



The "Libro áureo" and the "Relox" of Antonio de Guevara

Citation

Turner, Philip A. 1951. The "Libro áureo" and the "Relox" of Antonio de Guevara. Harvard Library Bulletin V (1), Winter 1951: 63-76.

Link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:42673624>

Terms of use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material (LAA), as set forth at

<https://harvardwiki.atlassian.net/wiki/external/NGY5NDE4ZjgzNTc5NDQzMGIzZWZhMGFIOWI2M2EwYTg>

Accessibility

<https://accessibility.huit.harvard.edu/digital-accessibility-policy>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#)

The *Libro áureo* and the *Relox* of Antonio de Guevara

THE Harvard College Library has recently acquired, through a gift of Imrie de Vegh, a very fine copy of an edition of the pirated *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio* by Antonio de Guevara,¹ printed in Valencia, 15 December 1528, for an unnamed publisher,² an edition which has been suspected or assumed to have existed, but of which it was till now believed that no copy was extant. This copy, in all probability unique, was in the library of Prince Galitzin, Russian ambassador to Madrid in the early part of the nineteenth century, and is listed in a catalogue of that library. The publisher of the catalogue failed to note, however, that

¹ Guevara was born somewhere in Asturias, ca. 1481. He was of ancient noble lineage, and in about 1493 went to court, probably as page, presumably in the hope of making a career as a courtier, for as second son in the days when the principle of primogeniture was rigidly observed he had no future in his own right. In 1504, shortly after the death of his protectors, he took Franciscan orders, with ambitious aims, it may be surmised, as well as religious ones. By 1521 he was well enough known as a preacher for Charles V to request his services, and in 1523 he became official preacher to the court. He was evidently esteemed by Charles, and had a part in the redaction of some of his speeches. In 1526 he was appointed Imperial Chronicler, and always claimed the title with pride though in fact he wrote hardly a line. In 1528 he became Bishop of Guadix, and was an energetic administrator. In 1535-36 he accompanied the Emperor on his expedition to Tunis, and thence through Italy and Provence. He became Bishop of Mondoñedo in 1537. He died 3 April 1545. He published the following works: *Relox de príncipes*, 1529; *Una década de Césares*, *Aviso de privados*, *De los inventores del marear*, and *Menosprecio de corte*, all in a volume bearing the misleading title *Obras*, 1539; *Epístolas familiares*, Part I, 1539, Part II, 1541; *Oratorio de religiosos*, 1542; *Monte Calvario*, Part I, 1545, Part II, the only posthumous publication, 1549; all in Valladolid, Juan de Villaquirán. The *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio* was never published with Guevara's authorization.

The bibliography on the subject of Guevara's life and works is quite large. I record here only certain of the more important studies, most of which I have utilized in the present paper. Bibliographical: Raymond Foulché-Delbosc, 'Bibliographie hispano-française' (3 parts published by the Hispanic Society of America in *Bibliographie hispanique* 1912, 1913, and 1914, New York), passim; Foulché-Delbosc, 'Bibliographie espagnole de Fray Antonio de Guevara,' *Revue hispanique*, XXXIII (1915), 301-384; Ludwig Pfandl, 'Über einen seltenen Guevara-Druck der Münchner Hof- und Staatsbibliothek,' *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, XXXII (1915), 340-346; Hugues Vaganay, 'Antonio de Guevara et son oeuvre dans la littérature italienne,'

the edition does have a colophon, with date, appearing not on the final leaf, as was the usual though by no means unvarying custom, but at the end of the text and preceding the four pages of tables with which this edition closes; he therefore described the edition as undated.⁸ As a result the book has lain since then unnoticed in the comparatively remote corners of distant Moscow, its date and importance being only recently uncovered.

The *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio* is a book which has often been confused with the authorized edition, published in 1529 with the title of *Relox de príncipes*, because of the fact that large portions of it were incorporated into the second work, and because of the confusing practices of the early publishers in entitling their editions of each; despite the incorporations the *Relox* was intended by Guevara to be quite a different book from the *Libro áureo*, and it is so in fact in many respects. The difference is one which has been studied and is known to specialists in Spanish literature, but which bibliographers, past and

