

INCONSISTENCIES IN THE USE OF ARCHAIC AND MODERN  
FORMS IN LA CELESTINA

---

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SPANISH  
IN THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE  
TEXAS STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

DEPARTMENT OF  
F O R E I G N   L A N G U A G E S

BY  
RUTH NATIONS, B.A.

---

DENTON, TEXAS

JUNE, 1938

Thesis  
T 1938  
N 2776

# TEXAS STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

DENTON, TEXAS

JUNE 1938

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared  
under my supervision by RUTH NATIONS  
entitled INCONSISTENCIES IN THE USE OF ARCHAIC  
AND MODERN FORMS IN LA CELESTINA  
be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Rebecca Switzer  
In Charge of Thesis

Rebecca Switzer  
Director of Department

Accepted:

W.H. Clark  
Director, Graduate Division

65286



## PREFACE

This study is based on the first five acts of La Celestina, tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea. (Madrid: Librería de los Sucesores de Hernando, 1924). In general this text followed that published in Valencia in 1514, by Juã Joffre. It was compared also with the edition of 1516, with that of Burgos in 1499, and of Sevilla in 1501. The edition published in Burgos in 1499, by Fadrique Alemán is the oldest edition known.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Doctor Rebecca Switzer, whose advice and direction have made this study possible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE LINGUISTIC VALUE OF <u>LA CELESTINA</u> . . . . .	1
II. ORTHOGRAPHIC INCONSISTENCIES. . . . .	4
III. ARCHAIC WORDS AND FORMS . . . . .	25
IV. PRONOUNS . . . . .	34
V. <u>LA CELESTINA'S</u> CONTRIBUTION TO THE SPANISH	
LANGUAGE . . . . .	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	42

## CHAPTER I

### THE LINGUISTIC VALUE OF LA CELESTINA

Very little is known about the author of La Celestina, tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea,<sup>1</sup> Fernando de Rojas<sup>2</sup> (or whoever he may have been) and how he happened to write the book. It is written in such a direct, natural style that it is difficult to realize that this book was written centuries ago. All the more remarkable is Rojas' style when we realize that many of the best writers failed to appreciate Spanish as a medium of expression.

When we examine the state of the Spanish language in the late fifteenth century, we find writers declaring it to be too rude and undeveloped for their use. In 1477, Fray Juan López said that to write in Latin was much more satisfactory, as it was a richer and more flexible language. Ambrosio de Morales, in 1565, considers Spanish "venido en tanto menosprecio que basta ver un libro escrito en castellano para no ser tenido en nada."<sup>3</sup> Many writers used Spanish rather apologetically as if they felt

---

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea, edited by Cayo Ortega y Mayor (Madrid: Librería de Sucesores de Hernando, 1924). Henceforth the shortened form of La Celestina will be used in referring to the work. This thesis has made a study of the first five acts.

<sup>2</sup>A dispute as to who is the author of La Celestina has existed almost as long as the book itself. This thesis does not wish to enter into the dispute, but, for the sake of expediency, will use Rojas in referring to the author of the book.

<sup>3</sup>Quoted from A. F. G. Bell, Luis De León (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 33.

it to be their patriotic duty to raise it from an everyday level to heights of artificiality through a superabundance of erudition.

Even as late as 1576 Fray Luis de León says some people think that to use romance is to speak as the plebeians do. They do not know that good speech is not common, but a matter of individual judgement as to what one says as well as how one says it; a matter of choice of words so that one may not only speak clearly but with harmony and sweetness.<sup>1</sup>

However, reason and good taste soon led Castilian writers away from the wild extravagance of style evident in some of the pseudo Latin scholars of the day. Contrary to the opinion of Lopez were the opinions of Nebrija and some of the other writers of the fifteenth century. In view of the fact that Nebrija was so thoroughly steeped in classical languages and literatures, it is remarkable that he should have been the first to take steps toward the standardization of a romance language. It was he who in 1492 wrote the first Spanish grammar, Gramática de la lengua castellana,<sup>2</sup> and although he used many Latinisms, his grammar must be recognized as the beginning of a new era in the Spanish language. He felt the need of a more usable, standardized mode of expression.

Since Rojas must have attended the University of Sala-

---

<sup>1</sup>Luis de León, De los nombres de Cristo (Madrid: Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1921), III, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Antonio de Nebrija, Gramática de la lengua castellana (Salamanca: 1492). The edition used was that of London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

manca where Nebrija taught, it is probable that he was influenced by Nebrija's teachings. Just how much is uncertain, but we do know that Rojas appears to have been torn by two desires, the one to follow in the steps of Latin and Greek scholars, and the other to follow the rather loosely established usages of the vernacular. Rojas, being a scholarly person evidently influenced by the nationalistic spirit in Spain, must have recognized the necessity for developing a language that would attract all the people of Spain rather than the favored few who happened to have been fortunate enough to have studied the classics. It was probably this love for his native tongue that inspired him to adopt the clear, unaffected, and natural style of La Celestina.

La Celestina is a landmark, a definite accomplishment in the field of linguistic standardization. Its greater fixity in linguistic usage over that achieved by other romance languages of the same period was due to the fact that the author recognized certain rules. Through the efforts of many Spanish scholars such as Nebrija, imbued with the spirit of nationalism, Rojas had an almost adequate set of linguistic and grammatical rules at his disposal. Under casual inspection, La Celestina apparently contains many inconsistencies, but through detailed study, there is discovered an astonishing regularity.

## CHAPTER II

### ORTHOGRAPHIC INCONSISTENCIES

The majority of confusions in La Celestina, with the exception of some transitional and archaic forms and irregularities of syntax, occur in spelling. Spelling, being inextricably involved in the problems of phonetics, was logically influenced by the usages of the common speech of the fifteenth century; and common speech usually abounds with inconsistencies. In learned usage, we discover an equal amount of indecision. As seen in the previous chapter, the opinions of Nebrija expressed in his Gramática and those of Valdés, expressed in his Diálogo<sup>1</sup> some fifty years later, failed to agree on many points. This lack of agreement of scholars causes us to expect many inconsistencies. In this linguistic study of an adequate work of the fifteenth century, La Celestina, we shall set forth various reasons for the apparent inconsistencies in grammatical usage and in spelling.

