

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - *La Fianza Satisfecha*: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

DESCRIPTION AND RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY
OF THE TEXTS USED

In this section, we shall first describe schematically the manuscript copy and the printed editions which we have used in establishing the present text of *La fianza satisfecha*.¹ Next, we shall discuss the considerations on which we have tentatively determined their chronological order.

In the following list of the texts, the capital letter at the beginning of each description is the symbol that we shall use throughout in referring to that text: thus, in referring to the MS copy, we shall call it 'A', 'B' will designate the first Leefdael edition listed, 'C' the second, and so on.

A. Comedia Famosa/De Don Pedro Calderon dela/Barca/Dela Fianza Satisfecha/Personas/

Leonido Galan	Zulema
Jerardo Viejo	Zarabulli
Tizon Graçiosso	Lidora Dama
Dionissio Cauallero	Marcela Dama
Belarbeyo Moro	Christo

[Begins] Iornada I.^a/Salen Leonido y Tizon/

Leon. No llamas?

Tiz. Yo no sigo tu viaje.

Leon. La puerta me has de guardar,
y la tengo de gozar
por afrentar mi linaje.

[Ends] con que tendra fin dichosso
la fianza satisfecha.

Fin

[Flourish]

¹ We have used thirteen printed texts and the MS copy in order to establish the present edition, having overlooked inadvertently, until our edition was in its final stages, an undated *suelta* published in Salamanca. We would have assigned that *suelta* a letter symbol indicating its relative chronological order (as we have done in the case of the other fourteen texts) if we had not been obliged to collate it at the last moment. In order to avoid the time-consuming reassignment of letter symbols with the attendant risk of introducing error into our edition, we have thought it best to assign the Salamanca *suelta* a symbol out of letter sequence: we call it 'S'.

We describe S along with the other texts and discuss it in the treatment of the relative chronology of undated texts, but exclude it from the 'Variants of B-N' and the notes pertaining thereto. Since S is very much like D (which we are convinced is based on it; see pp. 9-10), varying from D in only 25 readings, the omission of S's variants from their place with those of the other printed texts will not offer the reader any great difficulty. S's variants from D are given on p. 8, n. 1. (Regarding yet another edition, see p. 4, n. 1.)

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - *La Fianza Satisfecha*: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

215 × 155 mm. 40 leaves, or 80 pages, of which pages 1–25 and 42–3 only are numbered. *Jornada primera*, pp. 1–24; *Jornada segunda*, pp. 25–[49]; *Jornada tercera*, pp. [49]–[80].

[Osuna manuscript copy, Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) MS 16.840]

B. Num. 140./LA FIANZA SATISFECHA./COMEDIA/FAMOSA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A–C⁴ D². pp. [1]–28.

[Colophon] Con Licencia: En Sevilla, por FRANCISCO/DE LEEFDAEL, en la cafa del Correo/Viejo.

[Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid)]

C. Num. 140./LA FIANZA SATISFECHA./COMEDIA/FAMOSA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A–D⁴. pp. [1]–32.

[Colophon] Con licencia: En Sevilla, por FRANCISCO/DE LEEFDAEL, en la cafa del Correo/Viejo.

[Library of Edward M. Wilson]

D. LA GRAN COMEDIA/LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A–E⁴. 40 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Imprefa en Valladolid, en la/Imprenta de Alonfo del Riego,/donde fe vende esta Comedia,/y otras diverfas; y afsimismo/buen furtimiento de Libros,/Historias, Entremefes, Coplas,/Estampas; todo à buen pre-/cio: vive frontero de la/Real Vniversidad.

(The text ends on p. [39], and the colophon, with ornaments above and below it, occupies the entire p. [40], which is decorated with a border.)

[Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid)]

E. LA GRAN COMEDIA/LA FIANZA /SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A–D⁴ E². 36 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Imprefa en Valladolid, en la Imprenta de Alonfo del Rie-/go, donde fe hallarà esta, y otras de diferentes generos./Y afsimismo buen surtido de Romances, Historias,/Entremefes, Relaciones, Estampas,/y Libros.

(End of text and colophon on p. [35].)

