surely pointless, for the reader has no access to these arguments, which are not, therefore, justified by this reference.

I would recommend this study as an illuminating insight into Milton's poetic development, but I would also caution the reader against some of the linguistic theorizing which is incorporated into the critical explication but remains separate and distinct from it.

W. REAVLEY GAIR, *University of New Brunswick*

Rogelio Reyes Cano. *La Arcadia de Sannazaro en España*. Anales de la Universidad Hispalense. Serie filosofía y letras. Nº 16. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1973. Pp. 178. 300 pesetas.

Professor Reyes Cano opens the discussion of his topic with several pages on Sannazaro's relations with Spaniards in Naples, his friends, the famous Italo-Catalan poet Cariteo (Gareth) and a certain Giovanni Pardo, his membership in Accademia Pontaniana under the sponsorship of King Alfonso, and his two *farsas* celebrating the conquest of Granada. There is no record that either the Spanish world or its culture left any impression on the Neapolitan nor is there any evidence of the influence of any of his writings on Spaniards during his lifetime. That came later with the triumph of the Italian school.

In his brief mention of Sannazaro's poetry in Spain our author cites the Francisco de Aldana and Francisco Herrera Maldonado translations of his *De partu virginis*. For information on Garcilaso, the initiator of the vogue of Sannazaro in his country, we are advised to consult the bibliography in Gallego Morell's *Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas* (Granada, 1966). On him, incidentally, a relevant contribution has very recently been made in Chapter V of Inés Azar's Ph.D. dissertation (John Hopkins University, 1974), *Discurso retórico y mundo pastoral en la égloga de Garcilaso*. Professor Reyes has made the interesting discovery that two of the Italian poems of Sannazaro were put to music by Alonso de Mudarra in his *Tres libros de música en cifra para vihuelas*, one of which is the famous sonnet on jealousy, "O gelosia . . ." For it he reproduces the Spanish translation by Rey de Artieda. Why, one wonders, has he not gone on to note that in my *Estudios sobre el petrarquismo en España* (Madrid, 1960), I cite nine more translations and imitations as well as imitations of a dozen other poems?

This chapter is followed by fifteen pages on "*La Arcadia y los libros pastoriles españoles*," which largely discusses the present status of studies on the influence of Sannazaro on the Spanish pastoral novel. Some stress is laid on the originality in form and content of its three major representatives, Montemayor's *Diana*, Cervantes' *Galatea* and Lope's *Arcadia*. It is the best part of the discussion. As for other writers, they are disposed of in much too cursory a manner to be of any value. In the course of his comment on Cervantes, Reyes Cano extends his remarks to the *Quijote* story of Marcela and Grisóstomo, which reveals a pastoralism that, though it may have been stimulated by Sannazaro, is distinctly Cervantes' own. We may recall that Farinelli in his "Cervantes e il suo mondo idillico" (*Quaderni ibero-americani*, nos. 5-6, c. 1948, pp. 113-5) had observed that in Cervantes the Arcadian ideal runs parallel with its heroic side and that "il mondo arcadico del Sannazaro e del Garcilaso non urta col mondo fantastico degli Amadís delle matte imprese cavalleresche, ma le penetra con soavità e

dolcezza e ingenuo candore." The theme can obviously be probed more deeply than it has been. Since Reyes Cano has commented on Sannazaro in the great novel, I venture to add that I have written a paper on "Ecos de Sannazaro y de Tasso en *Don Quijote*" that can be read in my *Relaciones hispanoitalianas* (Madrid, 1953, pp. 27-37). It might have been utilized at this point. As a justification for any of the shortcomings that this chapter has, it is only fair to state that it is intended as an introduction to the analysis of four Spanish translations of the Italian masterpiece. It would have been preferable to have chosen a more specific title, such as *Cuatro traducciones de la Arcadia*, to avoid disappointing readers' expectations that it would contain a reasonably detailed treatment on the Spanish *fortuna* of the work.

Three of the four translations which exist in manuscript form only in the Madrid Biblioteca Nacional are by Juan Sedeño, Jerónimo Jiménez de Urrea and a Licenciado Viana, possibly Antonio de Viana. Of these the Sedeño and Urrea versions belong to the latter half of the sixteenth century, while the Viana version, a completely new find, must have been composed during the first decade of the seventeenth. With the exception of the Italian *esdrújulos* they faithfully reproduce the metrical forms in their original. In the prose passages Sedeño is less literal than the other two.