The occurrence of initial f or h in the same word constitutes one of the apparent inconsistencies in La Celestina. In a count of commonly used words such as fablar-hablar (fabulare), facer-hacer (facere), fijo-hijo (filium), fermosa-hermosa (formosam), filo-hilo (filum), and fuir-huir (fugere), initial h is used one hundred fifty-nine times, and initial f, thirty-one times.<sup>2</sup> A predominance of the initial h is noted showing that

---

<sup>1</sup>Juan de Valdés, Diálogo de la lengua (Madrid: Editorial "Saturnino Calleja," 1919).

<sup>2</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.



the attempt of Nebrija and some of the other writers of that period to regularize the use of aspirate h as a substitute for Latin f was beginning to exert its influence on the scholars of that epoch.<sup>1</sup> Menéndez Pidal says,

La f se conservó en la lengua escrita hasta fines del siglo XV--como se conserva hasta hoy en la generalidad de los romances, incluso el portugués y catalán--, pero luego fué sustituida por la h.....<sup>2</sup>

Initial h occurs in the verb hauer eighty-eight times, and is omitted thirty-seven times. It is not known positively whether h was consistently aspirated or was silent in the fifteenth century. The fact that a grammarian of the following period occasionally omitted h<sup>3</sup> in the verb hauer and sometimes used h<sup>4</sup> in the same verb illustrates the non-conformity even in later usage. That Nebrija realized this lack of consistency is to be seen in the following quotation:

La h no sirve por si en nuestra lengua, mas usamos della para tal sonido cual pronunciamos en las primeras letras destas diciones: 'hago, hecho'; la cual letra, aunque en el latin no tenga fuerza de letra, es cierto que como nos otros la pronunciamos hiriendo en la garganta, se puede contar en el numero de las letras, como los judios y moros--de los cuales nos otros la recebimos, quanto io pienso--la tienen por letra.<sup>5</sup>

Another example of the inconsistency in the use of, or

---

<sup>1</sup>Menéndez Pidal, Manual de gramática histórica española (Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez, 1929), p. 100.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>3</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 71.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>5</sup>Nebrija, op. cit., p. 26.



omission of initial h is in the spelling of hedad<sup>1</sup> (aetatem). Some of the writers of the fifteenth century omitted initial h from certain words and added it to other words where it was not needed. This evidenced a very loose use of h, which was probably due to lack of established rules.

In addition to the interchange of initial f and h, only one inconsistency occurs in the writing of initial f. The word filósofo is spelled twice with initial f,<sup>2</sup> and once with ph.<sup>3</sup> The ph is probably due to the practice of following the Latin spelling of philosophus. We may conclude, therefore, that in this case Rojas shows a tendency to discard the Latin form and employ purely phonetic spelling.

Paralleling the interchange of f and h as initial letters in the words cited in the preceding paragraphs is the use of initial u for v. Although u often replaces v when used intervocalically, initial replacement occurs only twice in La Celestina and that is the verb uer.<sup>4</sup>

Passing from the interchange of certain initial letters, we consider irregularities in the use of initial b and v. Irregularities, that is, variations from today's Spanish taken as the norm, occur in the use of these two letters. In order to see why

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

these irregularities occur it will be necessary to examine the use of initial b and v in the fifteenth century. We know a distinction was made between initial b and v in romance languages<sup>1</sup> and vulgar Latin as illustrated in La Celestina by such words as boca<sup>2</sup> and beuer,<sup>3</sup> which showed the tendency to follow the Latin sound and spelling of the words bucca and bivere. On the other hand initial v was pronounced as b in biuir<sup>4</sup> (vivere), boz<sup>5</sup> (vocem), boluer<sup>6</sup> (volvere), and bispera<sup>7</sup> (vespera), indicating the employment of the principle of dissimilation.<sup>8</sup>

Every word spelled with the initial ll today is found spelled with ll in La Celestina except lleuar. Lleuar (levare) is spelled with ll six times, and l three times.<sup>9</sup> The e of the stem of the Latin verb diphthongized to ie when stressed; the li of the resultant stem lieu produced ll in those particular persons of the conjugations (lleuo)<sup>10</sup> while l remained in the other persons, as (leuays).<sup>11</sup> Menéndez Pidal says: "....levare en

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>2</sup>La Celestina, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>9</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

la Edad Media se conjugaba etimologicamente liévo, liévas, liéva, levamos, levádes; ly--se pronuncio ll--y se extendió a todo el verbo: llevo,...."<sup>1</sup> In considering the occurrence of the verb llevar it is to be seen that the use of initial l and ll is due to the development and change of the Latin verb levare under the stress of popular pronunciation.

Throughout Ia Celestina c follows the exact usage of modern Spanish, except in a few cases. With few exceptions the Latin rule is followed in the spelling of quando (quando), qual (qualis), and quanto (quantum). In Ia Celestina, quando occurs twenty-two times, whereas cuando occurs only twice; qual occurs twenty-two times, and cual only three times; and quanto seventeen times and cuanto only once.<sup>2</sup> Quatorze<sup>3</sup> (quattuordecim), quatro<sup>4</sup> (quattour), and quasi<sup>5</sup> invariably follow the Latin spelling.<sup>6</sup>

Quite a few inconsistencies are found among the initial consonants, but such is not the case among the initial vowels. Igual<sup>7</sup> is written once with initial i and twice with y.<sup>8</sup> In all

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 251.

<sup>2</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 177.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>6</sup>Curujano - Through assimilation with the u in the second syllable, the i in the first syllable became u. In order to try to avoid the hard sound, initial c was changed to q.

<sup>7</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 1.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

other words either the i or the y is used consistently. The prefixing of an e to initial s plus a consonant is found in nearly all words of Latin origin, such as esperança (sperantiam),<sup>1</sup> especie (speciem), etc.; but there is some indecision as to the use of the e prefix in the words escriuir (scribere), espíritu (spiritum) and espantable (expaventare), Rojas having employed the e prefix twice as many times as he omitted it.

Inconsistencies in the internal consonants in La Celestina are explained by the struggle between the writer's traditionalism and his desire to follow the modern trend in writing, which struggle was only partially successful, as is illustrated by his use of both the Latin and romance language forms. Of the usages of the period M. Pidal says,

La posicion interior hace que las consonantes pronunciadas con mas energia se debiliten, y que las pronunciadas con menos esten expuestas a perderse; segun esto, la medial simple, si es sorda, se hace sonora y si es sonora tiende a perderse. La consonante doble se hace sencilla, y la ll y nn se palatalizan.<sup>2</sup>

The Latin voiceless sibilant s becomes voiced in Castilian, and is written in Old Spanish as s.<sup>3</sup> Examples are casa (casam), hermosa (formosam), uso (usum) and visitar (visitare).<sup>4</sup> However, the Latin voiceless ss remained voiceless ss in Old

<sup>1</sup>No attempt will be made in this thesis to distinguish between Classical, Literary and Vulgar Latin.