[Charles Patterson Van Pelt Library (Rennert Collection), University of Pennsylvania]

F. Num. 36./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A–D⁴. 32 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Hallaràfe esta Comedia, y otras de diferentes Titulos, en Ma-/drid en la Imprenta de la Plazuela de la calle de la Paz./Año de 1729.

[Hispanic Society of America]

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Description of texts*

G. Num. 36./COMEDIA FAMOSA. /LAFIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. 32 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Hallaràfe esta Comedia, y otras de diferentes Titulos en Madrid/en la Imprenta de Antonio Sanz, en la Plazuela de la calle/de la Paz. Año de 1736.

[Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid)]

H. Num. 136./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. 32 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Hallaràfe esta Comedia, y otras de diferentes Titulos en Ma-/drid en la Imprenta de Antonio Sanz, en la Plazuela de la calle/de la Paz. Año de 1745.

[Biblioteca Palatina (Parma)]

I. *N. 154. Fol. I./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. pp. 1-32.

[Colophon] Hallaràfe esta Comedia, y otras de diferentes Titulos en/Madrid en la Imprenta de Antonio Sanz, en la Plazuela/de la calle de la Paz. Año de 1756.*

[Hispanic Society of America; Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid)]

J. Fol.I./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. pp. 1-32.

[Colophon] CON LICENCIA./Barcelona: En la Imprenta de PEDRO ESCUDÈR, en/la calle Condàl. Año de 1757.

[Hispanic Society of America]

K. Num. 208./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. 32 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Con Licencia. BARCELONA: POR FRANCISCO SURIÁ, y BURGADA./Año de 1773./A Costas de la Compañia.

[Ticknor Collection, Boston Public Library]

L. Num. 208./COMEDIA FAMOSA./LA FIANZA SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-D⁴. 32 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Con Licencia. BARCELONA: Por JUAN SERRA Imprefor./A Costa de la Compañia.

[Library of the University of California, Berkeley; Library of King's College, London University; Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid); British Museum; and elsewhere]

M. COMEDIA./LA FIANZA SATISFECHA./DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

4^o. A-D⁴. pp. 1–32.

[Colophon] MADRID: AÑO DE 1799./Con Licencia: *Se hallará en la Librería de Quiroga, calle de la Concepción Geró-nima: en la misma Librería se halla un gran surtido de Comedias antiguas, Trage-|días, y Comedias modernas; Autos Sacramentales y al Nacimiento, Saynetes y|Entremeses: Por docenas á precios equitativos.*
[Ticknor Collection, Boston Public Library; Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid)]

N. *La fianza satisfecha. Comedia famosa.* In *Obras de Lope Félix de Vega Carpio publicadas por la Real Academia Española.* Prólogo y notas de Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. Vol. v (Madrid, 1895), pp. 363–94.¹

S. Num. 3./LA GRAN COMEDIA/LA FIANZA/SATISFECHA./ DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO.

4^o. A-E⁴. 40 unnumbered pages.

[Colophon] Impresa en Salamanca, en la Im-|prenta de Francisco Garcia Ono-|rato y San Miguèl, donde se ven-/de esta Comedia, y otras diversas;/y asimismo varios Entremeses./Vive en la calle de Libreros,/junto à la Vniver-/fidad.

(The text ends on p. [39], and the colophon, with ornaments above and below it, occupies the entire p. [40], which is decorated with a border.)

[British Museum]

Our purpose in this section is not to attempt to trace in detail the filiation of the texts which we have used as a basis of the present edition, but to hypothesize the relative chronology of the MS copy (A) and the six undated editions (B–EL and S). All of the texts we have used considerably post-date the supposed time of the play’s composition. Seven of them (F–KM) are dated and were issued by publishers active in the eighteenth

¹ In the project to reissue the Academy edition of Lope’s *Obras*, the N text of *La fianza satisfecha*, grouped as this play was by Menéndez y Pelayo among the ‘Comedias de vidas de santos’, has been duly reprinted as its turn came, in Volume 187 of the BAE (*Obras de Lope de Vega*, XII: *Comedias de vidas de santos*, IV (Madrid: Atlas, 1965), pp. 109–51). Unfortunately, this edition represents, with a few exceptions, a deterioration of N’s text. The title page (p. [107]) gives the title correctly, but the running headlines give it as LA FUERZA SATISFECHA. Aside from differences in capitalization, punctuation and stage directions, the variants which the reprint of N offers with respect to N are as follows:

