

## Laureola: A Mask for Melibea

Toward the close of the fifteenth century, two works on romantic love became very popular in Spain, although each treated the theme in a different way. Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor*, published in 1492, inaugurated the last decade of the century, and Fernando de Rojas's *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* brought it to a close in 1499; but while San Pedro incorporated into his work the medieval doctrines of chivalry and courtly love, Rojas, familiar with the *Cárcel*, satirized such notions and cast a very different light on love (Whinnom xxvii).<sup>1</sup> The situation presented in these two works is commonplace: fortune brings together two highborn loves; some unspecified impediment to their union causes suffering and death; and marriage is never discussed. However, the development by the two authors of this basic plot of impossible love illustrates two distinct world views.

As each book opens, the young hero is already a prisoner of love, and his symptoms conform to the formula for courtly love: he is intellectually, emotionally and physically debilitated. The direction and outcome of courtship will differ for each swain, however, in keeping with his character, with external forces, and especially with the behavior of his lady. A comparison of the two heroines offers considerable insight into the contrary views of love presented by San Pedro and Rojas. When comparing and contrasting Laureola and Melibea, I shall consider their names, their class, their family, their suitors, their go-betweens, and finally their respective courting behavior.

The fact that Laureola is not named in the title while Melibea is suggests that whereas San Pedro writes about love, Rojas writes about a woman in love; and while Laureola is merely a fictional device, Melibea is a fictional character. The baptismal names of the two women are significant. "Laureola" indicates that this lady fulfills the courtly ideal: she wears a crown of victory (*laureola*), and she wears a crown of virtue (*la aureola*), a halo of light which corresponds to the light that fills Leriano's imagination: "La claridad grande . . . es mi Pensamiento, del qual sale tan clara

luz por quien está en él, que basta para esclarecer las tinieblas desta triste cárcel” (San Pedro 48).<sup>2</sup> Rojas’s satirical intent first becomes apparent when he names his leading lady “Melibea,” linking her with the town of Meliboea in Macedonia, Laureola’s native country (*Casselli* 339). But “Melibea” also suggests *miel*—not Laureola’s virtue, but the honeyed attraction of “el dulce vivir.” In his famous lament, Melibea’s father Pleberio remarks, “Dulce nombre te dieron; amargos hechos hazes” (Rojas II: 210).<sup>3</sup> The honey motif is also sustained by Celestina when she characterizes herself as a bee who has power over Melibea: “Todo su rigor convertido en miel . . .” (I: 207).

The difference implicit in the two titles becomes evident in the physical presentation of Laureola and Melibea. Leriano, in obedience to the secrecy code of courtly love, does not describe Laureola’s appearance but merely attests to Laureola’s beauty when he describes her effect on him: “no te maravilles, que tu hermosura causó el afición, y el afición el deseo, y el deseo la pena, y la pena el atreuimiento” (52). Calisto, on the other hand, goes on at length in what María Rosa Lida calls a variation on an old convention, one of the most famous *prosopografías* in Spanish literature, praising Melibea’s hair, eyes, nose, mouth, and other features (Whinnom xxiii; Lida 449). Because Laureola’s beauty is simply assumed, she remains something of a stick-figure, a virtually disembodied ideal. In sharp contrast, Calisto’s very fleshly glorification of Melibea is challenged by a different but equally physical appraisal of her by the prostitutes Elicia and Areusa. We now see Melibea from a new perspective when Elicia, provoked by Sempronio’s reference to “aquella graciosa e gentil Melibea,” counters, “Aquella hermosura por vna moneda se compra de la tienda.” Areusa continues the Talaveran diatribe, including a negative reference to honey: “Todo el año se está encerrada con mudas de mill suziedades. Por una vez que aya de salir donde pueda ser vista, enuiste su cara con hiel e miel... e con otras cosas, que por reuerencia de la mesa dexo de dezir” (II: 31–33). This dual physical presentation of Melibea mirrors her duplicitous character.