<sup>2</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>3</sup>J. D. M. Ford, Old Spanish Readings (New York: Ginn and Co., 1911), p. xxxv.

<sup>4</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

Spanish, but is now written s.<sup>1</sup> The verbs passar (passare), necessitar (necessitare), and posseer (possidere); the nouns missa (missam), passión (passionem), and posibilidad (possibilitatem); the pluperfect subjunctive endings of tardasse and pudiesse; the absolute superlative of grandíssimo and excelentíssimo are all examples of the Old Spanish voiceless ss.<sup>2</sup> Intervocalic Old Spanish ss sometimes resulted from the assimilation of another consonant preceding the s:<sup>3</sup> esse (ipse) and osso (ursum).<sup>4</sup> Again we see that, although Rojas shows many non-conformities with modern spelling, he is consistent in his irregularities.

The only inconsistency observed in the usages stated above is in the verb necesitar (necessitare), which is spelled sometimes with single s, and again with ss, with ss predominating.<sup>5</sup>

S is also used in the place of x in the word misto<sup>6</sup> (mixtum), and in the prefix of estenso<sup>7</sup> (extensum), and escusar<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxv.

<sup>2</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>3</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxv.

<sup>4</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 96.

(excusare). This is an example of the tendency in that epoch to spell Spanish exactly as it was pronounced. Navarro Tomás says, "En la conversación corriente, la x ante consonante se pronuncia como una simple s: ...."<sup>1</sup>

In Rojas' use of intervocalic s he is more consistent than he is in his use of intervocalic c before e and i. According to Ford,

Latin intervocalic c before e and i and ti produced in Old Spanish a voiced dental sibilant written z. In the sixteenth century this unvoiced to ts and was confused with voiceless Old Spanish c from Latin c before e and i after a consonant, Latin ty and cy after a consonant and Latin intervocalic cy; by the end of that century .... the voiceless th of modern Spanish had been established.<sup>2</sup>

Vacio (vacivum), hazer (facere), and dezir (dicere) of La Celestina have lost their voiced sibilants today. Z is used rather consistently in the three words, but dezir and hazer are found twice spelled with c.<sup>3</sup> Although razón<sup>4</sup> (rationem) and goza<sup>5</sup> (gaudium) have retained their Old Spanish spelling, they are pronounced with the voiceless c (th). In Vulgar Latin intervocalic cy gave voiceless Old Spanish c:<sup>6</sup> coraçon<sup>7</sup> (coracionem) and

<sup>1</sup>T. Navarro Tomás, Manual de pronunciación española (Madrid: Casa Edit. Hernando, 1926), p. 137.

<sup>2</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxvi.

<sup>3</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>6</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxvii.

<sup>7</sup>La Celestina, p. 40.

cabeca<sup>1</sup> (capiciam). After a consonant c before e and i, ty and cy became ts, written c in Old Spanish. This voiceless sibilant became confused with the unvoiced c of the sixteenth century, and both have become the modern th written c before e and i, and z before a, o and u.<sup>2</sup> We find additional evidence of this confusion in the noun vergüenza which is spelled seven times with a c and once with z.<sup>3</sup> Another irregularity in the use of intervocalic c before e and i is in ación<sup>4</sup> (actionem), facción<sup>5</sup> (facionem), and confación<sup>6</sup>, words which in modern Spanish have cc. Rojas is consistent in the use of these three transitional forms. Evidently he preferred single c in this position.

Although a great amount of confusion occurs in the use of c before e and i, we find only one irregularity in the use of c before a, o and u. Intervocalic c before o, a and u offers little difficulty as it usually follows the Latin spelling: loca (glaucam?) and poco (paucum).<sup>7</sup> However, two cases are found in La Celestina of cc in occulto (occultum) and peccado (peccatum), which do not occur in modern Spanish. As peccado occurs only

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxvi.

<sup>3</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., Acts I-V.



twice, and pecado seven times, there is evident a decided trend toward modern spelling.<sup>1</sup>

With intervocalic l the author uses Latin spelling rather consistently. For example, the words palabra (parabola), dolor (dolorem), hilado (filum) have a single l in Latin; and intellec-tual (intellectus), maravilla (mirabilis) and constelación (con-  
stellationem) have ll.<sup>2</sup> Only one word, intollerable<sup>3</sup> (intolera-bilis), is found, and that only once, in which the l of the Latin spelling becomes ll in Spanish. There are a few cases in La Celestina, accounted for by acoustic equivalence, where Rojas substitutes r for l and l for r: for example, cobrallo,<sup>4</sup> esperallas,<sup>5</sup> posseellas<sup>6</sup> and frecha.<sup>7</sup> Menéndez Pidal says of acoustic equivalence:

El oído, al escuchar una palabra poco habitual, puede equivocarse, oyendo alguno de sus sonidos diferente de como se ha pronunciado, es decir, confundiendo un sonido con otro algo análogo.<sup>8</sup>

Only one inconsistency is found in the use of intervocalic n. Inocente (innocuus) is spelled twice with nn and twice

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 162.

with n.<sup>1</sup> The use of n can be explained by the modern tendency to avoid double consonants,<sup>2</sup> but the nn results from the retention of the final n of the syllable in which is derived from the Latin prefix in (in-nocuus). Menéndez Pidal says, "N .... se conserva en in (en)."<sup>3</sup>

The author's apparent inconsistencies in the use of x and j (g) which were two quite different sounds in Old Spanish, are due to his having followed the Latin spelling of the words in most cases. All words spelled in Latin with x, such as laxare (dexar), baxar (baxar), coaxare (guexar), are spelled with x.<sup>4</sup> Words spelled with the li (j equivalent) in Latin such as, tripaliare (trabajo), filium (hijo) and consiliare (consejo), maintain a consistent j.<sup>5</sup>

Old Spanish had two fricative prepalatals: voiceless x and voiced j (g).<sup>6</sup> The sound of the x was similar to the French ch of chambre, whereas today both fricatives are fused into a single voiceless velar fricative.<sup>7</sup> An example of this Old Spanish x is found in dixe.<sup>8</sup> G is used consistently in such words as

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>2</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

<sup>4</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 94.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>La Celestina, p. 68.

ligero,<sup>1</sup> afligidos,<sup>2</sup> and gente;<sup>3</sup> and j occurs in hereje<sup>4</sup> and jiri-falte. The only inconsistency in the use of g and j is in the words mujer and ajeno, in which they are spelled sometimes with g, sometimes j, with g predominating about two to one.<sup>5</sup>

The spelling of cuydado with a t as often as with a d is an inconsistency which may be attributed to the author's having followed the Latin spelling of the word.<sup>6</sup>

There is only one occurrence of an irregularity in intervocalic ll. This is the popular form ay (allí).<sup>7</sup> This is due to careless pronunciation of the ll resulting in its omission.

