

UC Merced

TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World

Title

Suárez, José I., ed. Gómez Manrique. Cancionero. Manuscrito 1250 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real. New York: National Hispanic Foundation for the Humanities, 2013. Print. 596 pp.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9tw4m5qg>

Journal

TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 3(1)

ISSN

2154-1353

Author

Cárdenas-Rotunno, Anthony J.

Publication Date

2013

DOI

10.5070/T431020845

Copyright Information

Copyright 2013 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Suárez, José I., ed. *Gómez Manrique. Cancionero. Manuscrito 1250 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real*. New York: National Hispanic Foundation for the Humanities, 2013. Print. 596 pp.

ANTHONY J. CÁRDENAS-ROTUNNO
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

The learned Alan Deyermond wrote more than forty years ago that Gómez Manrique was a major figure in early Spanish drama, adding that, having “established himself as one of the most careful craftsmen in versification” (194), he was the leading figure among poets writing around the mid-fifteenth century, too young however for inclusion among those of the *Cancionero de Baena*—Antón de Montoro, Suero de Quiñones, Pero Guillén de Segovia, and Juan Agraz (*A Literary History of Spain: The Middle Ages* 210). This literary corpus, then, the text of Gómez Manrique *Cancionero* is what José I. Suárez intends to transcribe as it is found in ms. 1250 of the Biblioteca del Palacio Real and which he dedicates to the memory of Kenneth R. Scholberg described by him as “el auténtico creador de esta edición” (iii).

Attractively appearing in soft cover with perfect binding, the text consists of Acknowledgements, a Prologue by Ignacio López-Calvo, an Introduction, and the *Cancionero* followed by two appendices: the first includes some thirty compositions not found in the Palacio Real codex; the second presents the works of Gómez Manrique according to six categories: love poems, dogmatic (political or moral) poems, occasional poems, satirical poems, and dramatic writings. The work concludes with an alphabetical listing of the first line of each poem, identified by page number in the manuscript, and a section on the prose pieces.

In a brief prologue, López-Calvo signals, after placing Gómez Manrique between two great poets, the Marqués de Santillana and Jorge Manrique (the former his uncle, the latter his nephew), his notable anti-Semitism although acknowledging that “Gómez Manrique tuvo un destacado papel en la protección de los judíos conversos” (ix). López-Calvo nevertheless quotes poems that, though some seem relatively neutral and others somewhat positive, present Jews as cowardly, backsliding “marranos” or Cripto-Jews. Their denigration would be incomplete without his ridicule of their stereotypical physical features. In addition to Gómez Manrique’s reflected religious intolerance and racism, common for the times, López-Calvo points out Manrique’s criticism of evil stewards of the

state. In another vein common to this period, Gómez Manrique offers laudatory poems to the Virgin while also including antifeminist pieces and admonishments to women to avoid lust, reminiscent, as López-Calvo notes, of Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, Archpriest de Talavera, in his *Corbacho*. The *Cancionero* includes moving eulogies for his own dead sons as well as for the deceased Garcilaso de la Vega. Lastly, López-Calvo points out Gómez Manrique's esteem for the nobleman who excels at both arms and letters, presenting himself as the prototype of such a nobleman.

In a pithy introduction, Suárez gives a synopsis of Gómez Manrique's life, placing him among the various and illustrious Manriques: Don Pedro, his father, and his younger brother Rodrigo Manrique, father of the illustrious Jorge Manrique. He traces the family's royal allegiance from Enrique IV to Alfonso XII, and on to Isabel la Católica whose cause they defended over the claims of Juana la Beltraneja to the throne; Gómez Manrique remained faithful to the Catholic Monarchs until his death in Toledo around 1490.

