With Melibea, on the other hand, Celestina's approach is much more cautious and even ritualistic. Although her normal pose is that of a seller of thread and mouthwash, only with Melibea does Celestina assume the go-between's traditional mask of médico, come to heal Love's sickness. She uses the formulas handed down to her by several generations of go-betweens, and she possesses all the cynicism of her type. Mrs. Malkiel may have been too optimistic when she wrote:

It is very probable that, at first, Celestina believes in good faith in the power of St. Polonia's prayer and of the cord 'that touched the relics that there are in Rome and Jerusalem' to cure the toothache, although at the same time she exploits the possibility of converting them into lucrative pledges of love.5

Since Celestina invented Calisto's toothache in the first place, her whole attitude is one of manipulative contempt for her victim. Moreover, the spirit that impels Areúsa to say of Melibea that "for a virgin, she has breasts as if she'd given birth three times" (IX, p. 145)6, displays a humor and cynicism worthy of Celestina, who is listening in apparent agreement. With Melibea, then, Celestina generally exhibits her engañadora side. A comparison with her initial approach to Areúsa clarifies this.

Although Areúsa is ill, Celestina uses almost none of the doctor-of-love rhetoric which she employs on Melibea; instead, she responds as another woman, saying, "Even I know something of this sickness, for my sins, for each of has it or her mother has had it . . ." (VII, p. 127)7. She goes into raptures over Areúsa's bed and body, even saying, "Oh, if I were only a man to be allowed thus to enjoy the sight of you!" (VII, p. 127)8 As Areúsa makes excuses and Pármeno is momentarily overcome, Celestina grows more and more preemptive. She tells Areúsa, "I'll put you at your ease. I'll smooth things over. I'll do the talking for both of you. He's quite
They hurry through Mass as shouts of Nowel ring out and then "forth runnen to reche hondeselle" (1. 66). This is hardly the behavior of a decorous, sophisticated people. The Green Knight’s conclusion that the court consists of bot berdlez chylder does not seem wholly unfounded, for in this they closely resemble a band of children rushing out on Christmas morning to see what presents lie under the tree. Their courtesy seems less intrinsic to their personalities than it is an arbitrarily feigned mode of behavior. Just as Arthur has nomen pur3 nobelay not to eat before he hears of an adventure—hears of, not experiences—so his knights and ladies have taken on their elaborate courtliness as a kind of masquerade. When the Green Knight storms in, demanding that Arthur’s game turn into a reality, they are unprepared to reply.

It is just one of the many paradoxes connected with the Green Knight that although he acts impulsively and scorns codified behavior, he proposes a gomen which requires the subordination of human instincts to the strictest chivalric regulations. An embodiment of immense vitality, he offers passively to accept a death blow if one of the court will in turn agree to receive one. To do them credit, the knights are not hypocrites. They realize that they would not be willing to risk their zep lives to fulfill such an unnatural bargain, and they do not display any false bravado. Doute and cortaysye combine to render them silent and immobile, and they leave the aghlich mayster to their king to deal with. The intruder’s taunts soon overcome Arthur’s doute but unfortunately his cortaysye goes with it. "He wex as wroth as wynde" (1.319) and accosts the challenger with rude words:

... "Hapel, by heuen, þyn askyng is nys,
   And as þou foly hatz frayst, fynde þe behoues.
   I know no gome þat is gast of þy grete wordes;
   Gif me now þy geserne, vpon Godez halue,
   And I schal bayþen þy bone þat þou boden habbes."

(11. 323-7)

His ill-concealed impulsiveness breaks through the courtly veneer as he swings the ax wildly before the impassive giant. But the quest is not meant for one who hopes to triumph through an active blow and avoid the darker consequences of the quest. Therefore at this moment Gawain speaks up to request that "þis melly not be myne" (1. 341).

Gawain’s eminently proper manner of asking this boon shows that for one of Arthur’s knights at least, courtesy is not merely a game. Despite the
tense atmosphere he can still function within a system which requires a
great number of words for a man simply to rise from the table. His display
of courtesy brings Arthur to his senses. Donning the king's mask again, he
with all due ceremony yields the task to Gawain. Yet Arthur still does not
realize what the quest will entail. He believes that success can come
through action rather than submission. Therefore he cautions his nephew:

"Kepe þe, cosyn ... þat þou on kyrf sette,
And if þou redez hym ryȝt, redly I trowe
Þat þou schall byden þe bur þat he schal bede after."
(11. 372-4)

But the blow Gawain will strike is unimportant. The essence of the test lies
in the blow he must seek and endure.