Old Spanish distinguished between an explosive voiced b and a fricative voiced v. Intervocalic b came from Latin p, while v (u) came from Latin b or v. Menéndez Pidal says,

La lengua antigua distinguía una b explosiva sonora, y una v fricativa sonora; entre vocales, la b procedía de p latina: recipio recibo y la v de b o v latinas: avem ave ....<sup>8</sup>

Thus in La Celestina we have cabeça (capitiam), trabajo (tripali-are), and recibir (recipere) with explosive b; and cavallo

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., Acts I-V.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 94.

(caballum), auer (habere), amaua (amabam), biuir (bivere), lleuar (levare), voluer (volvere) and seruir (servire) with the old fricative voiced v (u).<sup>1</sup> As shown above, u was consistently used for the fricative voiced v, the only exception being the verb lleuar, which occurred with a v one time.<sup>2</sup> In the sixteenth century both sounds were confused, the intervocalic explosive being lost and fricative v being used almost exclusively.<sup>3</sup> Fricative v was written either b or v in order to follow Latin etymology; thus our spelling today of amaba (amabam) and caballo (caballum), etc., differs from that of vivir (vivere).<sup>4</sup>

Intervocalic r with the exception of changes resulting from acoustic equivalence, discussed in the section dealing with intervocalic l, remained invariable with the exception of honrra.<sup>5</sup> When r was initial or followed by n or l, it was often written as rr in Old Spanish.<sup>6</sup>

In the labio-dental group bd, confusion arises over the question of when to sound and when to omit the b. Valdés pronounced the b and gives the following reason:

Porque a mi ver los vocablos estan mas llenos y mejores con la b que sin ella y porque toda mi vida los he escrito y pronunciado con b.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>3</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 95.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>La Celestina, p. 86.

<sup>6</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxviii.

<sup>7</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 109.

One reason for the loss of the b and retention of the d is that in romance syllabication the d then had the strength of an initial consonant, whereas the b had the weakness of a final consonant.<sup>1</sup> When the modern form ciudad occurs seven times and cibdad only once, it seems that modern orthography predominates; but such is not the case with all of the words of this group. Debda<sup>2</sup> occurs as often as deuda;<sup>3</sup> dubdosa occurs thirteen times and du-dosa once;<sup>4</sup> while cobdicia<sup>5</sup> occurs consistently in the old form. Therefore, it appears that Rojas conforms to no set rule, but uses first the old and then the modern form.

In the ct group, the k sound, being at the end of a syllable and weaker than the initial t of the following syllable, was influenced by the t until it finally weakened into a fricative and in most cases disappeared.<sup>6</sup> There is non-conformity in La Celestina in the spelling of the words belonging to this group. Instructo<sup>7</sup> (instructum), which in present-day spelling retains its c, loses it in La Celestina, while respecto<sup>8</sup> (respectum) and

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 133.

<sup>2</sup>La Celestina, p. 53.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., Acts I-V.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>6</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 118.

<sup>7</sup>La Celestina, p. 49.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

tractado<sup>1</sup> retain their archaic forms. The probable reason why modern santa<sup>2</sup> (sanctum) outnumber sancta<sup>3</sup> seven to two, is that, while either sancta or santa was used by the literati, santa was used almost exclusively by the common people. Valdés favored a rule to use ct in every case,<sup>4</sup> but as there was no well-established rule of usage, confusion abounded.

Confusion is also evident in inceptive endings. In a count of twelve frequently used verbs, sixty cases of inceptive endings and forty-two cases of regular er endings are found.<sup>5</sup> The verbs crecer (crescere), parecer (parescere), padecer (patescere), nacer (nascere), conocer (cognoscere), and carecer (carescere) occur in La Celestina thirty-seven times with inceptive endings and twenty-nine times with the regular present day er ending.<sup>6</sup> However, the occurrence of inceptive endings (inceptive endings, nineteen, and regular endings, thirteen)<sup>7</sup> in the verbs obedecer (oboedire), offrecer (offere), escurecer (excurrere), merecer (merere), recibir (recipere), and agradecer (ad gratum), is probably due to confused analogy.<sup>8</sup> Menéndez Pidal's explanation is as follows:

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>4</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 133.

<sup>5</sup>La Celestina, Acts. I-V.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 248.

Los incoativos (floresco, florescis) hacían etimológicamente: Yo nas-co, Tu na-ces, (sea por latinismo o por analogía de la s de Yo, se escribía también antiguamente Tu-sces, etc.); y modernamente la c (o z) de Tu, El, etc., entró en lugar de la s de Yo, para asemejar la terminación de todas las personas, diciéndose -zco, -ces (1). Esta conjugación se extendió por analogía a otros verbos en -cer que en latín no llevaban sufijo incoativo,....<sup>1</sup>

Confusion is manifest in La Celestina in the spelling of the nb (mb) consonant groups. Conbidasse occurs twice written with nb and once with mb; en balde occurs three times with nb and three times with mb.<sup>2</sup> In proof of the general confusion over the nb consonant groups that was rife among the writers of that period Menéndez Pidal says,

....los manuscritos medievales escriben indistintamente siempre or sienpre y lo mismo is corriente en ellos enbargo, reconbrar, etc.. La confusión se hace consciente en Valdes, quien escribía hanbre, canpona, diciendo <<no pronunció sino n>>....<sup>3</sup>

There was a tendency to change n to m before a bi-labial as evidenced in the use of m in the spelling of embidiar<sup>4</sup> and embueltas.<sup>5</sup> Although the m was adopted as the correct usage in later Spanish, its occurrence in these words was purely transitional.

In summing up the use of intervocalic single and group consonants, it can be seen that there is a much stronger trend

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>La Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>3</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 80.