Line	N	Reprint	798	Estás	Estas
36	tenga	tengo	1067	llegar,	llevar,
59	te	ten (an obvious misprint)	1398	habra,	habrá,
			1478	hablador,	labrador,
105	venidme	venirme	1849	la	le
148	Calla;	Calle;	1859	deja	dejo
194	de	del	1936	encontrado	encontrada
234	hija,	hijo,	2083	ocasiones	ocasionen (an obvious misprint)
283	de suerte	de tal suerte			
311	lección	lección	2310	esperanza	esperanzas

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - *La Fianza Satisfecha*: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Description of texts*

century; L, even though it is undated, is recognizable as an eighteenth-century product and may be assigned with assurance to the last third or quarter of that century, as our discussion will show. Even the Academy edition (N), according to its editor, is based on an eighteenth-century *suelta*. The Leefdael (BC), Salamanca (S) and Riego editions (DE), all five of which are undated, may also be attributed to the eighteenth century. While the MS copy (A) may possibly date from the very end of the seventeenth century, its handwriting is typical of the eighteenth.¹ Since the play is thought to have been composed between 1610 and 1620, there is a considerable gap of time between the date of the original manuscript or manuscripts and printed edition or editions (if any) and that of the manuscript copy (A), which we believe to be the earliest of the texts we have been able to find. The play appears already very corrupted in A. It is also quite corrupted in B–E and S, the earliest of our printed editions, but less so than in A and in different ways and in different passages. It seems certain, then, that at least two seventeenth-century texts once existed, from which A on the one hand and B–E and S on the other derived either wholly or partially. Indeed, the many variant readings of the later editions which can be traced neither to the early editions nor to the manuscript copy can be attributed only to the existence of several texts unknown to us or to a prodigious amount of improvisation on the part of the editors.

In view of there being so many unknown factors, it would be pointless to examine in detail the relationships between the various editions and the manuscript. We have reached a few conclusions, however, regarding the relative chronology of the undated texts, and these conclusions yield a semblance of textual tradition among all the texts.

The earliest dated edition we have found (F) is that of Madrid, 1729. The printery located in the Plazuela de la calle de la Paz, which Antonio Sanz apparently purchased between 1729 and 1736,² seems to have monopolized the printing of *La fianza satisfecha* from 1729 until 1757, when an edition done by Pedro Escudèr appeared in Barcelona. At the same address

¹ See the *Catálogo de la Exposición Bibliográfica de Lope de Vega organizada por la Biblioteca Nacional* (Madrid, 1935), No. 552, p. 149.

² Francisco Escudero y Perosso (*Tipografía hispalense: Anales bibliográficos de la ciudad de Sevilla desde el establecimiento de la imprenta hasta fines del siglo XVIII* (Madrid, 1894), p. 609 b, n. 1) places Juan and Antonio Sanz in the 'segundo tercio del siglo XVIII'. William A. McKnight and Mabel Barrett Jones, in their *Catalogue of 'Comedias Sueltas' in the Library of the University of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill, 1965), list a *suelta* published by Antonio Sanz in 1729 (No. 1236) and another in 1730 (No. 1338). But Sanz seems not to have purchased the printery in the Plazuela de la calle de la Paz until later. The colophon of another *suelta* published in 1729 (*op. cit.*, No. 1674) gives, like F, the name of the printery ('Imprenta de la Plazuela de la calle de la Paz'), but (also like F) not the name 'Antonio Sanz'.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - *La Fianza Satisfecha*: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

in Madrid as that of the 1729 edition, but under the name 'Antonio Sanz', other editions were issued, dated 1736, 1745 and 1756.

Very probably, taking into account the law of supply and demand, the Valladolid, Salamanca and Seville editions, as well as the manuscript copy, were done before 1729. Surely, if the manuscript was made because of the lack of printed editions,¹ it is more than likely that it was done before the first of the printed editions appeared.