After Gawain's blow and its astounding consequences, the Green
Knight departs as mysteriously as he came, leaving behind the cryptic, yet
compelling terms of the quest:

"Loke, Gawan, þou be grayþe to go as þou hettez,
And layte as lelly til þou me, lude, fynde,
As þou hatz hette in þis halle, herande þise knyȝtes;
To þe grene chapel þou chose, I charge þe, to fotte
Such a dunt as þu hast dalt — disserued þou habbez
To be 3ederly 3olden on Nw 3eres morn.
Þe knyȝt of þe grene chapel men knownen me mony;
Forþi me for to fynde if þou fraystez, faylez þou neuer.
Þe þe þe be behouses."
(11. 448-56)

Suddenly it is as if a spell had been lifted. Arthur and Gawain break the
tension with a laugh. The silent courtiers are now stoken of sturne werke,
stafful her hond. The company fairly bubbles with action after the near
paralysis the meruayl had occasioned. But the atypical knightly pledge still
stands.

For the remainder of the poem we are to wonder if Gawain can fulfill
his pledge. The poet undermines his hero somewhat when he comments
that Gawain may have undertaken the quest because men ben mery in
mynede quen þay han mayn drynk (1. 497). Nevertheless the reader does
receive a favorable overall impression of Gawain before he begins his
journey. Although the court, ever the voice of human, if anti-romantic,
This seems quite impressive in contrast to Celestina’s *cubdicia*, especially after Troilus’ reassuring answer to Pandarus:

But he that gooth, for gold or for ricchesse,
On swich message, calle hym what the list;
And this that thow doost, calle it gentilesse . . .

(III 400-2)

Yet immediately afterwards, Troilus concludes his speech of thanks by offering Pandarus his sisters—“Polixene, Cassandre, Eleyne, or any of the frape” (III 409-10)—which twists his rhetoric of disinterestedness. The idea of offering Helen, cause of the whole Trojan War, to Pandarus is especially comic. Pandarus had already offered Troilus his sister, before discovering that his niece is the real target (I 860-1). Here only the medium of exchange separates the two go-betweens: Celestina, working in a milieu of burgeoning capitalism, barters her talents for gold and clothing; Pandarus, perverting the intent if not the practice of courtly love, might exchange his work for surplus sisters. A final professional similarity is that both go-betweens have established a professional/client relationship that falls into a formal, ritualistic pattern where the clients must propitiate their employees. Calisto’s cloak thus serves the same purpose as Troilus’ conciliatory speeches. Each go-between, then, is operating within a somewhat mercantile context.

In the classic bedroom scene, where Troilus faints and has to be flung into Criseyde’s bed by Pandarus, who also undresses the inept lover (“and of he rente al to his bare sherte” III 1099), an element of vicarious lust enters the story. Pandarus hurries about in what would otherwise be a touching or at least sentimental setting, not unlike the scene of Lucrecia’s eavesdropping on Melibea’s garden tryst. Pandarus cries, “‘Nece, se how this lord kan kneele!’ . . . And with that word he for a quysshen ran” (III 962,4). As June H. Martin has noted, Pandarus may actually have spent the night in the lovers’ room, just as Celestina watched Pármeno and Areúsa, and as Calisto called Lucrecia as a witness:

If Chaucer has intended us to admire Troilus’ swoon before the awesome splendor of Criseyde’s bed, he would surely have kept Pandarus out of the room. The startling contrast between Troilus’ inertia and Pandarus’ bustling about in the bedroom renders the scene all the more humorous. Pandarus clearly cuts a most uncourteous figure, one who has no place at all in the bedroom scene. To a certain extent, he foreshadows the presence of Celestina and Lucrecia in similar key seduction scenes in the *Tragicomedia*. . . . There is no indication in the text that Pandarus left the room at all . . . a curious omission on Chaucer’s part since he has made us so aware of Pandarus’ presence up to this point.11
The next morning Pandarus pries under Criseyde’s sheet (III 1568–71)—another resemblance to Celestina’s behavior with Areúsa. Furthermore, both Pandarus and Celestina seem to display their own standards of propriety in these bedroom scenes. Celestina berates Areúsa for not doing her duty as a woman and a whore, and Pandarus berates Troilus for not doing his duty as a lover and a knight. They know what is expected of their positions, and they know what is expected from others. And Pandarus, made toothless by circumstance more than by age, would probably have agreed with Celestina: “Que aun el sabor en las encías me quedó; no le perdí con las muelas.” (VII, p. 132)