<sup>4</sup>La Celestina, p. 46.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 57.



toward the modernization of the single than the group consonant. Some Latin intervocalic consonant groups were retained for many years in Old Spanish especially in the written language; this accounts for many of the transitional word forms. There is also evident a modern tendency to reduce single and grouped consonants to a palatalized or voiced consonant.

There are relatively few inconsistencies observed in the use of final consonants. Both so<sup>1</sup> and soy<sup>2</sup> are found, with soy predominating in the count six to two. So is an old form of sedere (yo son), which usually dropped the final n.<sup>3</sup> Although vo<sup>4</sup> was used as a substitute for voy<sup>5</sup> in the sixteenth century, it occurs only once, while voy occurs four times in Ia Celestina.

Compared with the irregularities in intervocalic consonants, there are relatively few irregularities in the internal vowels.

First, in considering the internal vowels, we note that the inconsistencies usually occur when the vowel is atonic. The only inconsistency involving i is in escriuir and siriente: each is spelled three times with i and once with e.<sup>6</sup> The substi-

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 262.

<sup>4</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., Acts I-V.

tution of atonic e in escreuir was probably due to a scribal error, but the use of atonic e in seruiente<sup>1</sup> for siruiente<sup>2</sup> (servire) may have been a leaning toward Latin spelling. Both accented and unaccented u are used rather consistently with the exception of sospiro<sup>3</sup> (suspirare), mochacha<sup>4</sup> (mutilum) and soffrir<sup>5</sup> (sufferre).

There is only one irregularity in the use of final vowels, e being the vowel involved. Difícil (e)<sup>6</sup> and yguar (e)<sup>7</sup> occur twice and omit the final vowel in the remainder of the first five acts. The retention of the final e from the old Latin is thus seen to occur only twice, whereas the modern form predominates.

From the preceding paragraphs, it may be seen that so few irregularities occur in final consonants and internal and final vowels that we are almost able to say that they are non-existent. At any rate, we may state from this evidence of regularity that Rojas was conforming to some kind of standard. How that standard may have been evolved, we do not know.

Another cause of irregularities in spelling lies in confusion in the use of prefixes. Although many suffixes and pre-

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

fixes occur in Ia Celestina, there are no cases of irregularity in the use of suffixes and few in the case of prefixes. Confusion occurs in the use of the prefixes in and ex, as in the word exemplo (exemplu). It is spelled three times as enxemplo and three times as exemplo.<sup>1</sup> Menéndez Pidal says, "La acumulación de prefijos, que sobre todo veremos en el verbo, produce la conversión de ex en in-ex así; exemplu, ant. ensiemplo<sup>2</sup>....." Another irregularity (but not inconsistency, as the words always occur in the same form) is in the spelling of the words estenso (extentio), excusar (excusare) and escure (obscurum).<sup>3</sup> The spelling of the word escuro, says Ford, "shows the influence of the prefix ex."<sup>4</sup> Menéndez Pidal, however, gives another explanation for the es in escuro:

A la s líquida, o sea seguida de otra consonante, se le antepone una i o una e ya en el latín vulgar;..... Estas palabras atrajeron a si en latín vulgar otras que empezaban con s, como (ob)scuru escuro.....<sup>5</sup>

A confusion with the prefix des is illustrated in the irregularity in the spelling of demandar (demandare). It occurs once as desmanda<sup>6</sup> and once as demanda.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>2</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 199.

<sup>3</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>4</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>5</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 105.

<sup>6</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 98.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

Some confusion occurs in the use of the prefix a. Occasionally donde is found with the prefix a (adonde) and at times without it; acontecimiento is found frequently with the initial a and at times without it.<sup>1</sup> Some of this confusion may be due to one of several reasons: either to analogy with prefix a, to emphasis in pronunciation of certain words, or to adherence to the article or preposition.<sup>2</sup>

Another irregularity growing out of the confusion of prefixes and a tendency to avoid the Latin mm is found in connigo (con+meco). It occurs seven times as connigo and twice as comigo.<sup>3</sup> The form comigo comes from the Latin mm<sup>4</sup> which gives m. The two forms of comunicar (communicare) are also the result of confusing the old Latin prefix cum and Spanish con. With the Latin prefix we get the form comunicar (Latin mm giving m) and with the Spanish prefix, conunicar.

In studying the many inconsistencies arising in the use of prefixes in Ia Celestina, it is evident that confusion was rife. These irregularities arose principally through popular mispronunciation, through false analogy and through contractions. However, we can see, in spite of all the confusion, that there was a decided trend toward regularity of form.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., Acts I-V.

<sup>2</sup>A. M. Espinosa, Estudios sobre el español de Nuevo Méjico (Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1930), p. 241.

<sup>3</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>4</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. xxxv.

When Rojas was writing La Celestina, the old Latin orthography and pronunciation were considered archaic. Despite this fact there was a scholarly retention of many of the old forms. It is partly due to this retention of old forms that numerous irregularities in consonant groups appear. Retention of some of the Latin forms was due to limited literary usage, false analogy, and diverse phonological tendencies. The trend toward modern forms was assisted by custom and common usage, mechanics of syllabication, phonology, etc.

### CHAPTER III

#### ARCHAIC WORDS AND FORMS

As has been previously stated, the Spanish language being quite limited in scope was scorned by many scholars of the fifteenth century, and was used patronizingly by others. Those who did use it had a sincere desire to enrich and perfect it. One means of improvement was the carrying over of pure Latin forms and usages into Spanish. There are numerous instances in fifteenth century manuscripts of Latin forms which were used interchangeably with Spanish forms and were even considered modern. Some confusion of Latin and modern forms is found in La Celestina, but in most cases Rojas is consistent in his use of archaisms, or words not considered modern today.

For example, there is a profusion of nominatives occurring in La Celestina that end in -iente, -ende and -ante coming from the old Latin present participle. These forms, such as recibiente,<sup>1</sup> sciente,<sup>2</sup> allende,<sup>3</sup> dante,<sup>4</sup> are now obsolete. Other Latin participles today used as adjectives are doliente,<sup>5</sup> diferente, perseverante; as nouns, estudiante, residente; and as adverbs, durante, etc.