Although San Pedro and Rojas both witnessed the dusk of the Middle Ages, their fictional ladies do not share the same world. In keeping with her name and idealized beauty, Laureola’s social position is peerless. The only daughter of King Gaulo of Macedonia, she resides in the royal court at Suria, the apex of medieval society, and her allegorical value is enhanced by her royal and foreign birth. An archetypal figure, she is part of the courtly tradition which still adheres to the four codes identified by Bruce Wardropper: love, chivalry, war and Christianity (“Mundo sentimental” 172). Melibea, in contrast, lives in Spain, in the reader’s own society, which Rojas sees as dominated by the flesh and the devil. Although she too is of high rank, her status is only that of the *clase ociosa*, the upper

bourgeoisie discussed by José Antonio Maravall. She also is an only daughter, not of a king whose honor is determined by standards of chivalry and Christianity, but of a *nouveau-riche* whose name means "commoner" and whose honor is vested in wealth and appearances. Melibea's class dons the inherited trappings of Laureola's medieval nobility but does not exhibit what Wardropper calls "nobleza conocida por intuición" ("Mundo sentimental" 193). Traditional codes are feigned but not felt, and "honor" has become merely "el mayor de los mundanos bienes" (Maravall 51).

Just as the destinies of Leriano and Calisto necessarily depend on the behavior of their ladies, the deportment of Laureola and Melibea is related in turn to that of their parents. Like Laureola herself, King Gaulo is more representative than real, symbolizing blind, royal justice, unmoved by compassion. Laureola is an instrument of his honor as well as that of his forebears, and when that is threatened he readily believes false witness, imprisons her, and sentences his only heir to death. Her mother, the Queen, represents the ideal noblewoman whose compassion is exemplary. Whereas Laureola's father is fearsome and powerful, Melibea's is kindly but ineffectual. He arrives late in the *Comedia*, when neither his earlier influence—"aquellos antiguos libros que tú, por más aclarar mi ingenio me mandauas leer" (II: 198)—nor his present authority hold any sway with Melibea. Marcel Bataillon notes a lack of nobility in both of Melibea's parents, ascribing to her mother, Alisa, a "rôle passif mais funeste" (Bataillon 183). She has, after all, fully consented to Melibea's unchaperoned visit with Celestina, a notorious *alcahueta*; she does not investigate the noise she hears from Melibea's room; and, when she is alarmed by the commotion between Melibea and Pleberio, she becomes hysterical and does nothing to intervene in her child's suicide. The child-parent relationship is best dramatized in the laments of both Laureola's mother and Melibea's father. Both express their sorrow at being left without an heir, the sense that nature has been violated, and the wish to follow the child to the grave. However, they also embody opposing values which distinguish the two books. For example, believing her daughter to be unjustly doomed to die, the Queen speaks to Laureola of honor, virtue and the life hereafter: "¡O hija mía!, ¿por qué, si la onestad es prueua de la virtud, no dió el rey más crédito a tu presencia que al testimonio? En la habla, en las obras, en los pensamientos, siempre mostraste corazón virtuoso" (68). Faced with the King's intransigence, the Queen exhorts her child to look to God: "Pon, hija mía, el corazón en el cielo; no te duela dexar lo que se acaba por lo que permanece. Quiere el Señor que padezcas como mártir porque gozes como bienaueventurada" (68). After Melibea's suicide, on the other hand, Pleberio asks very different questions: "¿Para quién edificué torres? ¿Para quién adquirí honrras? ¿Para quién planté árboles? ¿Para quién fabriqué

nauíos? (II: 202). He too answers his own questions, not with reference to honor, virtue, or heavenly reward, however, but with a bitter condemnation of earthly love, which has taken from him all that mattered: “e yo no lloro triste a ella muerta, pero la causa desastrada de su morir... ¿quién forçó a mi hija a morir, sino la fuerte fuerça de amor?” (207–209). Each parent has identified the dominant motivating force in his and her daughter: for Laureola, honor; for Melibea, sexual love. These motivations or values are especially manifest within the crucible of courtship.