The congruence of two characters in one literary tradition does not, of course, automatically lead to any overall similarity. Nowhere is each work’s own tone more clearly expressed than in their attitudes towards space, particularly as developed through each work’s extensive house-imagery. As George A. Shipley has shown in a perceptive article on the image of the garden in the Celestina, the garden simultaneously represents paradise within chaos and chaos within paradise. The garden is “not an order brought forth out of chaos; rather an ordered sphere still . . . surrounded by chaos.” As such, the garden is able to generate and focus all of Melibea’s love and hope as well as all of her father’s despair. If we compress this idea of defined—though ambiguous—space one step further, we can trace each work’s prevalent tone through house-imagery. Because each author’s vision is consistent with the mood of his own time, each vision absorbs and transcends the literary tradition.

In his introduction to Severin’s edition, Gilman writes, “The basic vital situation in La Celestina is domesticity. Life is lived in a closed house with others.” A little later he refers to “that lack of roof or of refuge” which may be “the basic situation of the modern novel.” These two views of “basic situations” help to demonstrate the place of La Celestina between medieval and modern literature. In Rojas’s work, the characters are extremely aware of the walls and roofs that make up their houses, and this awareness of an essential fragility gives them a profound sense of insecurity. Celestina’s own house, “at the edge of the city, there near the tanneries, on the bank of the river, an isolated house; half-fallen, little repaired and less provisioned” (I, p. 60), is the archetype for all their houses, and it is moreover a symbol of the central motif of la caída or the fall which destroys everyone. Stairs are one key symbol in the Celestina; the constant ascents and descents of the characters as they speak foreshadow later actions and, furthermore, represent the social links between the various characters. As the proverb indicates, the house is the ultimate unit of self-interest: “A tuerto o a derecho, nuestra casa hasta el techo.”
(I, p. 69) Other people’s houses, on the other hand, are alien forces ("las paredes han oídos" I, p. 59); for Celestina, "peaceful" (reposado) means "a vivir por tí, a no andar por casas ajenas. . . ." (VII, p. 121) Elicia’s lament for Celestina is a vivid comparison of in-ness and out-ness, where a house is an ultimately defining symbol:

you would go outside, I was shut within; you were ragged, I was well-dressed; you would enter continuously, like a bee through the house, I would destroy. . . . (XV, p. 201)

And of course the house means destruction for the three characters who leap to their deaths, as it is pure emptiness for the bereaved Pleberio, who might have said with Celestina, “Leave me in my house with my fortune” (XII, p. 182).

As the garden can be seen to resist yet encompass surrounding chaos, so the house is seen as an illusory refuge that ultimately serves as a tool of the world’s destructiveness. With unconscious irony, Celestina tells Calisto: “You haven’t dealt much with my house; you don’t really know what I can do” (VI, p. 115). Houses are, more than most things, susceptible to various characters’ subjective misinterpretations; but the reader, exposed both to Celestina’s complacency and Pármeno’s contempt (“la casa medio caída”—“a half-fallen house”), necessarily reaches a middle view and sees that the illusion maintains the house as much as the house maintains the illusion. Perhaps Rojas lived out this mood of double-edged insecurity in his roles as a converso uneasily assimilated into a Christian culture and as an intellectual facing the transition of Spain’s economy from feudalism to capitalism. The shaky house as well as the withered garden can symbolize Rojas’s society, and so his characters seek safety in units within units: “Most of the . . . action takes place indoors, in . . . ‘cells of human intimacy’, where characters are notably sensitive to the invasion of their privacy and guarded in their involvements.” When Melibea and Calisto must speak “por entre las puertas” in Act 12 (Argumento 168), they are as much groping backwards towards whatever security they can find in these “cells” as they are groping forward towards a new meeting of selves. Their ambiguity towards their houses also appears when they curse the doors that keep them apart. Calisto exclaims, “¡O molestas y enojosas puertas!” (XII, p. 174), yet he flees at the first noise, desiring to keep his lady, her house, and his own skin inviolate. His “encerrada doncella” eventually falls—first from her virginity, and then from her roof—and when she does so her house becomes the agent of her destruction. Her suicide by leaping thus furthers the identification
between herself and her home and at the same time serves to widen the house’s significance as a means for an almost cosmic chaos. With their weak structures, both her stately home and Celestina’s run-down shack express the world’s potential and actual, ruin.

