

Published in Journal of Hispanic
Philology, 3 (1979): 178-82
Author's Web site:
<http://bigfoot.com/~daniel.eisenberg>
Author's email address:
daniel.eisenberg@bigfoot.com

Bibliography of Old Spanish Texts (Literary Tests, Edition-2). Compiled by Anthony Cárdenas, Jean Gilkison, John Nitti, and Ellen Anderson. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1977. x + 112 pp.

This bibliography, also known by its acronym, BOOST, was produced as part of the continuing Old Spanish Dictionary project of the Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies at the University of Wisconsin. Its stated aim is to include all literary (defined by the editors as “non-notarial”) texts written in Spanish (Castilian) prior to 1501; the scope is defined chronologically rather than literarily. Thus, translations of foreign works are included, but post-1500 texts of pre-1501 works are included only if no pre-1501 text survives.

The data base from which this bibliography was produced is computerized. The work therefore includes a number of computer-produced indices, which, though requiring some familiarization, are quite useful. (An index of the Specific Title field, and an index by manuscript number, were sorely missed, however.) The typesetting was done directly from the computerized data. The work is not intended to be the final product, although it is very professional-looking for a provisional work. In both appearance and content, the work marks a great improvement over the first edition of this bibliography, published in 1975.

Having said the preceding, this reviewer must express, from a bibliographical point of view, his concern with the work. The compilers consider the bibliography to be an “international cooperative venture,” and their role limited to assembling the information sent in by others; this surely explains why the introduction is devoted almost exclusively to the computerized indexing and typesetting processes employed, saying nothing about how the accuracy or completeness of the bibliographic information has been ascertained. Since the bibliography depends primarily on data sent in by volunteers, it is amazingly up-to-date and thorough in the areas where a volunteer has substantial competence; it includes, for example, much information about manuscripts of medieval Spanish works which is not available in any other

published source. Where no one has sent in information, it is just as inaccurate, depending on unverified citations from the first (1953) edition of José Simón Díaz's *Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica* (from which many of the references to Gallardo, Haebler, etc., are tacitly taken). Anyone who has taken a portion of Simón Díaz's bibliography and subjected it to detailed scrutiny knows that his work is not only very incomplete, but that it is filled with typos and other, larger errors. The choice of this bibliography, the use of the first rather than the second, enlarged and revised edition, and the absence of any systematic attempt to verify Simón's data, is a major flaw in this bibliographic endeavor. One striking result is the number of facts (call numbers, titles, dates, locations) which are said to be "unavailable," in fact the most frequent word in the work. What is meant by "unavailable" is something closer to the Spanish "no consta": that it is missing in the data [p. 179] base, often because Simón Díaz did not supply it. These "unavailable" pieces of information are often surprisingly easy to obtain. The call numbers of two MSS in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris (Items 1330 and 1762) are said to be unavailable, whereas Morel-Fatio's catalog of the Spanish and Portuguese MSS in that library reveals them to be Esp. 37 and Esp. 204 respectively. In some cases "unavailable" should be deleted as misleading, as with the call numbers of the rare books of the Hispanic Society of America, which have none.

The following are examples of other bibliographic problems this reviewer has found with the work:

1. Failure to refer to critical editions of texts for bibliographical information. Sometimes editions only give references to copies, but sometimes very detailed and complete bibliographic information is found. It would have been more logical to refer the reader, for further information on the *Cancionero de Fernández de Híjar* and the *Cancionero de Herberay des Essarts* (items 255 and 256), to the editions of these texts by Azáceta (1956) and Aubrun (1951) respectively, rather than to Gayangos and Gallardo. Some other examples of critical editions which should have been used: Regina of Geijerstam's edition of Fernández de Heredia's *Grant cronica de Espanya* (Uppsala, 1964) offers valuable information to supplement Items 1088–1091, including a completely different specific title for 1089 ("La grant et verdadera ystoria de Espanya," p. 141), devoting 9 pages (50–58) to a discussion of Item 1090 alone. The edition of Heredia's translation of Thucydides by Luis López Molina (Madrid, 1959) should be cited and used; likewise, that of Tuulio and Casas Homs of the *Gaya ciencia* of Pero Guillén de Segovia (Madrid, 1962), etc.

