

richiamano l'esperienza del giudice Vitale, che ha suscitato nel Nostro sofferita partecipazione. Aldo Rocco Vitale, presidente della seconda Sezione penale della corte D'appello di Catania, arrestato all'alba del 24 novembre del 1984 con un bliz spettacolare, veniva assolto due anni dopo perchè il fatto (interesse privato in atto d'ufficio e rivelazione di segreti) non sussisteva. Ma un fatto che non sussisteva, cioè che non era un fatto, aveva intanto distrutto la vita e la dignità morale di un uomo. E Sciascia ha annotato tutto questo tra le sue storie, assieme all'amicizia profonda che si era instaurata con la famiglia del giudice Vitale.

⁶ L'ultimo lavoro del romanziere, "Una storia semplice", sembra assumere questo ottimistico risultato, nel momento in cui troviamo finalmente il protagonista non più vinto, ma vincitore.

⁷ "Stava intanto guardando il cavaliere, la morte e il diavolo. Forse Ben Gunn, per come Stevenson lo descriveva, un pò somigliava alla Morte di Dürer; sicchè gli parve prendesse, la Morte di Dürer, un riflesso di grottesco. L'aveva sempre un pò inquietato l'aspetto stanco della Morte, quasi volesse dire che stancamente, lentamente arrivava quando ormai della vita si era stanchi. Stanca la Morte, stanco il suo cavallo... E la Morte, nonostante i minacciosi orpelli delle serpi e della clessidra, era espressiva più di mendicizia che di trionfo. "La morte si sconta vivendo. Mendicante, la si mendica" (69 s.).

● WORKS CITED

- Leonardo Sciascia, *Il cavaliere e la morte*. Milano: Adelphi Edizioni S.P.A., 1988.
Italo Svevo, *La coscienza di Zeno*. Milano: Edizione Dell'Oglio, 1931: 2:32s.

"Enxienplo de la propiedad qu'el dinero ha": Stanzas 490-512 as Evidence of the Secondary Unity of the *Libro de buen amor*

Richard Burkard
Penn State at Berks

One of the better known subthemes in the *Libro de buen amor* is the "Enxienplo de la propiedad qu'el dinero ha" (sts. 490-512) which appears in the *ars amandi* of the love god, don Amor. The popularity of the piece is understandable: what the Archpriest has to say about the nature of money constitutes a high point in Spanish satirical literature. And yet the topic itself is not original: along with many other *Libro* components such as the Endrina episode or the Aesopian animal fables, the "Enxienplo" was based on a pre-existing source model. These "outside" adaptations are, in fact, so numerous and diverse as to raise the question how well each one suits the particular context in which it occurs.

The inquiry is not without a bearing on a prominent approach to *Libro* interpretation since the middle of the 20th century: an attempt — can we even say a need? — to demonstrate the presence of a common design or purpose among the multiplicity of pieces comprising the work. For a few examples one might mention Anthony Zahareas who sees a general ironic-aesthetic intent on the part of the Archpriest and Vicente Reynal who finds a cautious attack on clerical celibacy running the length of the poem.

Few would deny the presence of irony and subtlety in the *Libro*. Nonetheless restraint would be in order when it comes to interpreting the poem as a whole along highly subjective lines. If there is much that is clever in our poet's masterpiece, there is also much that is indicative of a "secondary" thematic unity, i.e., an improvised unity imposed on pieces originally independent of each other. One could point, for instance, to the redundant *ars amandi* in stanzas 607d-648b (rendered redundant by don Amor's previous lesson in love) or the introduction of the old woman gobetween in stanzas 912cd-914 as if she were unknown to the reader. One gains the impression that the episode containing these latter verses (the "Apuesta dueña") was not at first intended for inclusion in the *Libro*.¹

The "Enxienplo de la propiedad qu'el dinero ha" also represents, I would suggest, an instance of an imperfectly contextualized subtheme. Considered *grosso modo* the piece is not strikingly in conflict with what

goes before or after. But yet, if we give careful thought to a stanza near the beginning of the love god's *ars amandi* and compare it to the "Enxienplo" we perceive a degree of discrepancy. Even more, in another stanza right after the "Enxienplo" one detects an attempt by the Archpriest to reduce the disaccord. This combination of inconsistency and corrective within one and the same episode has something to say, I think, about our poet's priorities in organizing the *Libro*, and I would like to undertake a close examination of the relevant stanzas. As we shall see, strict contextual compatibility was not necessarily a requirement for the inclusion of a piece in the poem.