As for the Leefdael editions (BC), the period during which they could have been published is 1701 (or, more probably, a few years later) and 1730.² According to Mariano Alcocer y Martínez,³ Alonso del Riego published from 1700 to 1763. We expect to make clear, in the following examination of the textual relationship of the undated texts, that 1700 is too early a date for either of our Riego editions and that 1763 is much too late.

On the basis of our experience with the dated editions, we can say that the prime consideration of the editors is grammatical and morphological correctness. Their secondary concern, becoming more noticeable in the later editions, is metrical regularity. Their knowledge of classical antiquity and geography, however, is not so firm as their acquaintance with current linguistic usage (see, for example, vv. 446 and 1045). A good case in point is the corruption of the place name *Licata*, which helps determine the

¹ In all likelihood it is one of those manuscripts which Antonio Restori characterizes as 'quelle copie che tra la fine del secolo XVII e il principio del XVIII si esiguivano in gran numero per riparare alla rarità, che cominciava allora a sentirsi, delle vecchie edizioni, mal supplite dalle difettose sueltas dei Sanz e dei Leefdael' (*Una collezione di commedie di Lope de Vega* (Livorno, 1891), p. 16). While Restori seems to suppose that Sanz was publishing earlier than he actually was (see above, p. 5, n. 2), his remark regarding the scarcity of texts may well explain the existence of the manuscript copy of *La fianza* and lend strength to the supposition that first it and then the Leefdael, Salamanca and Riego editions were done before 1729, the date when Sanz, or one of his predecessors in the printery of the Plazuela de la calle de la Paz, began to help fill the demand for the play.

² See Escudero y Perosso, pp. 47–8. Since Leefdael began publishing in the Calle de la Valléstilla, and he did not move until later to the Casa del Correo Viejo, which, according to the colophons of the two editions of *La fianza*, was his address when he published them, it may be supposed that he did not print them during the first few years of the century. Unfortunately, if Escudero knows when Leefdael moved from the first address to the second, he does not tell us.

Escudero states that Leefdael died *c.* 1727 and that by 1730 the publications of the house appear under the name of his widow; hence our *ad quem* date of 1730.

The two Leefdael editions of *La fianza* which we have used are not listed by Escudero. He does list *La fianza satisfecha* (No. 2939) under 'Comedias impresas por José Padrino, en la calle de Génova'. We have not found any copies of this edition. Padrino, according to Escudero (p. 51), was a Sevillian printer active during the second third of the eighteenth century.

³ *Catálogo razonado de obras impresas en Valladolid, 1481–1800* (Valladolid, 1926), pp. 17–18.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Description of texts*

chronological order of the manuscript copy (A), the five undated *sueeltas* (B–E and S), considered as a group, and the *suelta* edition of 1729 (F).

Licata is found spelled correctly in A wherever it occurs; in B–E and S, it is spelled correctly in vv. 526, 534 and 627, but *Alicata* (incorrectly) in vv. 2417, 2449 and 2691; in F (and in all subsequent editions), it is spelled *Alicata* throughout. It is safe to assume on the basis of the progressive corruption of the word *Licata* that A is the earliest of the seven texts, that F is the last of them, and that B–E and S fall between A and F chronologically.

Since B and C were both published by Leefdael, one would expect that whichever of them was printed later would have been based on the earlier one. That this is indeed what happened is borne out by the fact that the two texts frequently group alone in showing an identical variant reading. Their joint divergence from the other texts is particularly obvious in such lines as 1970, 2308, 2441 or 2610, where a nonsensical misprint or misreading in one of the two texts has been reproduced uncritically in the other.

B is a much less carefully done edition than C. The texts are almost alike except for C's much greater grammatical correctness and freedom from misprints, even though it does have a few of its own. On the reasonable assumption that the editor of the later edition would have worked to improve the sense and the syntax of the earlier one, C would seem to be the later of the two editions because of the pattern of error and correction in several lines.

