Las almenas de Toro exists as a manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, in two different hands, with a title page added in yet another hand, presumably some time later. As Professor Case hastens to point out, "The manuscript is not a Lope autograph." (p. 12). Seventeenth-century printings (in *Partes*) are extant, and Case has attempted a derivation of the various texts from the apparently lost autograph. The play has been printed several times also in the present century, attesting to a certain popularity which it has enjoyed. From its versification the date assigned to *Las almenas de Toro* by Morley and Bruerton was 1610-19 (probably 1610-13). From other data Case concludes in his edition that Lope de Vega wrote the *comedia* between 1615 and 1619.

In addition to describing the manuscript, commenting on printed versions, and attempting to date the play, in his well written Introduction Professor Case gives us a great deal of additional useful information, such as an analysis of plot and versification, the historical setting, the sources for the plot, the characters (Princess Elvira, King Sancho, the Cid, Velido Dolfos, etc.), the style, *Las almenas* as a tragicomedy, and a brief evaluation. The critical text is carefully presented, with variants in footnotes. The Notes to the Text of the play are abundant and accurate. The "Bibliography of Works Consulted" is rich and to the point. (It is interesting to note that Dr. Case acknowledges the guidance of Professor Edmund de Chasca, whose fruitful work on the *Cid* and on the *Comedia* is very well known.)

It would have been helpful if Case had included an index to words and phrases commented on in the Notes – for the reader's convenience – and perhaps an index to critics cited in the Introduction, again to facilitate ready reference. Nevertheless, the edition has been carried through to a successful conclusion, and it incorporates all the various necessary characteristics of a "critical and annotated edition." The editor and critic is to be congratulated on his achievement in bringing to us in scholarly form yet another important portion of the Lope de Vega canon.

J. H. PARKER, *University of Toronto*

Fred M. Clark. *Objective Methods for Testing Authenticity and the Study of Ten Doubtful "Comedias" Attributed to Lope de Vega*. Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, Number 106. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. 185. \$5.00.

Professor Clark has analysed very carefully ten *comedias* at times attributed to Lope de Vega. The plays are: *Alejandro el segundo*, *Los contrarios de amor*, *El prodigioso príncipe transilvano*, *Santo Angelo*, *El rey fingido y amores de Sancha*, *El rey por trueque*, *El toledano vengado*, *El valiente Juan de Heredia*, *La venganza piadosa* and *Bernardo del Carpio*. The "objective methods for testing" presented and employed are those put forth by various critics over a period of some years, such as Morley's article (*HR*, 1937), the Morley and Bruerton *Chronology* (1940), Poesse's *Internal Line-Structure* (1949), Fichter's article (*Homenaje a Archer M. Huntington*, 1952), and that of Arjona (*HR*, 1956), etc. To sum up his procedure, Clark writes (p. 30): "The present work is a study of the orthoepy and rhyme patterns of ten plays attributed to Lope but classified as doubtful by Morley and Bruerton on the basis of versification. Other studies of these plays which have employed

objective criteria will be utilized." Whenever possible, manuscript copies and early printed forms of the plays are referred to.

Dr. Clark further explains his purpose (p. 30): "to accumulate all the possible non-Lopean elements in the *comedias* in order to determine whether they provide sufficient evidence to warrant rejection of these plays as being by Lope and thus contribute in a small way to the establishment of a canon of Lope's *comedias*."

After the detailed scrutiny of each play in the manner described, there is a good summing up, and "Conclusions" reached (and I would say proven) are that "The accumulation of non-Lopean elements revealed in the study of these ten *comedias* provide sufficient evidence for rejecting the plays from a canon of the dramatist's authentic works." (p. 177) The "résumé of the most noticeable non-Lopean elements in the plays studied" (pp. 178-81) presents in a very concise manner the kernel of the arguments, sufficient to show that the plays are not Lope de Vega's, or, at best, in a few cases, "radically recast" by some other hand or hands.

A reviewer can only congratulate Professor Clark on a job well done. Clear and logical, the arguments are brought forth systematically for the drawing of correct solutions. The bibliography is scholarly and to the point (why not the Morley and Bruerton *Cronología* of 1968?). A helpful addition to the volume would have been an index of critics cited. But that is only a minor point. Let us hope that Dr. Clark will continue to apply his "objective methods for testing authenticity" to the large number of other plays of doubtful Lopean attribution.

J. H. PARKER, *University of Toronto*

Augusta Espantoso Foley. *Occult Arts and Doctrine in the Theater of Juan Ruiz de Alarcón*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1972. Pp. iv, 108.

In this neatly presented and printed book, the author provides an interesting study of a fascinating topic that certainly merits attention. The plays that form the object of this study include *La cueva de Salamanca*, *Quien mal anda en mal acaba*, *La manganilla de Melilla*, *La prueba de las promesas*, *El dueño de las estrellas*, and *El anticristo*. A general survey, with special reference to Spanish literature, introduces the reader to the occult and its different facets (necromancy, pacts with the devil, divination, omens, etc.) as found in Western literary traditions. Opinions, definitions and views of theologians and philosophers of different periods are also provided as a background, and the prevalent theological attitudes in the Golden Age are discussed with considerable detail. Alarcón's literary use of the occult is thus presented in a historical and social context, which considerably contributes to an over-all understanding of the subject. The book is carefully documented and furnished with a very useful bibliography.

In the course of the study two main conclusions seem to be drawn:

1) No didactic intention is implied by Alarcón's use of the occult and the inclusion of doctrine in Alarcón's plays constitutes merely a necessary safeguard against any possible accusations of unorthodoxy with its potentially dangerous implications. When doctrinal statements concerning magic are made, these are cleverly fused with the plot.