Bibliofilia, XVII (1915-16), 335-358 (also published separately); Sir Henry Thomas, 'The English Translations of Guevara's Works,' in *Estudios eruditos in memoriam Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín* (Madrid, 1930), II, 565-582; Louis Karl, 'Note sur la fortune des oeuvres d'Antonio de Guevara à l'étranger,' *Bulletin hispanique*, XXXV (1933), 32-50; J. H. van Praag, 'Ensayo de una bibliografía neerlandesa de las obras de Fray Antonio de Guevara,' in *Homenaje a Antoni Rubió i Lluch* (Barcelona, 1936), I, 271-292; Carlos Clavería, 'Guevara en Suecia,' *Revista de filología española*, XXVI (1942), 221-248, and XXVIII (1944), 83-84; Lino Gómez Canedo, *Las obras de Fray Antonio de Guevara, ensayo de un catálogo completo de sus ediciones* (Madrid, 1946) — reprinted from *Archivo ibero-americano*, 2nd Ser., VI (1946), 441-601; Félix Lopes, 'Traduções manuscritas portuguesas de Fr. António de Guevara,' *Archivo ibero-americano*, 2nd Ser., VI (1946), 605-607; Jeannette Fellheimer, 'Hellowes' and Fenton's Translations of Guevara's *Epistolas familiares*,' *Studies in Philology*, XLIV (1947), 140-156. Life and works: Marcolino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela* (Madrid, 1905-15), I, 164-175; Alfred Morel-Fatio, *Historiographie de Charles-Quint* (Paris, 1913), pp. 22-41; René Costes, *Antonio de Guevara, sa vie* (Bordeaux, 1925) — previously published in *Bulletin hispanique*, XXV (1923), 305-360, and XXVI (1924), 193-208; Costes, *Antonio de Guevara, son oeuvre* (Bordeaux, 1926); Américo Castro, introduction (in English) to his edition of Guevara's *Villano del Danubio* (Princeton, 1945); María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, 'Fray Antonio de Guevara,' *Revista de filología hispánica*, VII (1946), 346-388; Ramón Menéndez Pidal, 'Fray Antonio de Guevara y la idea imperial de Carlos V,' *Archivo ibero-americano*, 2nd Ser., VI (1946), 331-338.

⁸ Probably Juan Jofre. The privilege was issued to Juan de Molina (see p. 66, below). Molina published eight translations of various authors; of these, five are definitely known to have been published first by Juan Jofre, between 1520 and 1527.

⁹ Ch. Gunzbourg, *Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque du Prince Michel Galitzin* (Moscow, 1866), pp. 65-66, item 189.

present, have not always understood, or kept in mind, with the result that many bibliographies, among them some of those most commonly consulted, are in a state of confusion. Palau, for example, with the majority of his listings preceded simply by 'idem,' cites copies of the two works quite without distinction. Except when he gives the full title one cannot tell whether a listing refers to the *Libro áureo* or to the *Relox*, and it must be confessed that this famous bibliography, in many respects so rich and useful, is on the subject of these two books worse than useless and better ignored. Brunet's confusion was also basic, as he considered the authorized edition to be but a heavily augmented edition of the *Libro áureo*, 'contenant de plus le *Relox de principes*.'⁴ A brief summary of the circumstances of publication of the two books will suffice to make the very necessary distinction a clear one.

Most of the information regarding the publication of these two books is given by Guevara himself in an *argumento* which is the third of his prologues to the *Relox*. He claims that he began writing the *Libro áureo* in 1518, and that up to 1524 none knew the nature of the work he was doing; but that in that year the Emperor, who was lying ill, heard of the book, and requested that Guevara lend the manuscript to him to help him pass the time. Despite the fact that the work was not in finished form, Guevara lent the manuscript, with the admonition that none other than the Emperor should see it. It was soon stolen, however,⁵ numerous copies were made, each more faulty than the preceding, and eventually it was printed in Seville.⁶ 'I put the readers between myself and the printers,' says Guevara, 'as judges of whether it was in accord with law or justice that anyone should have dared to

⁴ As with Palau, Brunet can be trusted only when full title is given; as a matter of fact, this is true of Brunet's *Manuel* on any topic, I have found, as it is true also of the *Supplément*, and of many other bibliographies. There does exist a new bibliography of the works of Guevara which can be consulted with some confidence, compiled by Lino Gómez Canedo, *Las obras de Fray Antonio de Guevara*, listed in note 1 above. This bibliography suffers only from occasional omissions; of a few editions, and more frequently of mention of source. Gómez Canedo's explanatory remarks are accurate enough, but scanty.

⁵ Soon enough so that in 1526 René Berthaut de la Grise, who was in Spain in attendance upon the imprisoned Francis I, had acquired a copy of the manuscript and begun the translation published in 1531.