After a short description, analysis and biographical sketch of the trio, Reyes Cano puts them aside in order to concentrate in depth on the earliest and best translation, the *Arcadia de Jacobo Sannazaro*, printed in Toledo in 1547 and four times thereafter. Diego López is the translator of its prose, and Diego de Salazar of its verse, though Blasco de Garay made a drastic revision of the verse portions. The date of the printing of the 1547 text places it squarely within the transition period, that is, during the height of the struggle between the Spanish and Italian schools. The predominance of native meters, *quintilla*, *pie quebrado*, *copla mixta*, *copla de arte menor*, over Italian verse forms (chapter IV) makes it clear that both Salazar and Garay were strong traditionalists. I tend to agree with Reyes Cano's conclusion. "Pensamos . . . en Jorge de Montemayor, que da cabida en su *Diana* a los metros tradicionales junto a las nuevas formas italianas. En este sentido la traducción de Toledo inaugura en España el bucolismo culto italianizante y la postura de Montemayor, Gil Polo y otros está en su línea" (*op. cit.*, p. 147).

Our author also points out that in the Toledo text there is a limited use of Latinisms drawn from Sannazaro and the humanist lexicon, a feature in line with the conservative reaction against the promiscuous neologizing of Juan de Mena and his contemporaries. The Italianisms accepted are even fewer. In both cases traditionalists and non-traditionalists were aligned together. See Menéndez Pidal, *La lengua de Cristóbal Colón*, 2a ed. (Madrid, 1958, p. 67). Only examples from the Salazar-Ayala-Garay version are cited, on the *cultismos* (*op. cit.*, pp. 119-25), and on the Italianisms including diminutives and superlatives in *-ismo* (*op. cit.*, pp. 127-40). It would have been worthwhile to compare them with the examples in the other three translations. If they are equally sparse in the Viana version, for example, then it can hardly be connected with Antonio da Viana, author of the *Anti-qüedades de las Islas Afortunadas de la Gran Canaria. Conquista de Tenerife* (1604), which extensively indulges in *cultismos*. See María Rosa Alonso, *El poema de Viana* (Madrid, 1952, pp. 187-96). It may be noted in closing that the problem of foreign borrowings, together with that of the Italianate suffixes, is essentially the same as those faced by Jáuregui more than fifty years after the appearance of the Toledo volume in the two editions of

his translation of Tasso's *Aminta*. See the massive discussion in Joaquín Arce, *Tasso y la poesía española* (Madrid, 1973, pp. 157-304).

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA, *Northwestern University*

Charles Jacobs. *Francisco Correa de Arauxo*. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973. Pp. x, 99. Guilders 37.50.

Although one always welcomes a small and concise study of a major musical figure in the Renaissance, this reviewer finds little value in Jacobs's essay on Correa de Arauxo, the leading Spanish organist between Cabezon and Cabanilles and a musician whose works bridge the styles of the Late Renaissance and Early Baroque periods. The book has two parts: 38 pages of verbal commentary and 53 pages of musical transcriptions, divided by 7 pages of facsimiles from Correa's *Facultad Orgánica* (1636).

The commentary is marred by the occasional typographical error and persistently awkward sentence structure. For example: "Examination of Correa's use of some of the other proportions he employs for the often flamboyant rhythmic patterns in the *Facultad* reveals further confusion, upon Correa's part, concerning the legitimate way to label the proportion" (p. 9). In the biography Jacobs offers a résumé of research conducted by other scholars, but its organization is purely his own. A moment of light-hearted humour emerges inadvertently from two non-sequitur statements: one describing a payment, in the form of six hens, made to Correa for some music, and the other presenting his alleged death date. The reader might infer that Correa died from a surfeit of chickens. The sections on Registration, Forms and Fingerings offer interesting material of a practical and stylistic nature. Some of the conclusions drawn in the sections on Dissonance and Ornamentation are thought-provoking, but their importance is tangled up in an unruly undergrowth of unnecessary verbiage and incomprehensible quotations from the *Facultad*. In two other sections, Tempo, Proportions and Conducting, Phrasing, Jacobs presents a confusing mish-mash of historically-derived principles and his personal editorial practices; it is impossible to extricate these two aspects easily given the redundant and illogical combination of factual and critical material. The section on the Modes is poor inasmuch as Jacobs draws conclusions based on a random selection of theorists and derived, not from their original texts, but rather from secondary sources, some of which have been superseded by more recent research. Misconceptions are here aggravated by misinformation.

The musical transcriptions are good, accurate for the most part and easy to read. A comparison with S. Kastner's transcription of the entire *Facultad* (*Monumentos de la Música Española* VI 1948 and XII 1952) reveals only minute and unimportant differences. Hence one is prompted to wonder about the reason for the selected transcriptions made by Jacobs. For the enthusiast of Spanish organ music, Jacobs's book can function as a handy item, but for the scholar of Renaissance music it provides as much relevant and original research as it does irrelevant and mistaken information.

MARIA RIKA MANIATES, *University of Toronto*