As dictated by literary convention, each suitor works through an intermediary in order to court his lady. San Pedro offers the Auctor to Leriano, while Rojas provides Celestina’s services to Calisto. The two go-betweens heighten the differences between the two works in general and between Laureola and Melibea in particular. In keeping with the chivalric setting of the *Cárcel de Amor*, for example, the Auctor is a military man and an aristocrat who quickly learns the protocol of the Macedonian court. He is motivated by altruism and, like Laureola, believes that virtue is worth more than life itself. Rojas sends Melibea a radically different kind of emissary, the *alcahueta* Celestina, who is described by the man-servant Sempronio as “vna vieja barbuda . . . hechicera, astuta, sagaz en quantas maldades ay” (I: 58–59). The Auctor of the *Cárcel* feels the inferiority of his position before Laureola, but Celestina shows little hesitation in approaching Melibea, a woman of presumed virtue and breeding, because she sees an opportunity for herself in the union of Calisto and Melibea. While Celestina undertakes the task of intermediary for money, the Auctor assumes his mission for Leriano’s sake: “Tanta afición te tengo y tanto me ha obligado amarte tu nobleza, que avría tu remedio por galardón de mis trabajos” (49). The result is that while Leriano sends an ambassador who shares his and Laureola’s sense of virtue, Calisto’s choice of Celestina reduces his high praise of Melibea’s “nobleza é antigüedad” to pure convention and mocks the “resplandecientes virtudes” he has attributed to her (I: 53).

Laureola’s character is developed around the tension she feels between honor and compassion. The meaning of “honor” in the *Cárcel de Amor* derives from Christian doctrine and chivalric codes which emphasize chastity, and these conflict with that tenet of the courtly love doctrine which requires that every noble lady show compassion to her vassal-lover (Gili y Gava xviii). Since pity alone can cure Leriano of his lovesickness, Laureola is cast in the role of redeemer, and the religious imagery adopted by the cult of love is used almost to deify her: “pues si la remedias te da causa que puedas hazer lo mismo que Dios porque no es de menos estima el redemir quel criar, assí que harás tú tanto en quitalle la muerte como Dios en darle la vida” (50). At the same time, the conflict between her honor, which resides in her chastity, and her compassion, which resides

in her nobility, is established in her very first encounter with the Auctor. Honor, linked to reputation, demands not only that Laureola's virtue remain intact, but that she be *seen* to be chaste. All the Auctor asks of Laureola is that she receive Leriano's letter and answer it; "con sola esta merced le podrás redimir." But even such a modest *galardón* is fraught with peril.

Although Laureola remains a minimally fictional character whose vitality is limited to the tension she feels between the two virtues in contention, Leriano's behavior helps to define the heroine, for he is as protective of Laureola's virtue as she: "¿Cómo auía de aprouecharme el bien que a ti te viniese mal? Solamente pedí tu respuesta por primera y postrimero galardón" (56). And in service to his beloved's honor, he cavalierly takes up arms, even against his own king. Ennobled by his faith, Leriano performs great and heroic feats, as prescribed by courtly love. Yet, despite his success in freeing Laureola from her father's prison and restoring her honor, he is bound more than ever to averting the slightest suspicion of dishonorable conduct and so asks the Auctor to find some irreproachable way for him to see her and talk to her: "que tanto deseaua Leriano guardar su onestad, que nunca pensó hablalla en parte donde sospecha en ella se pudiese tomar" (73). Leriano's subsequent appeals to Laureola's compassion are virtually fruitless. Although she replies to his letter, it is only to repeat San Pedro's theme that honor is worth more than life itself, and that she therefore cannot prevent his death. She refuses to see him "avunque la muerte que dizes te viese recibir, auiendo por meior la crueldad onesta que la piedad culpada" (75). Leriano gladly dies for Laureola but not until he issues his twenty reasons why men are obligated to women, a tribute to Laureola which sums up the fusion of courtly, chivalric, and Christian virtues which she personifies. His death is a testimony to this faith.