⁶ This is the edition published by Juan Cromberger, 27 February 1528. Copies are in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid and in the library of the University at Santiago de Compostela.

print or publish a book dedicated to his Imperial Majesty, whose author was but a child,⁷ which was unfinished and had not been corrected. But the affair did not stop there; it was again printed in Portugal,⁸ and later in the realms of Aragon.⁹ Although the reference to the realms of Aragon is vague, it seems almost certain that the present edition of the *Libro áureo* is the one Guevara had in mind, for Valencia had long been one of the kingdoms (as they continued to be designated by their inhabitants and by the law) owing allegiance to the crown of Aragon, now resting on the Emperor's head. The privilege for publication in the city and kingdom of Valencia was issued by the magistrates of that kingdom to a certain *bachiller* Juan de Molina, a humanist and a translator of some note; this Molina was a member of the staff of Ferdinand, or Ferrante, of Aragon, Duke of Calabria, who married Germaine de Foix, the widow of Ferdinand the Catholic, in 1526, and was from that time till his death in 1559 the Viceroy of Valencia.¹⁰ Guevara had been in Valencia in 1525 as a representative of the Emperor on the occasion of the rebellion of the Moors; as such he was almost surely acquainted with Germaine, who was at the time herself Viceroy, and may even have been acquainted with the duke and especially with Juan de Molina himself, who by then had already been in Valencia for several years and had an established reputation as a translator.

Under the circumstances one can easily imagine the fury with which Guevara would greet the news of unauthorized publication. His exasperation can be sensed the more strongly by considering that before the publication of these pirated editions he had already finished his revision of the book, his *Relox de príncipes*; that he had been granted a privilege for the whole of the kingdom of Castile on 13 December 1527, only to see the *Libro áureo* appear in that very Castile, in Seville, on the 27th of February of 1528; and that he had received another

⁷ Guevara was at this time nearly fifty years old.

⁸ So far as is known this edition is not extant. That it was in fact printed is known from a statement of Enrique Flórez, *España sagrada*, XVIII (Madrid, 1764), 231, that he had a copy before him as he wrote, printed in Lisbon in 1528, and which he was careful to mention because he had not seen it mentioned elsewhere.

⁹ Inocente Hervás y Buendía, *Diccionario histórico, geográfico, biográfico y bibliográfico de la provincia de Ciudad Real*, 2nd ed. (Ciudad Real, 1899), p. 284. Hervás erroneously gives the name of the duke as Alfonso de Aragón. See also Nicolás Antonio, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1788), I, 744. For more complete information on Molina, see my note, 'Antonio de Guevara, *Libro áureo di Marco Aurelio*, Valencia, 1528,' *Nueva revista de filología hispánica*, IV (1950), 276-281.

privilege for the entire kingdom of Aragon dated 6 November 1528, only to see another edition of the *Libro áureo* appear in Aragon, in Valencia, on December 15th of that very year.¹⁰

Guevara's own version finally appeared in Valladolid, 8 April 1529, from the presses of Nicolás Tierrí, with the following title:

Libro llamado, relox de principes enel qual va encorporado el muy famoso libro de Marco aurelio auctor d'l vn libro y del otro: que es el muy reuerendo padre fray Antonio de guevara predicador y coronista de su magestad: y agora nueuamente electo en obispo de Guadix el auctor anisa al lector: que lea primero los prologos: si quieren [sic] entender los libros. Con preuilegio imperial para los reinos de castilla y otro preuilegio para la corona de aragon.

It will be noted that the name of the author is prominently displayed, as it was, to the best of my knowledge, in all following editions of the *Relox*; and that Guevara's name appeared nowhere in the extant editions of the *Libro áureo* mentioned thus far, nor did it ever appear on the title-page, at least, of any of the later editions whose titles I have been able to see (and these number eighteen) except for the editions of Lérida, 1569, and of Barcelona, 1624 and 1647.¹¹

The plan of the *Libro áureo* had been very simple. It was written primarily with literary pretensions, to be sure; but in Guevara's day any work had to be justifiable on grounds other than those simply literary, and the ambitious cleric surely looked upon his work as useful for the education of the young Emperor, who was only eighteen when Guevara began writing. The work consists of forty-eight chapters of fictitious discourses or letters of Marcus Aurelius, held together by miscellaneous curious data concerning his exemplary life and habits, and the life, customs, and legends of the ancients, followed by nineteen equally fictitious personal letters from the Roman emperor to sundry

¹⁰ There are those, chiefly René Costes, who feel that Guevara may not have been opposed to the surreptitious publication of the *Libro áureo* — that he may have seen in it a way to achieve notoriety (since, in fact, the authorship of the book was well known despite the absence of the author's name) with immunity. The dates of Guevara's privileges for the *Relox* tend to make this interpretation seem unlikely, but it is by no means impossible.