The occurrence in La Celestina of the transitional forms

---

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

nescio<sup>1</sup> (nescium), pesces<sup>2</sup> (piscem) and cobdicia,<sup>3</sup> has already been discussed in the chapter on spelling under consonant groups. The sc in Old Spanish was written c and today c or z.<sup>4</sup> Menéndez Pidal gives the following explanation: "sc da θ, que en la ortografía antigua se escribía c y hoy c o z: miscere mecer, roscidu rucio; pisce anticuado pece; ....."<sup>5</sup>

Rojas shows no indecision in the use of agora<sup>6</sup> (hac+hora) which he consistently uses for our modern form ahora. It would not have been surprising to have found ora,<sup>7</sup> as a few years later this form is used by Valdés in his Diálogo de la lengua, although the fact that Rojas avoids the more popular form is significant. The form agora is frequently found in many South American dialects today. The difference in spelling probably resulted from a slight variance in pronunciation. Navarro Tomás gives the following reasons: "A las razones de lentitud o rapidez y de énfasis o falta de énfasis, que alteran, como queda dicho, la práctica corriente....."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>4</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

<sup>6</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 49.

<sup>7</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 43.

<sup>8</sup>Navarro Tomás, op. cit., p. 158.



The form assaz<sup>1</sup> from the Latin ad+satis is obsolete and is now replaced by bastante. Valdés censored assaz and suggested using harto.<sup>2</sup> Assaz, however, was not lost in all romance languages, as it appears in French as assez.

Priessa<sup>3</sup> from Latin pressus is a transitional form of modern Spanish prisa. Stressed e in Latin usually gave ie in Old Spanish.<sup>4</sup> The modern form prisa resulted from a reduction of the diphthong ie to i. Menéndez Pidal says:

También ocurre a veces la reducción ante una s agrupada, debido al carácter palatal de esta consonante: .... pressa prisa (frente a fiesta, siesta ....).<sup>5</sup>

While Rojas is quite consistent in his use of the archaic form of the words treated in the preceding paragraph, he uses two and sometimes three forms of some words.

Cibdad (civitatem) occurs one and ciudad seven times,<sup>6</sup> which shows a decided leaning toward the modern spelling. Sancta (sanctum) occurs twice and santa seven times,<sup>7</sup> which is naturally to be expected in a word used frequently by the common people. Virgo<sup>8</sup> comes from the nominative form of the Latin virgo, while

<sup>1</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 158.

<sup>3</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>6</sup>Ia Celestina, Acts I-V.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

virgen<sup>1</sup> comes from the accusative form virginem. Each occurs twice, but only virgen remains in popular usage today.

As assi occurs fourteen times and ansi<sup>2</sup> (ac+sic) only once, the modern usage is seen to have predominated even at that time. For Old Spanish in general the form was assi. In the fifteenth century the preferred form was ansi and most commonly used by Santa Teresa and the dramatists of the sixteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Espinosa believes the n in the archaic form results from a confusion between ac+sic and exin (exinde) or from assi by dissimilation to ansi.<sup>4</sup>

In La Celestina, mesmo (met+ipse) occurs ninety-five times and mismo eighty-seven, showing a decided confusion on the part of the author. According to Espinosa, mismo, the older form and that preferred by modern literature, does not come from mesmo, as many try to prove.<sup>5</sup> He further states that mesmo, which is of uncertain origin, was quite rare in Old Spanish and did not become prevalent until the second half of the fifteenth century. Mesmo is found now only in dialects.

In the use of the three forms desque,<sup>6</sup> dende,<sup>7</sup> and desde,<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

<sup>3</sup>Espinosa, op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>6</sup>La Celestina, p. 33.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

Rojas shows confusion of usage; however, the predominance of desde evidences a modern trend.

Ford<sup>1</sup> claims that the word monesterio<sup>2</sup> comes from a literary Latin form of monasterium spelled monesterium probably through the influence of ministerium. It is also possible that the atonic e came forward through assimilation of the stressed e of the tonic syllable. Rojas was probably influenced more by the popular than the literary usage because he showed a preference for monasterio.<sup>3</sup>

In the forms difícile<sup>4</sup> and yguale,<sup>5</sup> the more modern forms difícil<sup>6</sup> and yguale<sup>7</sup> predominate. This dropping of final e was the customary usage of the period. Concerning this, the opinion of Menéndez Pidal is: "La e final se pierde siempre tras t, d, n, l, r, s, c, y en la lengua antigua tras otras muchas consonantes ....."<sup>8</sup>

Luengo,<sup>9</sup> the old form for "long," came from longum through diphthongization of tonic o.<sup>10</sup> In La Celestina luengo is used

<sup>1</sup>Ford, op. cit., p. 254.

<sup>2</sup>La Celestina, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 66.

<sup>9</sup>La Celestina, p. 34.

<sup>10</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 49

rather consistently and the occurrence of largo<sup>1</sup> (largum) is rare.

Aucto,<sup>2</sup> which probably developed through confused analogy, predominates over the modern form acto<sup>3</sup> (actum).

The conjugational endings in La Celestina are usually the same as those found in modern Spanish. However, the archaic form occurs once in each of the following verbs: the conditional of sentiríades<sup>4</sup> (sentiriatis), the imperfect subjunctive of viníés-sedes<sup>5</sup> (viniessetis), and the future subjunctive of quisiéredes<sup>6</sup> (quisieretis). These forms are analogous to the equivalent Latin forms except that the t of the ending is changed to voiced d.<sup>7</sup> The d in these endings is a purely transitional form. The modern form of these endings may have come either directly from the ti-i<sup>8</sup> of the Latin stem or the popular tendency to omit intervocalic d.<sup>9</sup>

As a rule the verb stems of La Celestina are modern, but occasionally an archaic stem appears in the following verbs: haber,

<sup>1</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 31

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>7</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 108.

tomar, traer, ser and ver.

Ouo<sup>1</sup> occurs as the result of the attraction of the u of the conjugational ending to the a in the Latin stem<sup>2</sup>. According to Menéndez Pidal, "De estos verbos, los que tienen vocal temática a la hacen o por atracción de la u postónica....."<sup>3</sup> Touiesse<sup>4</sup> occurs as a result of analogy with ovo. Discussing this rule Menéndez Pidal says, "Los verbos con e temática prescendieron de esta vocal para asimilarse ora a ovo, ora a pude, según su consonante final fuese y o d....."<sup>5</sup> The modern form of the verb tuvo<sup>6</sup> and the archaic form of traer, truxiste<sup>7</sup> were formed, according to Menéndez Pidal, through an attempt at regularization: "La mezcla de las dos vocales o y u y la tendencia de la lengua moderna por la u postónica trajeron la uniformación de la misma en u....."<sup>8</sup> Vido<sup>9</sup> from the Latin form vidit is today found in dialectal usage but is usually considered archaic. Thus it can be seen that the majority of archaic verb stems are preterite stems.