In the creation of Melibea, Rojas burlesques the values personified by Laureola. Instead of the conflict between compassion and honor felt by Laureola, these virtues are now replaced by their corruptions: sexual appetite and social convention. While Leriano, Laureola and the Auctor clearly act in concert within an aristocratic community of shared Medieval values, Calisto, Melibea and Celestina dwell in a changing, chaotic world of markedly different moral values—lust, greed and hypocrisy.

Whereas Laureola, for fear of scandal, shuns private meetings with Leriano, the *Comedia* begins with a garden scene in which Melibea, alone with Calisto, displays little caution. Calisto, surpassing Leriano's adulation, equates Melibea with God Himself and mocks still another courtly convention when he characterizes the suffering which ennoble him as "seruicio, sacrificio, deuoción é obras pías" which in his case are designed to bribe God—"que por este lugar alcançar tengo yo a Dios offrescido" (I: 32). Melibea shows little maidenly modesty in her response to him:

“Pero avn más ygual galardón te daré yo, si perseueras” (I: 33). Lida de Malkiel comments upon Melibea’s lack of clear moral purpose: “. . . en lugar de rechazarlo de inmediato, le ha inducido solapadamente a declararse más para retirarse luego achacándole un propósito pecanimoso, trasto del horror-deseo que se está incubando en el alma de la ‘virginal doncella’ ” (419). In her feeble defense of honor Melibea protests, “Que no puede mi paciencia tollerar que aya subido en coraçon humano conmigo el ylicito amor comunicar su deleyte” (I: 34). However, from the outset the young woman shows a great discrepancy between what she says and what she does, as well as between what she says or does at different times. This behavior, however, must not be confused with the ambivalence which characterizes Laureola. In this scene, Calisto’s praise of Melibea’s “resplandecientes virtudes” is an ironical convention, especially when linked to her “grandíssimo patrimonio” (I: 53). Like all courtiers, Calisto seeks a *galardón* from his lady, but lacking concern for Melibea’s virtue or honor, he wants much more than a letter. Whereas Leriano, the Auctor and the King support Laureola’s chastity, Melibea finds no such backing; her pretense of virtue is readily eroded by Calisto, Celestina and indifferent parents, but most of all by her own appetites.

By calling Celestina “vezina honrrada,” Melibea’s mother unwittingly ridicules her daughter’s honor and her own. The irony persists in Rojas’s treatment of compassion. Parodying San Pedro’s Auctor, Celestina speaks to Melibea of compassion when she presents Calisto’s case, praising the young woman’s “noble boca,” “alto linaje,” and “liberalidad,” while studiously avoiding the specifics of her mission. Melibea succumbs readily to the *alcahueta*’s flattery, claiming, “Que yo soy dichosa, si de mi palabra ay necesidad para salud de algun cristiano Porque hazer beneficio es semejar á Dios . . . E demás desto, dizen que el que puede sanar al que padece, no lo faziendo, le mata” (175). Laureola herself might have uttered such a piece, but Rojas uses compassion satirically in this context, and Melibea’s reference to traditional Christian teaching on *piedad* is a sham.