In Troilus and Criseyde, on the other hand, houses have a very different, more medieval, connotation. In the first place, most of the houses are palaces, remote from all fragility. Nothing could be further from Celestina and her house than this image of Pandarus planning his strategy:

For everi wight that hath an hous to founde  
Ne renneth naught the werk for to bygynne  
With rakel hond, but he wol bide a stounde,  
And sende his heretes line out fro withinne  
Aldirfirst his purpos for to wynne.  
Al this Pandare in his herte thoughte,  
And caste his werk ful wisely or he wroughte.  
(I 1065–71)

Houses represent not the uncertain forces of society, as they do in the Celestina, but rather the psychological states of the characters. The rooms containing Troilus, for instance, are always very warm. This image is at its strongest when Pandarus arranges the lovers’ meeting at his house. Criseyde and her attendants are forced to remain at Pandarus’ house because of a heavy rainfall. Troilus, meanwhile, has been hidden from Criseyde and can only see “thoroughout a litel wyndow in a stewe” (III 601). “Stewe” means not only “closet” but also “brothel” and “a small heated room.” Here, housing imagery perfectly represents Troilus’ lustful condition. The smallness of the room alone might suggest sexual activity; Pandarus had arranged the lovers’ first meeting in a “lite chaumber” at Deiphebus’ house, where “fewe folk may lightly make it warm . . . .” (II 1646–7), and now he has Criseyde sleep in a “litel closet”:

. . . And I wol in that outer hous allone  
Be wardein of youre wommen everichone,  
And in this myddel chaumber that ye se  
Shul youre wommen slepen . . .  
(III 664–7)

Pandarus’ housing arrangements echo both social and psychological reality. He is alone yet close to and watchful towards the women; Criseyde waits in the narrow closet of love; and the waiting-women are simultaneously protectors and partakers. Moreover, Chaucer completes his imagery
by having Troilus creep into Criseyde’s room through a “secre trappe-
door,” where each word has a sexual connotation. Chaucer is being es-
pecially deliberate here, for “The account of the way by which the lovers
are brought together differs widely from the corresponding part of the
Filostrato.”26

The go-betweens are characterized in full accordance with these differ-
ing attitudes towards houses. Pandarus, as we have seen, is associated
with houses as a metaphor for stability. His skill lies in narrowing the
physical scope: driving people together from their normally wide spheres
of activities into his controlled finite areas. Through Pandarus’ manipu-
lations, Chaucer’s epic scope is continually refreshed and refined. In Cele-
tina’s world, on the other hand, her art lies in evicting people from their
enclosures and widening their spheres until they intersect. And where
Pandarus is comfortable with buildings and is able to stage dramatic
effects through a specific use of rooms—he stations Criseyde at a window,
for instance, where she will have to see Troilus as he rides by (II 1226–56)
—Celestina is uncomfortable with either end of her dichotomy of nuestra
casa and casas ajenas. Celestina must always ask Elicia for admission to
her own house, and when she enters, Elicia almost always scolds her for
her for her late hours. Celestina is both tied to and alienated from her
own house. Her activities can be seen in terms of alienating and defen-
sive maneuvers: she overcomes Pármeno and Areúsa and Melibea by
alienating them from their previous values, and she does so by a series
of forays and retreats like one beseiging a stronghold. Pármeno had val-
ued loyalty to his master, Areúsa to her captain, Melibea to her parents
and to her honra; but all are defeated by the old woman from the half-
fallen house who destroys every structure in her path. Ultimately, Pan-
darus is much less destructive than Celestina, for though his victims—
like hers—are destroyed, the destruction does not extend to the very walls
of the castle. Pandarus exists within a more medieval tradition where
evil has finite and measurable results, and so Troilus can look down at
earth from heaven with a new and quieter perspective, in sharp contrast
to Pleberio’s ragings against his infinity of despair. Pleberio’s whole world
has been demolished; Troilus’ and Criseyde’s continues.

Than seide he thus: “O paleys desolat,
O hous of houses whilom best ihight,
O paleys empty and disconsolat,
O thow lanterne of which queynt is the light,
O paleys, whilom day, that now are nyght,
Wel oughtestow to falle, and I to dye,
Syn she is went that wont was us to gye!
O paleis, whilom crowne of houses alle,  
Enlumyned with sonne of alle blisse!  
O ryng, fro which the ruby is out falle,  
O cause of wo, that cause hast ben of lisse!  
Yet, syn that I may no bet, fayn wolde I kisse  
Thy cold dores, dorste I for this route;  
And farwel shryne, of which the seynt is oute!"