The only other case of an archaic stem occurring in La

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 277.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>La Celestina, p. 98.

<sup>5</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 277.

<sup>6</sup>La Celestina, p. 33.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>8</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 277.

<sup>9</sup>La Celestina, p. 96.

Celestina is in the verb sey.<sup>1</sup> Both this form, sey, and the modern sea come from Latin sedeam. In Vulgar Latin the final letters were omitted and de gave di and then y.<sup>2</sup>

Another cause of the presence of archaic forms in La Celestina is the principle of metathesis or the change of place of sounds within the word. It occurs occasionally in the future and conditional verb forms: for example, verná<sup>3</sup> (yendrá=venrá), ternás<sup>4</sup> (tendrás=tenrás), porná<sup>5</sup> (pondrá=ponrá), and ternía<sup>6</sup> (tendría=tenría). The only other form in the first five acts in which metathesis occurs is in the imperative plural of llamar, llamalda<sup>7</sup> (llamadla).

Apocopation accounts for a few of the archaic forms in La Celestina. Through the operation of the principle of apocopation many of our present day forms were developed in the fifteenth century. In a few cases, however, the use of this principle operated to produce irregular or transitional forms, some of which are found in La Celestina. San (sanctum) in proclitic position sometimes occurs as santo<sup>8</sup> and again as sant.<sup>9</sup> Cien in similar posi-

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>2</sup>W. Pidal, op. cit., p. 253.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 32.



tion occurred consistently in the first five acts as cient.<sup>1</sup> The final o in proclitic position was often dropped in Spanish, but rarely did a word end in an nt consonant group even in Old Spanish. Menendez Pidal says the nt or nd was preserved through "cultismo."<sup>2</sup>

Another transitional form is do<sup>3</sup> from Latin de-ubi (de-ubi=deub=deu=do). It developed through the operation of natural linguistic laws but is now obsolete. Donde<sup>4</sup> (de-unde), the modern form of the word, is the predominant form in Ia Celestina.

Comparatively speaking, Rojas used few archaisms. He was undoubtedly a scholar in the best sense of the word. Although he went back to the old classic sources and made use of their materials, ideas, and even linguistic usages at times, he selected the best they had to offer. In an age when writers were inclined to be too flamboyantly classic in their attempts to be erudite, we find Rojas proceeding calmly down the conservative path of good taste. His art lay in his ability to fuse the commonplace and real with the old and the artistic.

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 139.

<sup>3</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 38.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 53.



## CHAPTER IV

### PRONOUNS

La Celestina presents an interesting study of the pronoun. Although lacking the fixed rules we have today, very few irregularities occur in either the form or usage. The relative, the true reflexive, and the subject pronouns have the same form and usage as those of modern Spanish.

In treating briefly the development of some of the pronoun forms from Latin, it is seen that various cases occur besides the accusative, which served as the Latin source for adjectives and nouns.<sup>1</sup> The nominative singular gave the personal, the demonstrative, and the relative pronouns: yo, este, que. Le and les came from the dative of the Latin demonstrative, while ello (illud), esto, (istud), and que (quid) developed from neuter pronouns.

From this it can be seen, therefore, that the pronoun structure may show more irregularities than that of the noun. Me and te, the first and second person singular object pronouns, have come down unchanged from the pure Latin forms, and serve both as direct and indirect objects. Lo (illum-ello-llo-lo), la (illam), los (illos), las (illas), third person object pronouns, were formed by dropping the i in enclitic use and by reducing ll to l. Illi and illis produced le and les in the same manner.

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Pidal, op. cit., p. 213.

These forms are used regularly in La Celestina except in the use of the third person singular feminine direct object pronoun, as found in the expression podrÍala yo fablar.<sup>1</sup> Here la is substituted for the indirect object pronoun le. The substitution of la for le is not contrary to modern usage, and, consequently, the same usage exists today. According to the Real Academia:

....asi como emplea también la forma propia de acusativo la para el dativo femenino singular..... Y no le falta razón, porque perdida la noción de caso,<sup>1</sup> que el pueblo no distingue, tiende a distinguir el sexo....

Le, the personal masculine third person singular form of the direct object pronoun, is used occasionally for the impersonal form. An example in La Celestina is in vesle<sup>3</sup> where le is used to refer to laud rather than the more common form lo. Ge is used in the combination of direct and indirect third person object pronouns, as is exemplified in gela.<sup>4</sup> Ge developed from Latin illi-lli-lle-ge.

Another confusion occurring in the form of pronouns used in La Celestina is the frequent substitution of the prepositional form for the objective form. Dexa a mi<sup>5</sup> is found in the same act

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup>Real Academia Española, Gramática de la lengua española (Nueva ed. reformada; Madrid: Casa Editorial Hernando, 1928), p.218.

<sup>3</sup>La Celestina, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

with déxame,<sup>1</sup> while quiero ver a ella<sup>2</sup> and verla quieres<sup>3</sup> are found in adjoining paragraphs. This difference in usage shows either that there were no rules, or that the author was not following definite grammatical rules. While he is consistent in the use of ge, we find him inconsistent in the use of la and le and prepositional forms.

There is a greater proportion of irregularities in the position of object pronouns than there is in the form. In noting the position of the object pronoun in relation to the infinitive, the following positions are found: first, after and attached to the modal auxiliary, as podrÍala yo hablar;<sup>4</sup> second, after and attached to the infinitive, verla quieres;<sup>5</sup> and third, before the infinitive, auré de lo oyr.<sup>6</sup> This changing about of the position of the object pronoun may be due to the author's desire to write smooth, melodic prose. It is also possible that, in the first and last examples cited, Rojas is following Latin rules which do not allow the joining of the object pronoun to the infinitive.