Turning first then to the "Enxienplo" we notice that stanzas 488 and 489 act as an introduction. They, too, are of interest. We read as follows:

Otrossí quando vieres a quien usa con ella,
quier sea suyo o non, fáblale por amor d'ella;
si podieres, dal' algo; non le ayas querella,
ca estas cosas pueden a la mujer traella.

Por poquilla cosa del tu aver que l' dieres,
servirte ha lealmente, fará lo que quesieres;
que poco o que mucho dal' cada que podieres;
fará por los dineros todo quanto le pedieres.²

In his well-known study of *Libro* source texts, *Recherches sur le Libro de buen amor*, Félix Lecoy held that this precept in the art of seduction, as indeed many of the precepts in don Amor's *ars amandi*,³ was adapted by the Archpriest from the *Ars amatoria* of Ovid. His opinion has become rather standard over the years. And yet the passage in the Roman poet cited by the French scholar as corresponding to *Libro* 498-499 shows a notable amount of difference. This is not the place to enter into a comparison of the *Ars* and our Spanish poem. Suffice it to say that any attempt to derive the amatory ideas in the *Libro* directly from the *Ars* will prove so problematic as to render the correspondence suspect. Many of don Amor's notions about sexual love do seem, to be sure, to stem from Ovid's guide to seduction, but there were probably several intermediate compositions which served as the direct source. And one of these, as can be shown, was the *Pamphilus*. It would be useful to take a look at verses 125-128 in this 12th century "elegiac comedy": they make up part of the advice given by the goddess Venus to the would-be lover:

Et famulos famulasque domus sibi sepe loquentes
Allice colloquiis muneribusque tuis,

Ut semper referant de te bona uerba vicissim

Et pascant dominam laudibus usque tuam! (text of F. Becker)

And so with casual conversation and gifts gain
the confidence of her domestic servants, the ones
who often talk to her, in order that they, one
after the other, might always speak well of you.
Have them "feed" your lady with your praises!

As we can see, the four verses from the *Pamphilus* show a strong similarity both of idea and expression to *Libro* stanzas 488-489 (a considerably greater similarity than the *Ars* passage cited by Lecoy). Even more: one comes upon evidence elsewhere in the Spanish poem in support of the association. Since the previously mentioned "Endrina" episode represents the Archpriest's vernacular rendition of the *Pamphilus* as a whole, we might expect to find there a second version of these same four verses from the elegiac comedy. And we do: the corresponding locus is stanzas 638-639 where the aspiring lover is advised as follows:

Quando vieres algunos de los de su compañía,
fazles muchos placeres, fáblales bien con maña;
quando oye esto la dueña, su corazón se baña:
servidor lisonjero a su señor engaña.

Ado son muchos tizonos e muchos tizonadores,
mayor será el fuego e mayores los ardores;
ado muchos le dixieren tus bienes e tus loores,
mayor será su quexa e sus deseos mayores.

A comparison of stanzas 488 and 638 reveals that both are fairly similar (especially with respect to the first two verses) and give the content of *Pamphilus* 125-128. But a comparison of the second stanza in each group, or 489 and 639, shows a divergence. In 639 the Archpriest continues to develop his theme more narrowly in accordance with the sense of *Pamphilus* verses 127-128 and describes the effect which the flattery of the intermediaries will have on the woman the lover seeks to seduce. In 489 on the other hand the poet concentrates on the idea of gift giving mentioned in verse 126 of the Latin play (and 488c in the *Libro*). Such giving, we are told, is useful as a means of insuring loyalty and obedience. But at the same time the initially ambiguous characterization of what was to be given ("algo,") becomes money outright ("poquilla cosa del tu aver"), as if

that had been from the start the specific nature of what the lover was to hand out. The "swerve," as it were, then allows the poet to launch into the "Enxienplo" in the following stanza or 490. It would seem, therefore, that 488-489 is an adaptation of a *Pamphilus* text utilized for the sake of introducing the antimoney theme contained in the next 24 stanzas. This clear influence of the elegiac comedy on don Amor's *ars amandi* should be kept in mind. It is not limited to stanzas 488-489.

Moving on now to the "Enxienplo" proper we might take a look at a few excerpts to get the gist of the piece and take note of an aspect likely to strike the reader as bizarre. The first two stanzas run as follows:

Mucho faze el Dinero, mucho es de amar:
ca al torpe mesquino faze buen omne de prestar,
faze correr al coxo e al mudo fablar;
el que non tiene manos dineros quiere tomar.

Sea un omne necio e rudo labrador,
los dineros le fazen fidalgo e sabidor;
quanto más algo tien' tanto es de más valor:
el que non ha dineros non es de sí señor. (490-491)

The general character of all 24 stanzas is already present in these two: the audience is being offered a stock satirical theme in which the writer or poet complains of the power of money and its detrimental effect on the social order. Thus, money, we are told, does much; it is highly to be prized. It can induce the lame to walk and the mute to speak, or enable the coarse peasant to take on the status of nobleman and scholar. Indeed, the greater his wealth, the greater his worth. On the other hand — here the converse — the man who has no money is not even master of himself.