2. Incomplete references to source works cited. First names, publishers, and the like are omitted; we are often not told whether a page, column, or item number is being cited. With some references it is not clear whether a book or an article is being cited, and some of them would take research to identify, particularly for someone not specializing in medieval Hispanic studies: 561, 573, 601, 1432 (compare with 1463), 1741, 1746, etc. The reference to Cueto in Item 659 is incomprehensible to me. At the very least, a bibliography containing full information on all works cited should be included.

3. Entries are included which should have been excluded for chronological reasons, according to the compilers' criteria: Nos. 5777, 860, 1132, 1345, 1410–1413, 1575, 1688–89, and others (see the Specific Production Date Index). No explanation is offered of why exceptions have been made for these texts and not for others. Item 577, an edition of *Partinuplés*, was included because it has no date, and therefore could have been of the fifteenth century, but included with this same entry is the information that the book was printed by the "herederos de Juan de Junta" in Burgos, which clearly places it not only in, but about the middle of the sixteenth century.

4. No explanation is given of the principles followed in standardizing titles and authors' names. Some decisions seem clearly arbitrary: a work [p. 180] always known as the *Historia de Alejandro Magno* has become the *Historia de Alexandre* (750, 751); Josephus' *Jewish Wars* has become *Siete libros de la guerra* (1553), thus making the title much less descriptive than the traditional one. What is the difference between the *Proverbios de Séneca* (817, 1026) and the *Proverbios del Seudo-Séneca* (1027–1042)? With Items 1575 and 1578 we also see inattention to standard titles.

Some authors' names have been Latinized (Guillemus Parisiensis). Others have been Hispanized (San Jerónimo—indexed under "San," incidentally—, Plutarco). Some Italian authors are referred to by their original names (Guido delle Colonne—who wrote in Latin), others by a Hispanized form (Domingo Cavalca). Some are just strange: Nepos de Montalouan (1485), Antoninus di Pierozzo (Item 373). That this lack of standardization hinders the location of particular entries goes without saying.

5. Another practice making the bibliography harder to use than it should be deals with the way the main entries are arranged, and the use of the term "Anonymous." Since the orientation of this bibliography is more linguistic than literary, the translator, as the one who created the Spanish version, is given priority in arranging the entries over the author's name. Well and good. It is very confusing, however, to find a section of words alphabetized under "Anonymous" followed by a

section of “Anonymous (trans.), Anonymous,” and to find that not only are works with “Anonymous [?]” not interfiled with the “Anonymous” works, but that “Anonymous [?] (trans.)” is located in a somewhat different place than “Anonymous (trans.) [?]” And there are many works which are clearly translations (578, 987, 1079, 1080), which are entered without the mention of any translator, anonymous or not, and are filed under the author’s name. The same work is found under both the name of a translator (1026) and under “Anonymous” (817).

Other sorting problems have led to the confusing failure to group together all the MSS of a single work (689–695, 699–702), separating them by printed editions. Even more confusing is to find that García, Martín, comes *after* García de Santa María, Gonzalo, and Guillén, Diego, after Guillén de Segovia, Pero.

6. No explanation is given of how the compilers have transcribed characters not in the character set they use. Are we to conclude that such words as “D’VOCIONES” and “D’NUESTRA” were really printed this way?

Some specific problems:

Item 216. This MS is not in Madrid but in Berkeley. See *La Corónica*, 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1977), 115.

Item 382. The compilers have confused the “era” with the year.

Item 416. There is a typo: “OLYA.”

Item 617. The Specific Title is merely the first few words of the text.

Item 622. “This text was done”?

Item 697. Goff, *Incunabula in American Libraries*, mentions a copy in the Huntington Library.

Item 707. Keller, in his edition of this text, gives the foliation as 161r–195v. [p. 181] There are two sets of numbers on the pages: see Keller’s facsimile.

Item 719. The *Catálogo de incunables de la Biblioteca Nacional* (Madrid, 1945) mentions a copy of this text.

Item 751. Goff indicates three additional copies.

Item 977. This entry is one of the best in the volume. Since the works in this collection of *tratados* of Seneca are also included individually (804, 805, 822), it would be useful to have them in the index. There is precedent for this in the treatment of March MS 22/8/2 (804–806, 808–809, 816, 818, 822).

Items 1004–1013. Why does the Original Production Date vary?

Item 1037. “existence doubtful.” Beardsley, *Hispano-Classical Translations*, p. 3, reports a copy in the Library of Congress.