The editor puzzlingly states that he edits this text “[d]ado a que el manuscrito 1250 [2-J-3] de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real de Madrid nunca se ha transcrito” (xxi) yet he cites the edition by Antonio Paz y Meliá who himself states on page xxxvi of his introduction that he uses it (Gómez Manrique. *Cancionero*. Madrid, 1885. Web.); Francisco Vidal González, whom Suárez does not cite, also claims using it as a base text (Gómez Manrique. *Cancionero*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2003, 83). Perhaps the explanation is found in his use of the word “transcrito” instead of “editado.” Suárez insists that it has not been his intention to “hacer una edición crítica ni ‘científica’” (xxi). This disclaimer may explain some of the queries below.

This is a normalized edition in which, wherever possible, the original orthography has been maintained. To this end, consonantal *u* and *i* are maintained as are vocalic *u*, *y* and *j*. *Ç* is kept where it appears. Allographs of *s* and *r*, however, are presented simply as *s* and *r*. He renders the Tironian sign as *e*. Punctuation, accentuation, and word division are modernized. Contracted preposition plus pronoun are separated with an apostrophe, so the forms such as *d'este*, *d'ellos*, etc. appear in the work.

The edition, therefore, makes accessible to the modern reader the text as found in what is considered the most complete, albeit not the oldest, of Gómez Manrique's work—this one dates from shortly after 1476. Appendix 1 exists, as Suárez states, “a fin de presentar todas las obras de Gómez Manrique (xxi). This perforce led him to consult other texts. Each is identified by a letter of the alphabet from A to J that then identifies the variant when placed in the margin below the text of the edition. In addition to the Real Palacio text used as his base, another from the same library appears as H [ms. 617]. Another four are housed in the Biblioteca Nacional de España [A, ms. 7817;

B, ms. 4114; C, ms. 10047; and I, ms. 11151]; one other is housed in the British Library in London [E, ms. add. 10431, apparently as edited by Hugo Albert Rennert, “Der Spanische *Cancionero* des Brit. Museums,” *Romanische Forschungen* 10 (1899): 1-176.]; and still another in the Biblioteca de Menéndez y Pelayo in Santander [J, ms. 78]. Additional published works consulted that contain Gómez Manrique’s works not in ms. 1250 include the *Cancionero de Juan Fernández de Ixar* (1956) [D], the *Obras completas* of Juan Álvarez Gato (1928) [F], and the *Cancionero general* of Hernando del Castillo (1958) [G]. Whereas all nine are used in the notes, including the mysterious designation X (notes 6 and 8 on page 118), only five appear in Appendix 1 with four—C, D, I, and J—not appearing. Manuscript A is the most heavily relied on, producing a very high percentage of the textual notes, as well it should because it is a manuscript coetaneous to ms. 1250, and emanates from the scriptorium of Gómez Manrique himself.

Dedicated to don Rodrigo de Pimentel, Conde de Benavente, codex 1250 is “un lujoso manuscrito” as characterized by Suárez. His stated goal is to produce an edition that is faithful to its source, ms. 1250 of the Real Palacio, and “a la vez accesible al lector moderno, pero siempre ateniéndome a la paginación original” (xxi) that he claims “consta de 534 páginas” (xx). But then the text of the *Cancionero* appears to end on page 536 followed by Appendix 1 on page 537. Only three stanzas of the text’s last poem, which begins with “¡O Madre de Dios, electa,” are found in 1250. After the third stanza, Suárez indicates in note 4 that the remainder of the poem is provided from A, an additional four stanzas extending the text to page 536.

The consequence of this fidelity to the textual distribution is an ampleness of margins (some pages providing text on only half of the page, e.g., the thirteen pages numbered 165 to 177, and four blank pages: 392, 434, 462, 490). Other pages have single columns of poetry when double columns would have served just as well. Granted that would have vitiated the layout as proposed, but given the empty space one has to wonder if perhaps just placing a page number of the manuscript in appropriate places might not have been a more economical solution. At any rate, wide margins do provide generous space for notes for any reader so inclined.