Compositions like these often have an anticlerical dimension, and so does that of our poet. In stanzas 492-493 we find don Amor lamenting the venality prevalent in the church, especially the Papacy:

Si tovieres dineros avrás consolación,
plazer e alegría e del papa ración;
comprarás paraíso e ganarás salvación:
do son muchos dineros es mucha bendición.

Yo vi en corte de Roma, do es la santidad,
que todos al Dinero fazíanle omildad,
grand onra le fazían con grand solenidad:
todos a él se encrinavan como a la magestad.

What is one to make of the indignation demonstrated by the god of illicit sexual love for human moral failure, especially that of the clergy (all in all there are ten stanzas assailing clerical greed in the "Enxienplo")? One of the previously mentioned critics sees the diatribe as ironic in sense: don Amor appears to attack the power of money, but his attack is non serious: it amounts in reality to praise (Zahareas 99-105). Against this view, however, is the fact that the theme in itself is not original. The undeniable existence of source text antecedents for don Amor's complaint (see Lecoy 237-243) should cause one to be wary of "reading in" too much. And the need for caution becomes all the greater when we consider that other sub-themes of only partial relevance to the wider context can be found here and there in the *Libro*.⁴

One can point, moreover, to textual evidence that the Archpriest himself was not convinced of the complete compatibility of the piece and sought to incorporate an adjustment. If we look farther down at verse *a* of stanza 513 we find the love god generalizing about the power of money:

Las cosas que son graves fázelas de ligero.

But the verse is not so much part of the "Enxienplo" — it ends properly with stanza 512 — as rather a transitional statement allowing the poet to introduce the ideas contained in the remaining verses of 513 and all of 514. The passage runs as follows:

Por ende a tu vieja sey franco e llenero,
que poco o que mucho non vaya sin loguero:
non me pago de juguetes do non anda dinero.

si algo non le dieres, cosa mucha o poca,
sey franco de palabra, non le digas razón loca;
quien non tiene miel en orça, téngala en la boca:
mercador que esto faze bien vende e bien troca.

Stanzas 513-514 are similar in sense to the introductory stanzas, 488-489, in that both sets of verse refer to the lover's intermediary or intermediaries and both mention the suitability of a monetary reward. But there are two important differences: in 513-514 the intermediary referred to is specifically an old woman and the implication is now made that the lover need not actually confer the reward: mere talk of remuneration can be sufficient. The careful reader senses an element of disaccord: nowhere in the "Enxienplo" was it stated that a pretense of possessing or conferring money was adequate for success. Indeed, the piece seems to imply re-

peatedly that a lack of financial means will perforce entail failure. For the sake of certainty we might give thought once again to 491d:

el que non ha dineros non es de si señor.

Or to 497c:

el que non tiene dineros échanle las esposas;

Or to 512d:

el que non tiene qué dar el su cavallo non corre.

Why, then, did the poet back off from this principle and introduce the deviation in 513-514?

The cause can be found at the beginning of don Amor's *ars amandi* in stanza 451 where the lover is instructed as follows:

De tus joyas fermosas cada que dar podieres;
quando dar non quesieres o quando non tovieres,
promete e manda mucho, maguer non gelo dieres;
luego estará afiusada, fará lo que quesieres.⁵

As we presently have the *Libro* the sense here would seem to apply by force of context to the ladylove. There are several cogent reasons, however, for believing that the sequence of stanzas in this part of the Spanish poem has been garbled and 451 was originally intended to apply to the old woman go-between.⁶ One might consider that:

- 1) The stanza which follows, or 452, is clearly out of place.
- 2) Stanzas 436-443 (the go-between recommendations) are possibly out of place and should appear as 444-451.⁷
- 3) The old woman go-between is a peddler of jewels.
- 4) If stanza 451 is taken as referring to the ladylove, the import renders all the rest of don Amor's *ars amandi* superfluous and is flatly contradicted farther down by 550cd.⁸

Why did the Archpriest find it necessary to insure that the "Enxienplo" did not eclipse the idea conveyed by 451? Or better, why was the precept in 451 thought to be of such importance as to warrant reinforcement in 513-514? The answer to the question lies in the *Pamphilus* where one of the prominent motifs is precisely that of the lover who promises

rewards to his go-between but fails to make good on delivery. This notion of welching on payment to an intermediary reappears frequently in *Pamphilus* inspired clerical literature.⁹ And our poet's vernacular adaptation of the Latin play, the Endrina episode — one may recall that it serves as a sequel to don Amor's lesson in love — is no exception. In stanzas 815-822 we are treated to a scene in which the old woman go-between and the lover are at loggerheads because of the latter's attempt to evade the payment promised in 719ab. We can see therefore why the Archpriest would not have wanted the "Enxienplo" to stand uncorrected.