¹¹ Perhaps it appears on the title-page of the edition of Tarragona, 1590; the title-page of the copy described by Gómez Canedo is mutilated. The omission was apparently a protective act of the publishers, not the result of lack of knowledge of the author's identity; the Escorial MS g. II. 14 printed by Faulché-Delhosc, *Revue hispanique*, LXXVI (1929), 6-319, bears the name of Guevara in at least six different places, and it seems a fair presumption, though by no means a certainty, that other manuscripts also bore it.

acquaintances, male and female. Whether Guevara was really discontented with this plan, or simply wished, once he learned his manuscript had been copied, to issue something unequivocally his own, we can only surmise; the plan of the *Relox de príncipes* (whose title now clearly betrays the didactic pretensions of the author) is, at any rate, much more elaborate, and with a greater superficial attempt at unity. It is divided into three books, the first devoted to a discussion of how the prince must be a good Christian, and containing Guevara's rationalization of his use of a pagan prince as model; the second discusses the prince's behavior with his wife, the virtues of marriage, giving counsel for husbands and, especially, for wives, and notes on the education of children; the third deals with the general behavior of the prince, especially in public. If one judges by the result, one must assume that Guevara decided first upon his plan; then, having already written the *Libro áureo* and anxious to utilize its wisdom, he chopped it up and distributed it throughout the three books wherever the material seemed best in accord with the plan. Of these materials, nine chapters or letters ended up in Book I of the *Relox*, nine in Book II, and thirty-three in Book III; sixteen, among them the more scabrous of the letters, were not included at all.¹² The remainder of the material in the *Relox*, which is double the length of the *Libro áureo*, is new, though some of it is similar. In any case, the original *Libro áureo* is submerged and nearly unrecognizable, at times, among the moral reflections and digressions of Guevara.¹³

The confusion regarding these two works was undoubtedly caused by the titles which they bore in the various editions. The first edition of the *Relox* is, I believe, the only edition to bear the title which Guevara gave to it: *Libro llamado relox de príncipes en el qual va incorporado el muy famoso libro de Marco Aurelio . . .* The editions of the *Libro áureo*, beginning with the first of Seville, bore almost without exception the title: *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio, emperador y eloquentísimo orador . . .*, with only minor variations. The *Libro áureo* had met with instant popularity, as is attested by the numerous

¹² In the very first pirated edition of the *Relox* (1529), however, and in all subsequent editions, they are printed as a sort of appendix, the publisher obviously sensing the appeal to his public of the risqué element.

¹³ The content of and differences between the two works are analyzed in detail by René Costes, *Antonio de Guevara, son oeuvre*, pp. 1-35.

editions of it appearing in 1528 and subsequent years.¹⁴ The publishers who set about issuing pirated editions of the *Relox* evidently recognized the advertising value of the already famous title of the *Libro áureo*, and the very first pirated edition, which issued from the presses of Germán Gallart in Lisbon, 13 September 1529, bears the title: *Libro del eloquentísimo emperador Marco Aurelio, con el relox de príncipes* . . . In fact, there exists an edition of the *Relox* published in Valladolid by Nicolás Tierri, bearing exactly the same date as the first edition, 8 April 1529, with the title: *Libro del emperador Marco aurelio con el relox de príncipes* . . . Some bibliographers consider this a later edition with the date copied from the true first edition; it is, however, not impossible that Tierri himself felt that the book would sell better if the prospective purchaser confused it with the famous *Libro áureo*, and did in fact simultaneously issue another edition, with or without the consent of the author, bearing the changed title. At any rate, every known edition of the *Relox* except the first bears the altered, shorter form of the title, usually in the form: *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio, con el relox de príncipes*, or simply: *Marco Aurelio, con el relox de príncipes*.¹⁵ It is easy to see how people not acquainted with the actual contents of the book would be led to assume that it was simply the *Libro áureo* with the *Relox* added. And when, in modern times, book dealers wishing to sell a copy either of the *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio, emperador y eloquentísimo orador* . . . , or of the *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio, con el relox de príncipes*, have made short-title listings by omitting everything following 'Marco Aurelio,' we have been left without any means of determining the true identity of the volume advertised.