In v. 2279, for example, where A reads *seréis* B has printed *seas*; in C, the reading is *sedís*, which looks like a partial correction of B's *seas*. In the list of *dramatis personae*, B reads incorrectly *Zulema, Mora*; C reads correctly *Zulema, Moro*. In vv. 857–8, C's reading of *soy* (where B reads *sé*) is obviously an attempt—not altogether successful—to restore some sense to the two lines.

In two cases, the correction—assuming that C's editor had B before him—worsened the text. In v. 1405, it is probable that the editor of B intended to print *al moro* (as in A) and that for some reason the *a* of *al* was not printed, giving the reading *l moro*. We suspect that B's misprint may have caused C and, as a result, most subsequent editions to print *el moro*, instead of *al moro* (a 'correction' which gives rise, incidentally, to still other changes in some of the later editions (see note, v. 1405)). It could be argued, of course, that B's editor had intended to print *el moro*; it might also be argued that C was the earlier text and that B's greater number of errors is a result of a careless job of editing and printing. The second of the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

two cases, however, seems to rule out such objections: in v. 576, B reads *Muer, aZulema*; C reads *Muera Zulema*, resulting in a misinterpretation. The comma in B is not clear, and, if it was not clear when C's editor read it, he surely took it for merely an error in spacing, which he rectified. Since he has set off with commas elsewhere in this same passage the names of persons addressed, he would have done so in this line if he had not misread B. The possibility that the change was in the opposite direction is minimal. We are reasonably certain, therefore, that our letter designation of the two Leefdael editions corresponds to their true chronological order.

S, D and E coincide with B and C in so many of the readings in which all five of these texts differ from the others that, if B and C are the earlier editions (and we shall demonstrate below that they are), the influence of the Leefdael pair on the other three is beyond doubt.

Of the other early texts, D is closest to S in its readings, differing from it in only 25.¹

¹ The following are the lines in which S differs from D. Each reading of S is to the left of the page, and, unless otherwise indicated, is the same as that of our adopted text. D's reading is given to the right of the page and is followed by the letter designation of the texts (including D) which offer that reading:

Line	S	D
105	a	om. ADE
128	quieres ver	quieres ver D-J
162	si no lo quieres pagar. (Unlike our text, but like E-HJ)	si no los quieres pagar. D
341	fratricida, (Unlike our text, but like BC)	fratricida, D-N
447	Mira (Unlike our text, but like BCE-N)	Mírame D
471	eso	esto D
619	ése,	éste, D
629	de	om. D
656	que,	om. DE
743	sirven,	sirvan, BDE
925	hallaras,	hallarás, B-EG
1104	arulllos,	argullos, D
1116	las sombras	sus sombras DE
1513	Eso	Esto DE
1530	lo	le DE
1648	Tener	Tened DE
1655	luego	lueño DE
1720	encerrado	enterrado D
2198	al estar (Unlike our text, but like C)	el estar BD-M
2280	Prosígueme	Prosigue C-EG-I
2576	travesada (A unique reading, a misprint, in S)	atravesada B-N
2583	a la parida,	a la partida DE
2610	no difiera	me difiera DE
2724	pendencia	prudencia DE
2820	los ofensas (A unique reading, a misprint, in S)	las ofensas B-HJ-M

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Description of texts*

S differs from B in approximately 115 readings and from C in only 85. Moreover, S coincides with C in more than 65 readings in which the latter edition differs from B. It may be assumed, therefore, that, if S follows B chronologically, C had also appeared by the time S was published. Of the 85 readings in which S differs from C, it coincides with B in 8. Of the same 85 readings, 13, most of them identifiable as misreadings or misprints, worsen the text in S; but 44 of them, including 7 in which S coincides with B, decidedly improve it in the sense that they make it more consistent and intelligible. Twenty-eight of the changes, including the remaining reading of the 8 in which S coincides with B, neither improve nor worsen the text, but some of these (like a few of the 13 that worsen the text) may have been made (or adopted from some unknown text) by S's editor with the intention of improving upon C (and B). In view of the fact that the great majority of S's different readings tend to improve the text, it is more than probable that S derives principally from C, with B having been used as well as a secondary base text.