But another question arises: if the Archpriest sought to bring don Amor's complaint into line with developments elsewhere in the *Libro*, how is it he did not do a more convincing job and modify the theme itself so as to state or imply that merely feigning possession of money can be advantageous? Why, in brief, was he satisfied with a two stanza ad hoc appendage?

In view of what we have seen thus far the answer would have to be that our poet was simply not interested in altering a composition that was already complete. Having composed the "Enxienplo" for some purpose independent of the *Libro* (which may not have existed at the time) he subsequently decided to incorporate the theme into the larger poem where best it would fit. But he had no intention of changing the piece itself to make it suit the surrounding context: for this purpose the addition of a few preceding stanzas to serve as an introduction and a few succeeding stanzas to offset the inconsistency were deemed sufficient.

The foregoing explanation involves of course an assumption: that the "Enxienplo" enjoyed an independent existence prior to becoming part of the *Libro*. To date there is no evidence that such was the case other than the thematic self sufficiency of the piece and its incongruousness vis a vis don Amor's lesson in love. But may we not consider this as evidence enough? Indeed, the relevant consideration is not whether the "Enxienplo" was originally autonomous, but why the Archpriest chose to include it at all in the *Libro*. We need not reflect very long to come up with a possible motive. Lecoy probably phrased it best when he suggested (p. 304) in reference to the redundancy caused by doña Venus' *ars amandi*: "... he (the poet) could not bring himself to sacrifice any of the products of his poetic creativity."

● NOTES

¹ And by extension (cf. 913) the same may be said for the "Ferrand García" in sts. 112-122.

² All quotations from the *Libro* are from the edition of Raymond Willis.

³ In spite of its age and faults Lecoy's study is still of use. For the *Libro-Ars* connection see 290-306.

⁴ For a forthright example see the fable of the wolf and the crane (sts. 252-256). The piece is introduced by a single verse (251d) and is offered to the audience as an illustration of the sin of avarice. But the lesson drawn in the final stanza (the futility of expecting to profit from a service rendered to the wicked) is hardly apropos. Aside from st. 255 (apparently inserted to reinforce 251d) the piece is self sufficient and was probably not intended at first to illustrate one of the capital sins.

⁵ Note the contradiction between 512d and 451d (in conjunction with cd).

⁶ But it should be noted that regardless of the person to whom 451 is intended to refer, vv *bcd* would still conflict with the sense of the "Enxiemplo."

⁷ Joan Corominas makes this rearrangement in his critical edition of the *Libro*.

⁸ "de quanto que pudieres non le seas escasso, / de lo que le prometieres non la trayas a traspasso." (the stanza refers undoubtedly to the ladylove).

⁹ See, for example, the advice given to the lover in vv 41-42 of the 12th or 13th century *Pseudo Ars Amatoria* (ed. E. Thiel), and "Ovid's" dealings with an old woman go-between in Book II, vv 355-396 of the pseudo-Ovidian *De Vetula*. See also Matthew of Vendôme's verse epistle in which an elderly go-between upbraids a seducer for his stinginess (pp 607-610 in a collection printed by W. Wattenbach).

● WORKS CITED

- Juan Ruiz. *Libro de buen amor*. Ed. Joan Corominas. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1967.
- Juan Ruiz. *Libro de buen amor*. Ed. Raymond S. Willis. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Lecoy, Félix. *Recherches sur le Libro de buen amor*. Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1938.
- Ovid. *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. Trans. J. H. Mozley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Pamphilus, Prolegomena zum Pamphilus und Kritische Textausgabe*. Ed. Franz G. Becker. Ratingen: A. Henn Verlag, 1972.
- Thiel, Erich Joseph. "Mittelateinische Nachdichtungen von Ovids 'Ars amatoria' und 'Remedia amoris.'" *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch*. V, (1968): 115-180.

Pseudo-Ovidius de Vetula. Ed. Paul Klopsch. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Reynal, Vicente. *El buen amor del Arcipreste y sus secretas razones*. Humacao: Ediciones Humanitas, 1982.

Wattenbach, W. "Ein Poetischer Briefsteller von Matthäus von Vendôme." *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, (Nov. 1872): 561-631.

Zahareas, Anthony. *The Art of Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita*. Madrid: Estudios de Literatura Española, 1965.