The extraordinary popularity of these works, as of other works of the same author, was by no means confined to the peninsula. The *Libro áureo* was translated into French and published in 1531, running to at least seventeen editions; into English in 1535, with the title: *The Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius Emperour and Eloquent Oratour*,

¹⁴ Twenty-seven editions are known certainly to have appeared by 1607, and three more have appeared since.

¹⁵ The *Relox de príncipes* itself enjoyed great popularity, though not as great, on the peninsula at least, as that of the *Libro áureo*. Eleven editions are known certainly to have appeared by 1557; no further edition appeared until 1650, when the work began to enjoy a short recrudescence of popularity, 5 more editions appearing by 1698 (a total of 17 as compared with 30 of the *Libro áureo*), but there has been none since then.

by John Bouchier, Lord Berners, and ran to twelve editions; into Italian at least as early as 1543, running to nineteen editions; into Dutch in 1565, with a total of eleven editions. There even exists a manuscript of a Portuguese translation, though it was never published.¹⁶ Abroad the *Relox* achieved far more popularity than did the *Libro áureo*. It was translated into French in 1540 and ran to no less than forty editions; into Italian (1553), English (1557), by Sir Thomas North, with the title: *The Diall of Princes . . .*; into German (1599), Latin (1601), the Latin translation running to at least eleven editions; into Hungarian (1610), Dutch (1617), and finally into Armenian (1738) and Polish (1793).¹⁷

The reasons for this popularity are multiple. Undoubtedly one of the chief factors was the air of erudition given by the frequent citation of little known or unknown classical sources — the 'Renaissance' flavor, that is, which Guevara succeeded in giving to his books. Modern scholars sometimes find it hard to comprehend this factor, since they know that Guevara was by no means a humanist, at least not in the sense in which the word has come to be used, because he was totally lacking in the humanist's reverence for demonstrable facts. This irreverence is basic, and characteristic of all of Guevara's historical or pseudo-historical works. In the *Relox* Guevara not only claims to have found a manuscript of some nonexistent *Declamations* by Marcus Aurelius, but even cites them by book and chapter with disconcerting seriousness. From Capitolinus' account in the *Historia Augusta* we know that Marcus Aurelius did indeed have four tutors, whom Guevara names, but they wrote nothing that survives; yet Guevara claims that his 'history' of the Roman emperor is for the most part a translation of

¹⁶ See Félix Lopes, 'Traduções manuscritas portuguesas de Fr. António de Guevara,' listed in note 1 above.

¹⁷ A clear and exact bibliography of the English translations of Guevara's works, made by Sir Henry Thomas, is to be found in the collection of *Estudios eruditos in memoriam Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín*, listed in note 1 above. To my knowledge no thorough technical study of the English translations has ever been made to determine whether the translations are exact, and whether such changes as occur are significant or merely capricious. That such alterations do exist I know from only a casual examination of North's *Diall*; for example, in the prologue Guevara states that scarcely a day has passed for eleven years that he has not put his pen to the work to extend or correct it, and North changes it to two years; Guevara claims to have rewritten the book five times, and North translates 'twice.' Jeannette Fellheimer's study of the translations of Guevara's *Epistolas familiares*, listed in note 1 above, is competent but only a beginning.

works by those men, and he cites as works of Sextus Choeromensis a *Life of Marcus Aurelius*, a *Republic*, a *Life of Nerva*, *Lives of the Ancients*, and the treatises *De legibus domesticis*, *De ambigua justitia*, *De diversitate linguarum*, *De laudibus mulierum*; and similarly for the others. Guevara apparently had in fact read a good deal, though without bothering with notes, for the most part; when he cites from memory he may have a confused reminiscence of his source and cite more or less correctly; if he cannot remember his source, he invents a source; if he cannot find the proper anecdote in any source he has read, he invents the anecdote and gives it whatever source first pops into his head. For example, he takes an anecdote about Critus from Macrobius' *Dream of Scipio*; even had he attributed the *Dream* to Cicero he would still have been wrong, for the anecdote is not there. René Costes, who has treated this whole subject in some detail,¹⁶ remarks that all we need to recall to us the name of Annio de Viterbo is to see appear the name of Berossus. 'Et le voici en effet qui se présente. Demandons-nous vite si le passage cité par Guevara se trouve dans le faux Bérose ou bien dans les passages plus ou moins authentiques qui nous restent du vrai. Précisément, ce n'est ni dans l'un ni dans l'autre. C'est un autre Bérose auquel il faut souhaiter la bienvenue: il vient apporter lui-même à Guevara l'appui de son autorité et va grossir la bataillon des nouvelles recrues.'