While Laureola and the Auctor are generally straightforward with each other—as much as their inflated rhetoric will allow—Melibea and Celestina deceive one another. The old lady flatters Melibea who, employing religious sanctions, confuses appearances with inner virtue as she insists, “Que no puedo creer que en balde pintasse Dios vnos gestos mas perfetos que otros, mas dotados de gracias, mas hermosas faciones; sino para fazerlos almalzen de virtudes, de misericordia, de compassión, ministros de sus mercedes é dádivas, como á ti” (I: 175). Like Laureola, Melibea assumes the conventional courtly role of cause-and-cure of her lover’s illness when she asks, “Por Dios sin más dilatar, me digas quién es esse doliente, que de mal tan perplexo se siente, que su pasión é remedio salen de vna misma fuente” (I: 177). And, like Laureola, she responds with rage to the intermediary’s first approach. Nevertheless, while the Auctor, unsure, de-

fects only ambivalence in Laureola, Melibea is a mistress of duplicity. Despite her private visit with Calisto in Act I, she now raises questions about her honor, which for her seems to be simply reputation: "Por cierto, si no mirasse á mi honestidad é por no publicar su osadía desse atreuido, yo te fiziera, maluada, que tu razon é vida acabaran en vn tiempo" (I: 178). Mimicking even further the lady-redeemer motif of the *Cárcel*, Melibea continues, "¿Querrias condenar mi onestidad por dar vida á vn loco? ¿Dexar á mí triste por alegrar á él é llevar tú el prouecho de mi perdición, el galardón de mi yerro? ¿Perder é destruir la casa é la honrra de mi padre por ganar la de vna vieja maldita como tú?" (I: 178-179). This reference to her father's honor is particularly cynical in view of the outcome of the *Comedia*. In addition, in her speech Melibea twice betrays her awareness of Celestina's financial motivation, a far cry from the Auctor's altruism; yet she continues her communication with the old bawd, so her protests are not to be taken seriously. (Laureola too continues her communication with the Auctor despite fears about her honor, but his character and her own self-discipline make for a completely different situation.) Melibea claims she cannot believe Celestina because of the old woman's wicked reputation for lying, but she then reverses herself and uses her "compassion" to rationalize sending her *cordón* to Calisto to heal his supposed toothache. Her willingness to deceive finally extends to her mother, from whom she conceals her arrangements with Celestina.

While Laureola directly expresses her fear that Leriano might misinterpret her reply to his letter—"que puesto que tú solo y el leuador de mi carta sepays que escriuí, ¿qué sé yo los iuyzios que dareys sobre mí?" (56)—Melibea deliberately tries to deceive Calisto with Celestina's aid: "Pues, madre, no le dés parte de lo que passó a esse cauallero, porque no me tenga por cruel ó arrebatada ó deshonesta" (I: 189). It is also likely that Melibea, aware of Celestina's reputation, would be suspicious of the toothache ploy, and that her complicity in the lie is self-serving.

The Auctor's confusion over Laureola is the converse of Celestina's insight into Melibea.<sup>4</sup> The old matchmaker reassures Calisto of victory, describing "las escondidas donzellas" like Melibea,

Las quales, avnque están abrasadas é encendidas de viuos fuegos de amor, por su honestidad muestran vn frío exterior, vn sosegado vulto, vn aplazible desuío, vn constante ánimo é casto propósito, vnas palabras agras, que la propia lengua se maruilla del gran sofrimiento suyo, que la fazen forçosamente confessar el contrario de lo que sienten (I: 208).

That Celestina has reduced Melibea to a type, just one of many young women of her class whose behavior is predictable, is an indication of Rojas's satirical intent.

The *cordón* granted, Calisto, like Leriano, receives a brief respite from

his suffering. However, while Leriano's hope is limited to a most chaste token—a letter, an interview with Laureola—Calisto's senses ache for much more: “los ojos en vella, los oydos en oylla, las manos en tocalla” (I: 219)—hardly the attitude of a champion of her virtue. Parodying Leriano's cavalier defense of his lady's honor, Calisto simply employs the language of chivalry while his intentions remain questionable:

. . . pero esta mi señora tiene el corazón de azero. No ay metal, que con él pueda; no ay tiro, que le melle. Pues poned escalas en su muro: vnos ojos tiene con que echa saetas, vna lengua de reproches é desuios, el asiento tiene en parte, que media legua no le pueden poner cerco (I: 221).