(V 540-55)

Even in his despair, Troilus never confuses the house with its tenant; he compares Criseyde’s abandoned home to a reliquary without a relic or a setting without a jewel. From this moment of recognizing the distance between spirit and matter, his perspective widens until it allows him to see and judge “This litel spot of earth . . .” (V 1815). But for Pleberio, the setting and the jewel were indistinguishable, and with his daughter’s death, the setting becomes a wasteland: “. . . a labyrinth of errors, a terrifying desert, a dwelling of wild beasts . . . a marshy lake, a region full of thorns. . . .” (XXI, p. 233)²² Pleberio’s bleak vision allows him no room in which to adjust to events—he cannot ever say “syn that I may no bet, fayn wolde I kisse/ Thy cold dores. . . .,” since he lives in an all-or-nothing world of reality or illusion, a pre-Quixotic vision terrifying in its intensity.

In Chaucer’s poem, the characters have a sense of their own positions in a stable setting, and that setting can expand from a house to the heav- ens without jeopardizing those characters’ sense of placement. In Rojas’ story, the characters are obsessed with their positions in a setting that may collapse and turn against them at any time, a setting that in fact is ultimately invoked as a wasteland. Their insecurity forces them into illu- sion, and just as Calisto’s mentality is the kind that both demands and produces illusions, Troilus’ is the kind that expects and receives mira- cles—a predictable set of miracles in no way incompatible with his daily experiences. That so frenetic a character as Pandarus can make so great an impact on an essentially passive audience is what helps give the Troilus its complexity and force. In Celestina’s world, everyone is a Pandarus, and there is no longer an image of encircling peace to absorb the personal catastrophes; and so, for Pleberio and his people, catastrophe is absolute.

Deborah Ellis received her M.A. in Comparative Literature from UC Berkeley in 1975. She is currently working on her doctorate in Compara- tive Literature and Medieval Studies at Berkeley.
Notes


2. Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina* (*Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea*), ed. Dorothy S. Severin (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1969), p. 82: “Melibea es hermosa, Calisto loco y franco; ni a él penará gastar ni a mí andar.” All references to the text are cited from this edition, and act and page numbers will hereafter be incorporated into the citations. My translations are used throughout, except where indicated.


4. *Ibid.*, p. 344: “Ante Melibea, citas bíblicas, reflexiones de Petrarca, ejemplos de bestiario se despliegan para mover a piedad a la doncella. . . . Pero para persuadir a Areüsa, se vale solamente de refranes, comparaciones pintorescas y vulgares . . . la erudición de la vieja, pues, es un aspecto de su adaptación estilística al interlocutor, por la que se insinúa en el ánimo de los que con ella tratan.”

5. *Ibid.*, p. 511: “Muy probable es que, en principio, Celestina crea de buena fe en la virtud de la oración de Santa Polonia y del cordón ‘que ha tocado las reliquias que hay en Roma y Jerusalén’ para curar el dolor de muelas, aunque a la vez explota la posibilidad de convertirlos en lucrativas prendas de amor.”

6. “unas tetas tiene, para ser doncella, como si tres veces hubiese parido”

7. “Que aun algo sé yo de este mal, por mi pecado, que cada una se tiene o ha tenido su madre. . . .”


10. The original version of the sixteen act *comedia* was extensively revised between 1500 and 1502 and became the twenty-one act *tragicomedia*: See Severin’s introductory note, p. 31. Celestina’s indignation in this scene has been expanded from the original version in several places, especially in her speech beginning “¿Qué es esto, Areüsa?” (VII, 131-132).


12. “For at least the flavor has stayed in my gums—I did not lose that with my teeth.”


15. Ibid., p. 21: “esta falta de techo o de refugio” . . . “la situación basica de la novela moderna.” His reference is to Lukacs, Die Theorie des Romans.
16. “al cabo de la ciudad, allá cerca de las tenerías, en la cuesta del río, una casa apartada; medio caída, poco compuesta y menos abastada”
17. “Right or wrong, our house up to the roof;”
18. “the walls have ears”
19. “To live for yourself, not to trot through others’ houses.”
20. “tú salías fuera, yo estaba encerrada; tú rota, yo vestida; tú entrabas continuo como abeja por casa, yo destruía . . .”
21. “Déjame en mi casa con mi fortuna.”
22. “Poco has tratado mi casa; no sabes bien lo que yo puedo.”
25. As defined in the Glossary to Robinson’s Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.
26. Ibid., p. 824 n.
27. “. . . un laberinto de errores, un desierto espantable, una morada de fieres . . . laguna llena de cieno, región llena de espinas . . .”