Under the circumstances it is somewhat dismaying, or perhaps amusing, to find in the *argumento* of the *Libro áureo*, repeated in almost the same words in the *argumento* of the *Relox*, such a statement as the following: 'Time is the inventor of all novelties . . . , and finally time brings to an end all that suffers an end; only truth is among all things so privileged that, when time seems to have broken wings, then she, like an immortal, but acquires greater strength. There is nothing so whole that it may not diminish, nothing so sound that it may not be vitiated, nothing so strong that it may not break, nothing so well guarded that it may not be corrupted: all these things time ends and buries, excepting only truth, which over time and all that is in time is triumphant.' As a matter of fact, despite appearances, this statement of Guevara's was sincerely intended and deeply felt. His strange practices in the use of sources were less those of an intellectual

¹⁶ *Antonio de Guevara, son oeuvre*, pp. 35-51, which I have utilized freely; the quotation which follows is from p. 51.

swindler, certain though it be that he was quite aware of the falsifications he was perpetrating, than those of one simply insouciant, who stuffed his works with classical citations because he recognized such to be the mode, but himself scorned such details as mere trivialities. When, therefore, he was severely reprimanded for his many inaccuracies in letters of a certain Pedro Rhúa,¹⁹ a true scholar, and harshly chided for his desertion of the truth, to the worship of which he was bound as a noble of the Guevara line, as Imperial Chronicler, and as bishop and theologian, Guevara found it possible to reply briefly and with complete equanimity: 'As you know, sir, [writings] vary so much that except for the divine letters there is nothing in any of them that can be either affirmed or denied; and to tell the truth, to very few of them do I give more faith than that necessary to make of them a pastime. And to what is one to give faith, since there are learned men . . . who say that Troy was but a hoax, and it is the Greeks who were destroyed? . . . Do not do homage to profane or gentile histories, for we have no more certainty of the truth of these than of the truth of the others, *et pro utraque parte militant argumenta.*' In his mind there was but one Truth, the faith of the Mother Church and the derived teachings; the rest were but perishable details.

Though true humanists scorned Guevara's scholarship, and the judgment of posterity has been in accord, his contemporaries either did not see his failings or chose to ignore them. Little did it matter to the average reader whether or not the source was precise; the fact remained that Guevara had caught as few other writers of the age the savor of antiquity, that he gave his readers an abundance of authentic detail on the life and customs of the ancients, in a cadenced oratorical prose that was elegant, powerful, and completely clear, pithy, anecdotic, and sententious as was the taste of the times, moral to the point of being irreproachable, but sufficiently familiar and risqué to be titillating. His was basically a traditional, a mediaeval spirit, partly hidden under the trappings of the Renaissance, whose methods, more or less new, he utilized only as a means to an old, transcendent end;

¹⁹ These letters, which evidently were actually sent to Guevara, were printed in Burgos by Juan de Zurita in 1549, entitled: *Cartas de Rhúa lector en Soria, sobre las obras del Rmo. señor obispo de Mondoñedo, dirigidas al mesmo.* Apparently almost totally unknown to contemporaries, they were not reprinted until 1850, in Vol. I of *Biblioteca español*, ed. Eugenio de Ochoa (*Biblioteca de autores españoles*, XIII), pp. 229-250; Guevara's reply is on p. 237, note.

only when the superficial Renaissance features ceased to represent a dominating mode was this curious mixture comprehended and rejected by generations which continued to revere his truth, but had learned to respect other truths as well.

Such are, in brief, the general considerations necessary to view with the proper perspective the newly found edition of the *Libro áureo de Marco Aurelio*, Valencia, 1528; a description of this volume follows:

[Title in red, within an ornate woodcut border:] Libro Aureo / d'Marco Au / relia ãpe / rador

2^o (in eights): a-mth, nth; 100 leaves. Foll. [i]-[c], the first and the last two being unnumbered; fol. iv misprinted vii. Black letter, in two columns.

a1v: Este es el libro aureo d'Marco Aurelio emperador y orador eloquentissimo. El qual con mucha razon deve ser leydo de todos . . . [in praise of the book's moral usefulness, followed by a statement of privilege:] Con privilegio por los muy nobles Señores los Jurados desta insigne ciudad de Valencia concedido al bachiller Juan de Molina, que sin su consentimiento ninguno sea osado imprimirlo; ni mandar lo imprimir en la dicha ciudad y reyno dentro entres años primeros siguientes contadores dela hecha deste libro Sopena de perdidos los libros y otras penas contra el impressor en el dicho privilegio puestas y adlongum expressadas. . . .