For Rojas love has become warfare; the lover, conqueror.

In Act X, Melibea again talks of her honor, but not in the sense that Laureola does. Afflicted with a *terrible pasión*, Melibea regrets not having yielded to Calisto from the start and now fears losing him to another. At the same time, she professes to worry about her maid Lucrecia's opinion of her: “¡Cómo te espantarás del rompimiento de mi honestidad e vergüença que siempre como encerrada donzella acostumbré tener!” (II: 51). She asks God, “No se desdore aquella hoja de castidad, que tengo assentada sobre este amoroso desseo, publicando ser otro mi dolor, que no el que me atormenta” (II: 51). In declaring herself this way to Lucrecia, Melibea does not seem to share Laureola's concern for secrecy. Despite her protestations, she receives Celestina again into her home and continues her charade: “Dí, dí, que siempre la [licencia] tienes de mí, tal que mi honrra no dañe con tus palabras” (II: 55), but she just as quickly seesaws: “Agora toque en mi honrra, agora dañe mi fama, agora lastime mi cuerpo, avnque sea romper mis carnes para sacar mi dolorido corazón, te doy mi fe ser segura e, si siento aliuio, bien galardonada” (56).

In keeping with her name, Melibea yields to the *dulce amargura*, the *dulce e fiera herida*, the *blanda muerte* (II: 59). But, still conscious of at least the semblance of virtue, she warns, “No escandalizes la casa” (II: 61) and follows with her speech of capitulation, shunning any responsibility implicit in the use of the first person and substituting the third:

Quebróse mi honestidad, quebróse mi empacho, afloxó mi mucha vergüença, e como muy naturales, como muy domésticos, no pudieron tan liuianamente despedirse de mi cara, que no lleuassen consigo su color por algún poco de espacio, mi fuerça, mi lengua e gran parte de mi sentido (61).

Insisting that she is a prisoner of love—“En mi cordón le lleuaste embuelta la posesión de mi libertad”—Melibea nevertheless demonstrates herself to be quite autonomous when arranging her tryst with Calisto, swearing Lucrecia to secrecy, and ignoring her mother's warning not to

see Celestina a third time. Whereas Laureola vows obedience to her father, even in his unjust cause, Melibea remains impervious to all parental counsel. Celestina knows this and tells Calisto, "Que es más tuya que de sí misma; más está a tu mandato e querer que de su padre Pleberio" (II: 68). Despite Celestina's insistence that Melibea come to Calisto of her own free will and "aun de rodillas," Melibea continues to present the *persona* of the virtuous lady, donning the Laureola mask: "Desuía estos vanos e locos pensamientos de tí, porque mi honrra e persona estén sin detrimento de mala sospecha seguras" (II: 83). He and she then speak the language of *amor cortés*, paraphrasing the *Cárcel de Amor*. At the very same time, however, Melibea also invites Calisto to come to her the next night in the garden, cautioning him to be discreet and to bribe his servants into secrecy while she in turn lies to her parents. Deception follows deception so that even after satisfying her sexual desire Melibea continues to evade responsibility for her choice and to blame Calisto: "¿Cómo has quisido que pierda el nombre é corona de virgen por tan breve deleyte?" (119). Only after the fact does she remember her parents: "¡O mi padre honrrado, cómo he dañado tu fama e dado causa e lugar a quebrantar tu casa!" (II: 119). Whatever regrets Melibea may have for dishonoring her family, they pale in comparison to her sorrow over the loss of sexual pleasure caused by Calisto's death. Melibea kills herself not because of honor lost, neither her own nor her family's, but because she has lost the *remedio* for her *enfermedad e pasión*. In her first honest moment, Melibea tells her father the whole story; still, having decided to commit suicide, she continues to evade responsibility in her farewell prayer: "Tú, Señor, que de mi hablas eres testigo, ves mi poco poder, ves quán catiua tengo mi libertad, quán presos mis sentidos de tan poderoso amor del muerto cauallero, que priua al que tengo con los viuos padres" (II: 194). To Pleberio's exhortations, she responds that when the heart is impassioned, the ears are closed to advice, and fruitful words only increase one's rage (II: 195)—a judgment taken *verbatim* from King Gaulo of the *Cárcel de Amor* (66).

