



Espejo de principes y caballeros [El Cavallero del Febo]

Review Author[s]:
Joseph R. Jones

Hispania, Vol. 60, No. 2 (May, 1977), 390-391.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0018-2133%28197705%2960%3A2%3C390%3AEDPYC%5B%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

Hispania is currently published by American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aatsp.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

corroborated. The great positivists were not so intuitive after all.

The terrible thing about the *jarchas* is that, few and brief though they are, they command a mightily scholarly equipment of romance, Hebrew and Arabic poetic knowledge and sensitivity. It is no derogation of Frenk to say that she does not dispose of all these means. If her book has a major flaw, it is its failure to consider the *jarcha* critically, as a poetic work of art and, above all, as a function of the *muwashaha*. Alan Deyermond's characterization, in his history of Medieval Spanish literature, of the *jarcha* as an extension of the *muwashaha*'s simile is a most succinct point of departure. Moreover, if none of *muwashahas* is a heterosexual love poem, then the *jarcha*, in its panegyric, homosexual or other environment, presents deeply perplexing problems of interpretation. What Frenk's book shows best is that the *jarchas* are a scholarly and critical issue of much still-unresolved complexity.

ROBERT TER HORST

Univ. of Arizona

AYERBE-CHAUX, REINALDO. *El Conde Lucanor: Materia tradicional y originalidad creadora*. Madrid: Porrúa, 1975. Paper xvii + 389 pp.

This handsome volume has as its objective the illustration of creative originality in the *Conde Lucanor* by means of direct comparison of the *exempla* in the *Lucanor* with Juan Manuel's probable sources. The book has a short introduction, an "Estudio comparativo" of 171 pages, which contains the original analyses in the book; then 206 pages of text (actually an index) giving earlier forms of the *exempla* from medieval sources. Next follows an index of names found in the work, including names of authors of the critical articles in the footnotes—an important inclusion given that the book has no bibliography. Accompanying the study of *exemplum* 7 (Doña Truhana) is a fold-out sheet showing the different motifs and variations found in the folkloric tale as it appears in other collections.

We are told in the introduction that Prof. Ayerbe Chaux came across the personal library of Thomas F. Crane in the library of Cornell University, and that the study of this collection led him to his work on originality in Don Juan Manuel. As one who has worked with some of the same material, I can attest to the value of the summary of source material (pp. 175-79), and of the emphasis he gives to the fact that certain of the names of compilers (such as Herolt) often mentioned by editors of the *Conde Lucanor* are actually later and can only be used superficially for comparison.

The author states also that Daniel Devoto's valuable *Introducción al estudio de Don Juan Manuel y en particular de El Conde Lucanor* appeared in print during the latter stages of the composition of the present volume, a fact which explains much of the duplication of effort found in the two works. Readers of *Materia tradicional* would profit from consulting the bibliographical material of the Devoto volume to supplement the material lacking in Ayerbe-Chaux. For example, the treatment of the first *exemplum* of the collection (pp. 2-7), its difference from tradition as well as the relationship between the form of the tale in the *Legenda Aurea* and in the *Libro de los ejemplos por A.B.C.* had been discussed somewhat earlier (MLN 84 [1969], 286-92, and KRQ 17 [1970], 87-91), and it is curious that the author fails to mention his own article when dealing with *exemplum* 48 (BICC, 24 [1969], 37-49). However his intention is more creative than bibliographical, and the value of the study lies in the fact that the author draws our attention once again to what originality in medieval literature is all about—creative use of that which is familiar to express that which is new.

Although some typographical errors inevitably slip through (Bybbon-Monneypenny, p. 66; Jan Macpherson, p. 126; Gayagos, p. 8) the work is well done. The treatment is by no means complete, since the author does not deal with all of the tales in the collection and his analysis is at times sketchy, but he has contributed a valuable work in an area still needing attention.

HARLAN STURM

Univ. of Massachusetts

ORTÚÑEZ DE CALAHORRA, DIEGO. *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros [El Cavallero del Febo]*. Edition, introduction, and notes by Daniel Eisenberg. Clásicos Castellanos, 193, 198. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1976. Paper. lxxxviii + 1869 pp. in six vols.

Eisenberg, in his introduction, reviews what little is known of Ortúñez's life, summarizes the plot of the novel, and discusses its sources, style, continuations, popularity in Spain and abroad, influence, and the history of the text. He speculates that unity of concept, frequent dialogues, carefully varied style, classical elements, morality, clarity, and an optimistic tone all contributed to the success of the work. For me, it is Ortúñez's imaginative recombination of traditional elements (e.g., enchanted palaces) and his tolerable battle descriptions that made a leisurely reading of the *Espejo* a pleasant task.