a2r-a3v: Prologo. Como el tiempo sea vn inventor d'todas las nouedades . . .

a4r-n2r: Comiença el libro dela vida: nobles y virtuosos exercicios/ profundas y altas sentencias del eloquentissimo Marco aurelio emperador. Assimesmo de algunas cartas suyas dignas de salir a luz. Va el libro tan alto en estilo/ quan profundo en sentencias. Y aun sin injuriar anadie se puede dezir/ no auerse visto hasta oy estilo mas subido en lengua castellana. . . .

n2r (colophon): Fue impresso en la muy insigne ciudad de valencia. y acabado a .xv. de Diziembre de nuestra reparacion. M.D.xxviij

n2v-n4r: Siguese la tabla delos Capítulos y cartas que se contienen en este libro. . . .

n4v: blank.

Contains the full 48 chapters and 19 letters.

This edition seems to be in the main independent of that published previously in Seville. I have made a careful comparison of parts of the texts of the two.²⁰ There are numerous variants, mostly, of course, in

²⁰ Through the courtesy of the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid and of the Hispanic Society of America microfilms of the Seville 1528 edition of the *Libro áureo* and of the Valladolid 1529 edition of the *Libro llamado relox* have been available for purposes of comparison.

spelling. The Seville edition preserves the older forms *fazer*, *fermosura*, *fiço*, *foja*, *fallar* right beside and in about equal proportion to the forms *hazer*, *hermosura*, *bijos*, etc., whereas the Valencian printer preferred the latter forms always. The Seville edition almost consistently presents the Latinized spellings, the Valencia the more popular forms, not all of which persisted, of course; thus we find, respectively, *subcedido*, *sucedido*; *auctor*, *autor*; *corrupcion*, *corrucion*; *ygnorancia*, *ynorancia*; *dubdeys*, *dudeys*; *cobdicia*, *codicia*; etc. There exists also a fairly large number of variants which affect the sense, far more than I have space for here; most of them consist of changes of only one or two words — added, omitted, or substituted, or a change from future to conditional, indicative to subjunctive, etc. — and I shall remark of these only that in the majority of cases found the Valencia reading is in my opinion superior to that of the Seville edition, and in the rest, with a few exceptions, is at least as good. One of the more curious of the changes is found in the opening words of the first chapter where Guevara states that Marcus Aurelius became emperor in the 695th year of the founding of Rome and in the 163rd Olympiad (Seville, fol. vii); in the Valencia edition (fol. vii [i.e., iv]) this is changed to the 895th year and the 196th Olympiad, of which it can be said only that it is *closer* to the traditionally accepted date than the Seville reading; later on, however, where there is a reference to an event supposedly occurring in the 720th year of the foundation of Rome, the Valencia edition leaves the reading unchanged, despite the manifest contradiction of its own previous reading (Valencia, fol. xxvii, verso; Seville, fol. xxxii, verso). Equally curious is the variant found in the letter of Marcus Aurelius to the prostitutes of Rome, in which he refers to an effigy of himself displayed by them, 'en la qual estauan esculpidas en dos renglones estas letras: N. T. T. M. L. S. Q. D. S. U. Las quales a mi parecer quieren dezir esto; no tienen tantos metales la estatua, quantos doblezes su vida' (Valencia, fol. lxxxviii). The Seville edition (fol. xcvi) bears the letters: 'M. N. T. N. J. S. U. S.' It will be noted that the letters given in the Valencia edition are in fact the initial letters of the Spanish interpretation Guevara gives of the inscription; since the inscription would originally have been in Latin, bearing no such close correspondence to the Spanish translation, it is obvious that this is but a capricious emendation.