The object pronoun occurs in two different positions in relation to the auxiliary verb of the perfect tense: first, fol-

<sup>1</sup>Ia Celestina, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

lowing the past participle and preceding the auxiliary turbado me has;<sup>1</sup> and second, as in modern usage, preceding the auxiliary, me la has aprouado.<sup>2</sup>

At times the object pronoun is found after and attached to the simple present indicative, dígolo,<sup>3</sup> véole;<sup>4</sup> the future, dirásle,<sup>5</sup> diréte;<sup>6</sup> the conditional, podrÍala,<sup>7</sup> and the imperfect indicative dáualo,<sup>8</sup> acompañáuála.<sup>9</sup> Rojas, in the enclitic use of pronouns, conforms in most cases to the present-day usage. Keniston says,

In contemporary Spanish, the use of the pronoun after the verb is almost wholly literary, the only expressions occurring in speech being fixed phrases of the type of dijerase. For the most part, modern writers follow the older tradition of using postposition only at the beginning of a group or after a pause, but with a few writers the use of this order is merely a mannerism unrelated to any feeling for rhythm of the sentence, as a result of which they may use postposition even in a subordinate clause.<sup>10</sup>

Another irregularity of pronoun forms occurs in the spell-

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>10</sup>H. Keniston, Spanish Syntax List (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937), p. 68.

ing of essa<sup>1</sup> with Old Spanish voiceless ss. This form has been discussed in the chapter on spelling.

The contraction of pronouns occurs generally throughout the first five acts, but these contractions are limited to pronouns with initial e preceded by the preposition de: the demonstratives desso,<sup>2</sup> desto,<sup>3</sup> desta,<sup>4</sup> deste,<sup>5</sup> etc., and the possessives dél<sup>6</sup> and dellas.<sup>7</sup>

Rojas is consistent in the use of contractions, although some of his contemporaries were not. The following quotation from Valdes states a similar use of this method of contraction:

....tengo por mejor, para conservar la gentileza de mi lengua, hazer d'esta manera que, si el vocablo que procede acaba en e no la pongo en el que se sigue....y si el vocablo precedente no acaba en e póngola en el que sigue.....<sup>8</sup>

In conclusion, we may state that while the pronouns in La Celestina are not generally irregular in form, they show confusion in position. They are decidedly not archaic in form, but rather evidence a tendency toward modernization.

<sup>1</sup>La Celestina, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>8</sup>Valdés, op. cit., p. 92.

## CHAPTER V

### LA CELESTINA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE SPANISH LANGUAGE

A dispute as to who really wrote La Celestina has existed since the 1501 edition came out attributing the first act to one author and the remainder to Rojas. Critics vary as to their opinion and bring in interesting points of proof. Juan de Valdés in 1536, M. Foulché-Delbosc in 1900, and Sr. Guisasola in 1924, all believe someone other than Rojas to be the author, while H. W. Allen, Menéndez y Pelayo and others attribute the authorship to Rojas.

Although this thesis is not presenting conclusive proof as to the author of La Celestina, it has discovered material which tends to show that one man wrote the first five acts. In checking inconsistencies in spelling of commonly used words, we find that the same inconsistencies occur in Act I as in Acts II, III, and IV. Acts II, III, and IV were used because their combined length was equivalent to that of Act I. We shall give examples of initial f and h since more inconsistencies occur in the use of these consonants than in the use of other letters. In Act I hablar occurs eleven times with initial h and twice with f; hacer occurs thirty-five times with initial h and five times with f. In Acts II, III, and IV hablar occurs thirteen times with initial h and three times with f; hacer occurs eighteen times with initial h and three times with f. One sees readily that the proportions of Act I correspond closely with those of the acts which follow. Therefore, in considering the importance of these ex-



amples and many others not included here,<sup>1</sup> it appears unlikely that two writers could show in the same number of pages an almost exact proportion of inconsistencies in the spelling of the same word.

Many inconsistencies in spelling in La Celestina are due directly to the application of phonological principles. There is a definitely strong trend toward the modernization of the language evidenced by the tendency to reduce single and grouped consonants to a palatalized or voiced consonant. Some of the Latin voiceless letters became voiced in Spanish; while on the other hand, some of the Latin intervocalic grouped consonants were retained for many years in Old Spanish writings. This fact accounts for many of the transitional word forms that are found in La Celestina.

Not all of the spelling inconsistencies, however, can be attributed to the palatization of the consonants, nor to the retention of Latin intervocalic consonants.

The non-conformities in spelling involving the use of the internal vowels e, i, and o are less numerous than some of the other spelling inconsistencies, and in general are employed in the same manner in which they are used in modern Spanish. Not only the use of internal vowels, but the use of final vowels and final consonants as well, shows very few cases of inconsistency.

On no occasion is there confusion in the addition of suffixes, nor are there many cases of confusion among the prefixes.

---

<sup>1</sup>The examples are not included since it is not the purpose of this thesis to attempt to solve the controversy.



The form and the position of pronouns show decidedly more fixity and regularity in La Celestina than they show in the Cid and the Libro de buen amor.

Relatively few archaisms and archaic forms are found in La Celestina; these are due principally to the retention of Latin participial, noun, and verb forms; to vulgar and literary grammatical usage, and to false analogy and metathesis.

In view of the fact that the Spanish language was passing through an evolutionary phase at the time when La Celestina was written, it is remarkable that there are so few inconsistencies and irregularities in syntax, word form, and spelling. Many of the forms used by Rojas have become established as standardized and are integral parts of modern Spanish.

Rojas showed a remarkable insight into the situation as it existed then. He recognized the urgent necessity for standardization of the language. That he made a sincere effort in the attempts to standardize it is undoubtedly noticeable in La Celestina. It is true that he included archaisms and archaic forms and that he occasionally followed the practices of the masses in his confusion over choice of words. Nevertheless, too much emphasis cannot be placed upon this outstanding fact: Rojas was writing during an epoch in which the rules of grammar were in their incipency. Add to this the fact that the scholars were meeting opposition from every side when they attempted to break away from the classics and establish a national language of their own, and it becomes all the more amazing that Rojas was able to produce that monumental work, La Celestina.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### SOURCES:

Rojas, Fernando de. La Celestina, tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea. Madrid: Librería de Sucesores de Hernando, 1924.

### AUTHORITIES:

Bell, A. F. G. Luis de León. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Espinosa, A. M. Estudios sobre el español de Nuevo Méjico. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1930.

Ford, J. D. M. Old Spanish Readings. New York: Ginn and Co., 1911.

Keniston, H. Spanish Syntax List. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937.

León, Luis de. De los nombres de Cristo. Madrid: Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1921.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. Manual de la gramática histórica española. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suárez, 1929.

Navarro Tomás, T. Manual de pronunciación española. Madrid: Casa Edit. Hernando, 1926.

Nebrija, Antonio de. Gramática de la lengua castellana. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Real Academia Española. Gramática de la lengua española. Nueva ed., reformada; Madrid: Casa Editorial Hernando, 1928.

Valdés, Juan de. Diálogo de la lengua. Madrid: Editorial "Saturnino Calleja, 1919.