Although Laureola's choice of honor over compassion leads to Lariano's death, he gladly accepts martyrdom for his faith since he, Laureola and her family will thereby retain their honor. In direct contrast, Melibea's choice of sexual love over reputation leads not only to the unconfessed deaths of Calisto, Celestina, the servants and herself, but also to her father's despair. As for the question of honor, Pleberio's famous lament makes no mention of either honor or reputation, nor does he mourn the loss of Melibea's virtue as such.

Laureola serves San Pedro's depiction of courtly love very well. She is the ideal lady. If the ultimate measure of values—in fiction as in life—is death, Laureola demonstrates by her behavior that honor is her primary concern and that she means what she says. Her lover, her father, her uncle, her mother and the Auctor all share her conviction that honor transcends

life's limits and belongs to eternity. Accordingly, Leriano suffers martyrdom for her sake, and his "loco amor" is thus ennobled.

Melibea's suicide, however, is paradoxical. Devoid of Laureola's transcendental view of honor and chastity, Melibea is tied to earthly love and, therefore, to time. While her "amor loco" might have led her to fear death and the consequent loss of sexual pleasure, she in fact *takes* her own life because she has lost Calisto, who embodies that pleasure. Her suicide is an attempt to deprive death of its victory; and her strangely contorted wish for transcendence, for life after death which will reunite her with Calisto, inspires her to kill herself. She plans to join her lover, not in the Christian heaven of Laureola and Leriano, but in a temporal, physical union of corrupting bodies, her grave next to Calisto's. The parallel between the two heroines is therefore quite convoluted: as Laureola and Melibea view life, so they understand death and the hereafter. While San Pedro creates Laureola to exalt older values, Rojas destines Melibea to ring the death knell for the *medievo*.

Catherine Henry Walsh  
University of California, Los Angeles

#### NOTES

1. In his introduction to *Prison of Love*, Keith Whinnom establishes a direct link between the two works: ". . . we must not overlook the fact that Rojas, attacking the doctrines of courtly love in *Celestina*, was thoroughly familiar with *Prison of Love* and quotes from it . . ." (xxvii).

2. Hereafter all quotations from the *Cárcel* will be cited parenthetically by page number alone.

3. Hereafter all quotations from the *Celestina* will be cited parenthetically by volume and page number.

4. For opposing views of the Auctor's confusion between love and compassion, see Waley (260) and Wardropper ("Allegory and the Role of *El Autor*").

#### WORKS CITED

- Bataillon, Marcel. *La Celestina selon Fernando de Rojas*. Paris: Didier, 1961.  
*Cassell's Latin Dictionary*. New York: Funk & Wagnall's Company, n.d.  
 Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. *Originalidad artística de La Celestina*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Universitaria, 1962.  
 Maravall, José Antonio. *El mundo social de "La Celestina."* Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1972.  
 Rojas, Fernando de. *La Celestina*. Vols. I & II. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1972.  
 San Pedro, Diego de. *Cárcel de Amor*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1971.  
 Waley, Pamela. "Love and Honour in the *Novelas Sentimentales* of Diego de San Pedro and Juan de Flores." *BHS*, XLIII (1966): 253-275.  
 Wardropper, Bruce W. "Allegory and the Role of *El Autor* in the *Cárcel de Amor*." *Philological Quarterly*, XXXI (1952): 30-44.  
 ———. "El Mundo sentimental de la 'Cárcel de Amor.'" *RFE* (1953): 168-193.  
 Whinnom, Keith, trans. and introd. *Prison of Love*. By Diego de San Pedro. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1979.