These are but a sample of the variants existing; all variants of the type could be simply corrections of the Valencian printer, or of Juan

de Molina — or of the scribe who made the manuscript they were following. That they were in fact following a manuscript rather than copying the Seville edition is, I believe, conclusively proved by those cases where the Valencia edition contains important words or phrases which do not occur in the Seville edition at all, and which do not represent improvements sufficiently marked to warrant their being considered emendations. An example is the following, where I have put the 'added' words in italics (Seville, fol. xxi; Valencia, fol. xvii): 'Lo qual assí fué cumplido como el emperador auía mandado. Y desde aquel día jamás pantamimo [sic] ni truhán hasta que murió el emperador pareció en Roma. *Porque conocieron tan de verdad el beneficio que la república recebia con alcançar esta pestilencia de la pública conuersación que, los buenos por fauorescer aquel bien y los malos por miedo de otro tal castigo, nunca más mientras el emperador vivió tal gente en Roma se vido.* El qual muerto no passaron dos años que en tiempo de Cómodo su hijo luego fueron tornados.' The passage reads perfectly with or without the addition, and although its inclusion furnishes an additional idea, it is by no means a necessary idea of the type that Molina might have felt forced to insert to clarify the passage. It should also be pointed out that the italicized portion is not to be found in the manuscript (Escorial g. II. 14) printed by Foulché-Delbosc.²¹ It seems most reasonable to assume that one of the copyists inadvertently skipped an entire sentence, another copyist did not, and that Juan de Molina was in possession of one of the more nearly perfect manuscripts. It is not necessarily true, however, that the Seville edition is based upon the manuscript reproduced by Foulché-Delbosc. I have compared this edition with the other two, and find that although in the great majority of cases this manuscript agrees with the variants of the Seville edition, in at least two cases it agrees with the Valencia edition, and in at least seven cases it is quite different from either edition.²² Nor does either edition reproduce the first, dedicatory prologue of the Escorial manuscript. This manuscript and the one used by the Seville printer were in all probability related, but not the same. All this serves to give corroboration to Guevara's own testimony, in his *argumento*, that not one but many

²¹ *Revue hispanique*, LXXVI (1929), 6-319. It is unfortunate that the passage in question is not one which Guevara chose to convey verbatim to the *Relox*, so that we might ascertain whether the additional words are by Guevara's hand. I feel certain of it nonetheless; the style of the added words is clearly Guevara's.

²² For example, in the case of the inscription discussed a few lines above, the Escorial manuscript has the letters 'N. H. T. M. S. Q. M. V. S.'

copies were made, 'one person stealing [the manuscript] from the other, having it copied by the hands of pages, the faults in it increasing day by day, error upon error being added.'

On the other hand, there does exist one circumstance which tends to suggest that Juan de Molina was not totally unacquainted with the Seville edition. The paragraph on the verso of the title-page of the Valencia edition, in praise of the moral usefulness of the book the reader is about to begin to study, is a sort of paraphrase or rewriting of the similar paragraph which in the Seville edition is placed at the end of the text, on the verso of fol. cix. The phraseology is very different; the two paragraphs resemble two rough drafts of an author who is struggling to give the best expression to one and the same idea. That they are related is adequately proven by the fact that there are several sentences which are identical. Yet neither version is to be found in the Escorial manuscript. We cannot, of course, be sure that no such thing existed in the manuscripts reproduced by the early printers; hence the relationship between the two 1528 editions cannot be considered as proven, but only as probable.

The investigation I have made of the provenance of this edition and the interrelationship of the two earliest editions is, of course, only a beginning. A thorough comparison of the editions with each other and with such manuscripts as exist may well settle definitely such problems as remain, and it is to be hoped that such research may be done. Another hope that is encouraged by the discovery of this lost edition is that the 1528 Lisbon edition of the same book, believed not extant, may still be found, some day, somewhere, safe on some forgotten shelf.

PHILIP A. TURNER

List of Contributors

- CAROLINE ROBBINS, Professor of History, Bryn Mawr College
- C. R. BOXER, Camões Professor of Portuguese, London University, King's College
- KEYES D. METCALF, Professor of Bibliography, Director of the Harvard University Library, and Librarian of Harvard College
- EDWIN E. WILLIAMS, Chief of the Acquisition Department of the Harvard College Library
- PHILIP A. TURNER, Instructor in Romance Languages, Harvard University
- A. E. GALLATIN, New York City
- L. M. OLIVER, Assistant to the Librarian in the Houghton Library, Harvard University
- JAMES E. WALSH, Cataloguer in the Houghton Library, Harvard University
- BRANFORD P. MILLAR, Assistant Professor of English, Michigan State College
- DORRIT HOFFLEIT, Astronomer in the Harvard College Observatory
- LAURENCE J. KIPP, Chief of Loan Services in the Harvard College Library
- ANNIE T. THOMAS, In charge of the Typing Section, Catalogue Department, Harvard College Library
- ALVIN WHITLEY, Instructor in English, University of Wisconsin
- EDWIN G. WILSON, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University