As we stated above, D differs from S in only 25 readings. E differs from S in 34. In view of the proximity of the texts of S and D, one must suppose that one of the two is based on the other. Of the 25 cases in which D differs from S, vv. 2576 and 2820 (new misprints in S) and 341 and 2198 (misprints already existing in BC and C, respectively, and perpetuated in S) are the only ones in which S's reading is inferior. There are two cases in which either reading is equally acceptable (vv. 1116 and 1530). S's *eso*, *ése* and *Eso* (vv. 471, 619 and 1513) seem better, though not much better, than D's *esto*, *éste* and *Eso*. In the remaining 16 cases, S offers unquestionably better readings. On the basis of v. 128 (*quies*, instead of *quieres*) and v. 1104 (*arrullos*, instead of *argullos*—becoming *orgullos* in E (see below)), we believe that S is earlier than D and that D's editor used S as a basis of his edition. His differences from the S text are attributable (aside from the four readings which he has corrected) to carelessness (vv. 105, 162 (error corrected in E; see below), 656, 1104, 1655, 1720, 2610 and 2724), or to reliance on B or C (vv. 743, 925 and 2280) or to his attempts to correct (vv. 128, 471, 619, 1116, 1513 and 1648). (To be sure, of the last-mentioned group, vv. 471, 619, 1513 and possibly 1648 may be attributable to misreading.)

The filiation of texts for which we have argued is lent additional support by the change suffered by v. 128. In A–C and S, it is *quies ver*; in D–J, it is *quieres ver*; in K–N, it will become *verás*. As we observed above, the earlier editors make corrections in grammar and morphology; the later ones are also concerned with metrical regularity. *Quies* can

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-14465-0 - La Fianza Satisfecha: Attributed to Lope de Vega, A Critical Edition

William M. Whitby and Robert Roland Anderson

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

become *quieres*, but it is unlikely that *quieres* will become *quies*. When the meter needs to be adjusted, once the language has been corrected, the editors will look for some acceptable alternative which fits the meter. So, *quieres ver* (one syllable too long) became *verás*.

We have argued that D derives from S. Our reasons for supposing that E is based on D are the following. E differs from S in 34 readings, by comparison with D's 25 variants from S. This fact would suggest that E is the later of the two Riego editions. E coincides with D in differing from S in 15 of those 34 readings, 3 of them, unique to D and E (vv. 1655, 2610 and 2724), being obviously erroneous. Of the other differences, 15 are new, not to be found in D nor in any of the texts which we have argued are earlier, and the remaining 4 (vv. 302, 934, 2280 and 2649), although to be found in B or C, could have been made by the editor without consulting the Leefdael editions. The exclusive dependence of E on D, therefore, seems clear. To establish that assumption more securely, the evolution of a reading in line 1104 may be traced. D's *argullos* is almost certainly a misreading of *arrullos* (found in A–C and S). E's reading *orgullos* surely is a 'correction' of *argullos* to the by then current form of the same word. (See note, v. 1104.)

The editor of F seems to have had B, C, S and D before him as he made his edition. He may also have consulted other texts, including E perhaps. The variant readings of F correspond now to one, now to another, now to two or more of the Seville, Salamanca and Valladolid texts. F corresponds in five of its variant readings exclusively to E (vv. 103, 156, 162, 1940 and 2172), but these are all minor variants, and it is by no means certain, therefore, that they derive from E. In spite of the possibility that F's editor did not consult E at all, it seems likely that E preceded F in its date of publication. This conjecture is based on the fact that in editing E, Riego does not take F or any later editions into account, basing E entirely on his own previous edition. This argument, while not a very strong one, does make it seem very probable that E precedes F chronologically.

The remaining undated text is the Juan Serra edition, which we have designated with the letter L, implying thereby that we believe it falls chronologically between 1773 and 1799. V. 2670, in which L improves on K (and its predecessors B–J) by inserting *un* to make the line full metrically, and other changes, though minor too, in vv. 381, 1056, 1297 and 1731 would seem to align K with the earlier textual tradition and show L departing from it. A stronger piece of evidence in favor of the assumption that L follows K is what happens in the two texts in the spelling of Zarabullí's name. In K, it is spelled with one *r* (as in the earlier texts) in