Item 1045. The Original Production Date could be more specific than just “15th century.” Juan de Mata Carriazo, in his edition of this text, p. xxviii, reports that it must have been written no later than 1448.

Item 1128. Goff cites five additional copies.

Item 1133. Goff cites a copy in the Casa del Libro, Puerto Rico.

Item 1193. How can a manuscript be located in more than one library? And what is a manuscript doing in the British Library’s *Catalogue of Printed Books*? Compare with Item 1191.

Items 1380–81. According to Kinkade’s article cited there, the *Coplas* of Jorge Manrique can be dated, not just as “15th century” (too vague in any event), but in 1479.

Item 1415. Are we dealing with a book or a MS?

Item 1433. Same question.

Item 1414–1419. Why the variation in dates of composition?

Item 1442. The specific title is: “La coronacion compuesta por Juan de Mena al Marques Iñigo lopez de mendoça” (Hispanic Society of America catalog [that published by G. K. Hall, not the rare book catalog of Penney]). Although BOOST mentions Goff, it does not mention the copy in the Boston Public Library he includes.

Item 1455. The Hispanic Society does not have a copy of his text, according to both Goff and the Hispanic Society’s printed catalog. What it has is a copy of the 1955 facsimile.

Item 1456. Goff reports a copy in the Casa del Libro.

Items 1471, 1474. The same copy is listed twice, with different details.

Item 1480. See Keith Whinnom, “MS. Escorialense K-III-7. El llamado ‘Cancionero de Fray Iñigo de Mendoza,’” *Filología*, 7 (1961), 161–72. Note that BOOST cites only folios 98–231, thus omitting the basic manuscript of Mendoza’s *Vita Christi* found on folios 1–97.

Item 1505. Goff cites two additional copies.

Item 1578. Typo: Contain.

Item 1590. “Phillipps” has 3 p’s.

Item 1719. Typo: Coronica.

Items 1759–1761. One cannot tell from the entries whether these are books or manuscripts.

A few texts, found in an hour in the library, which have completely been omitted:

“Vegeçio de las batallas,” a 15th-century MS found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Esp. 211 (Morel-Fatio, Item 101).

“El libro de menescalca et de albeyteria et fisica de las bestias que

compuso Johan Alvares de Salamiellas,” a 15th-century MS found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Esp. 214 (Morel-Fatio, Item 98).

Gonçalo Sanches de Useda, “Libro del Gentil y de los tres Sabios,” a 15th-century copy of a work composed in 1378, British Library Add. MS 14,040 (Gayangos’ catalog of the Spanish manuscripts in the British Library).

Cicero, “Libro de Paradoxis,” a 15th-century manuscript in the British Library, [p. 182] MS Eg. 1868 (Gayangos). This manuscript also contains two works of Lope de Barrientos.

Libro del Anticristo, trans. Martin Martinez de Ampiés; Burgos: Fadrique de Basilea, 1497. In the catalog of Biblioteca Nacional incunabula already cited.

[Pseudo-]San Bernardo, *Infancia del Salvador*; Burgos: Juan de Burgos, c. 1495. Also from the Biblioteca Nacional catalog.

The manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional (Reserve 247, *Olim Gg* 101) of the *Poema de José* (under which name this text should be, but is not, found in the title index of BOOST; it is only found under “Yuçuf”). Although the Academia de la Historia MS is included (Item 581), the statement that the MS is in Hebrew characters is erroneous; in fact, it is in Arabic characters. This MS was reproduced in facsimile by the University of Granada in 1952. See the edition by William Weisiger Johnson, *Romance Monographs* (University, Mississippi, 1974).

In conclusion: though this is certainly a useful work, and an improvement over BOOST 1, there is much to be done. In this reviewer’s opinion, the preparation of a bibliography must be undertaken, if not by bibliographers as such, then at least by persons who take responsibility for the completeness and the accuracy of the information presented. This would be, it seems to me, a prerequisite to a further edition.

Before soliciting more help from volunteer contributors, each of the references taken from Simón Díaz should be verified. While the compilers have apparently used systematically two sources, the catalog of the Spanish Escorial MSS by Zarco Cuevas and the Biblioteca Nacional manuscript catalog which is slowly being published, the other catalogs of incunabula and of manuscript collections of major importance to Hispanists should be systematically searched. The result will surely be a much more accurate and complete third edition of BOOST.

DANIEL EISENBERG
Department of Modern Languages and

Linguistics

Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (USA)