The footnotes are almost exclusively textual, i.e., treating orthographic, lexical, and some syntactic variants taken from the other texts compared with the text in ms. 1250. Footnotes also indicate omissions, additions from variant texts, and other idiosyncrasies: repetition of poems, interlinear writings, and other similar matters.

An example of an omission appears on page 5, where the Palacio text has *ventura acompañadas y' en las cuales*, footnote one indicates that in A, which is “Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 7817,

217ff; *Obras de Manrique, hacia 1475 [Dutton MN24]*” (xxii), *y* is omitted. On the same page, footnote 2 in *digo commo² tengo dicho* consists of the following note: “A.-digo que como ya.” Here the two words “que” and “ya” are lacking in ms. 1250. Finally, by way of example in footnote 3 in *preguntar a otro cómo³ avía de bruñir*, the note has “A.-otro de como” showing thereby the addition of *de* before *como* as contained in ms. 7817 of the Biblioteca Nacional. In other instances, footnote 1 on page 13 for example, a correct gender of the third-person object pronoun, *lo* with the referent *poder* rendered incorrectly as “la,” again in A, is noted. Notes also contain indication of words added by a different hand in the variants consulted; changes in syntax found in variants, e.g., *Pidiendo a Juan de Maçuela consuelo* (27) versus “Pidiendo consuelo a Iohan de Maçuela” (footnote 1). Similarly the footnotes offer omissions of larger portions of text as in footnote 2 of page 227 which states: “².B.- Omite esta estrofa.” Notes also indicate repetition of poems in the same text, e.g., the “Quexas e comparaçones” appearing on pages 370-72 and 415-417. Note 1 of page 486 indicates interlinear placement of word “la.” The only note on page 108 indicates that the first 7 lines of the first stanza are also found, probably by copyist error, on page 107, yet viewing page 107 fails to produce these seven lines or a note explaining their omission. Finally, the poem which begins “Quando Roma prosperaua” on page 117 is said to be repeated on page 487, and indeed it is. However, the last stanza, the 18th on page 489, lacks the last line of text—“por falta de gouernalles”—as seen in the last line, on page 122, the first time the poem appears. An explanation for this omission is not included.

As in the matter of the page layout resulting in most ample margins, material in notes might have been handled more economically. For example, on page 105 the obvious error *blaco* for *blanco* appears and is corrected in footnote one. Had brackets, a common editorial practice, been used to indicate editorial insertions (*bla[n]co*) it would have obviated a footnote. The same may be said for footnotes with “sic” to indicate that a word in the text requiring *ç* has erroneously missed the cedilla or that the cedilla has been effaced, as in textual *esperanca* pointed out in note 3, page 96, or *capatos* in note 3 of page 516. One final query as regards notes would be the usefulness of noting the variant *Johan* for *Juan* (note 1, 386) as this can hardly be considered one of many “variantes importantes” and more in line with one of “pequeñas variantes fonéticas y ortográficas” that the editor claims to have omitted (xxi).

Despite quibbles as to a more economical handling of the text and questions arising from some of the note content, the footnotes amass an abundance of material that could prove useful

depending on one's interest in the text and the relationship that exists among its various manifestations.

Although, in retrospect, anyone can sit down, take a text, and point out matters that he or she would have dealt with differently, not everyone can sit down, transcribe, and edit an entire text the way Suárez has done. It seems a pity, though, that an experienced scholar like Suárez did not take that extra step to at least produce what Francisco López Estrada has called an “edición crítica singular” where “el editor pretende llegar a un texto más satisfactorio de una obra mejorando el conservado” (*Introducción a la literatura medieval española* 60.) But as an experienced scholar, however, Suárez does accomplish what he set out to do: to transcribe this text, to “mostrar divergencias de contenido entre este manuscrito y selectos fragmentos y cancioneros transcritos del autor” (xxi), and to present all—including that not found in ms. 1250—of Manrique's poetic production between two book covers. This accomplished feat recognizes Gómez Manrique, the late Kenneth R Scholberg and, of course, its editor.