The chief novelty of the *Espejo* is its pairs: two heroes (Febo and his twin brother, Rosicler); Febo's two love-objects (Claridiana, an eight-foot-tall lady knight, and Lindabrides, who,

after much mind-changing by Febo, loses to her rival); and the two magicians who not only protect the virtuous knights with enchanted armor and the like but who are simultaneously composing biographies of the heroes. Ortúñez, in a remarkable passage, explains how the two stages are (at the time of his writing, apparently) bringing their chronicles up to date: "En todo lo que los sabios tenían hasta aquí escrito, no he hallado que hayan dicho nada del [hermano menor de los héroes]. . . . Y creo que lo aya causado la grande ocupación que han tenido en escrevir las cosas passadas. . . . Aora, que parece que por estar todos [los protagonistas] metidos en fiestas y regozijos tienen más lugar, los dos juntos vienen a hablar de él . . . (vi, 219-220. Cf. I, 270; iv, 163; v. 80). The vision of the two magicians mentally following their subjects about like anxious journalists makes Don Quijote's suggestions for his own biography to any magician who might be listening seem less "irrational" and, I think, rather funnier.

One of the sage authors actually allows the emperor Trebacio and his courtiers to read his account of Rosicler's life *hasta el punto en que a la sazón estava* (v, 80). This intrusion of one book (Rosicler's biography) into another (the *Espejo*) is not the only case of such fictions-within-fictions in early Spanish prose, but it is the most dramatic example with which I am familiar, and it is in some ways analogous to the appearance of *Don Quijote*, Part I, in Part II, without, needless to say, the consequences. There are other analogies, too, beyond those mentioned by Eisenberg, such as the narrator's "translating" and "editing" his sources, or doubting his abilities to do justice to the work (Cf. vi, 90, 92).

It is difficult at best to appreciate these romances for their own positive values, since Cervantes's parody always lurks in the background, ready to sabotage them, and Eisenberg's useful references to *Don Quijote* might better have been left in the introduction rather than placed in the notes, where they effectively undermine Ortúñez's serious intentions—for me, at least.

The new text of the *Espejo* is almost free of typographical errors; the notes are apt (with a few frivolous exceptions, like iv, 105), useful, even witty. Editorial criteria are sensible. A circumflex to indicate the *a embebida* instead of square brackets (e.g., *áquel* instead of [a] *aquel*) would have been preferable, in my opinion, since the bracket is also used for omissions, and the number of absorbed *a*'s shows that it was not Ortúñez's custom to write them consistently. The dieresis might have been used where *-que-* is equivalent to modern *-cue-*, though most readers of the *Espejo* will not be novices in Golden

Age prose, as Eisenberg observes, and will scarcely hesitate at, e.g., *cinquenta* for *cinquenta*. Considering its length alone, the editing of these volumes is a heroic piece of work.

Eisenberg's remarks on the critics' unacknowledged prejudice against long works and on the rarity of historically important texts will, I hope, help correct both deficiencies. His own edition is an excellent beginning. What we also badly need, as he suggests, is a motif-index of the Spanish romances. And I can think of no one better qualified to organize such a worthy project than Eisenberg himself.

JOSEPH R. JONES

Univ. of Kentucky

WEIGER, JOHN G. *The Valencian Dramatists of Spain's Golden Age*. Boston: Twayne, 1976. 169 pp. \$8.95.

The group of dramatists studied by Prof. Weiger flourished in Valencia in the latter sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. They are Rey de Artieda, Virués, Tárrega, Aguilar, Beneyto, Boil and Turia, to each of whom a special chapter is devoted. Virtually all their plays are analyzed with particular attention paid to their employment of the honor concept. Its presence in play after play is the distinguishing feature that gives them unity. It is here that Weiger makes a very significant contribution. Artieda is the senior member of the group. His *Los amantes* was printed in 1581 but composed several years before. Prior to that time there were plays which gave prominence to the concept but such instances are few and scattered. It is only with his play that we witness the beginning of a genuine vogue which quickly gathered the momentum that transformed it into a dominant theatrical device. The youthful Lope, who lived in Valencia in 1589-90, could hardly have escaped being influenced by this trend as well as in matters of the style and structure of his comedias.

In his brief discussion of honor and virtue in the ancients, Weiger brings out that Aristotle, Cicero and Seneca are "among the classical moralists whose thinking eventually led to Jorge Manrique, the Valencian dramatists and many others" (p. 120). It is clear from this quotation that it is less a question of direct sources than the transmission of ideas that had become commonplace during the Renaissance and Golden Age. Nevertheless, any historical exposition of the concept must necessarily open with the above-mentioned classics.

The last stanza of the famous *coplas* of Jorge Manrique also has its place in a historical presentation, but definitely not as the "foundation" of the honor concept (p. 118). Manrique is