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.

2) Alarcón employs the occult as a literary tool, useful for its dramatic possibilities, for the advancement of the plot and for the solution of insoluble situations, presumably as a *deus ex machina*.

These are basically valid statements if accepted with some minor reservations. Since Golden Age theatre is geared to a wide audience and thus the entertainment aspect is predominant, one would not expect explicit didacticism. Doubtless the necessity to protest one's faithful adherence to official church doctrine is bound to pose an artistic problem and in a less skilful writer than Alarcón it could easily lead to intrusive didacticism. While this is avoided in Alarcón, he and other Golden Age playwrights nevertheless do present a consistent vision of the world. Since this is presumably shared by the audience, we cannot speak of overt didactic intent, yet the plays do, in some cases at least, contain a definite moral statement. Thus, in view of Golden Age attitudes to diabolical pacts, the central theme of *Quien mal anda en mal acaba* boils down to that of "crime does not pay," while *El dueño de las estrellas* extols the superiority of reason and free will over sidereal influences. In both cases Alarcón takes sides with issues relevant to his contemporaries and in this sense a didactic statement is implicit.

For the above and other reasons I feel that the use of the occult as a mere literary *tool* appears to be slightly overemphasized in the author's conclusions. A playwright can obviously draw on countless devices to advance his plot, but the choice of a particular solution may be intricately interwoven with other intentions. One certainly has to agree that *La prueba de las promesas* "presents the subtlest use of magic," but is magic really *indispensable to the development of the story*? Without it the play's atmosphere would become different indeed, but I can see no reason why the test of the two suitors could not be developed on a realistic plane. As to the use of magic as a tool to solve an intricate situation, it certainly applies in the case of *La manganilla de Melilla*, but, depending on one's viewpoint, in *Quien mal anda en mal acaba* we seem to have an insoluble situation created by magic, which is solved by a most prosaic *tool*, the out-of-the-blue appearance of the *familiares* of the Inquisition at the point of no return. Given the nature and origin of the "villain," the choice of magic and the pact with the devil seem to be somewhat more than a mere device. The play, which smacks of anti-*morisco* bias, chooses an anti-hero who is a *morisco*, previously convicted by the Inquisition for secretly practising the Islamic faith, and whose grandfather was likewise on good terms with the devil. The connection of the *moriscos* with superstitions and the occult is notorious and not entirely unjustified as borne out by numerous *aljamiada* treatises on magic. On the other hand, the image of Islam among Christian theologians as an *abominable secta de Mahoma*, supposedly inspired by the devil, was all too prevalent. Here we have, therefore, a rather stereotyped portrayal of the *morisco* as conceived by Alarcón's contemporaries: untrustworthy in his newly acquired faith and given to magic practices and superstitions. The occult would therefore seem to have more than a functional significance in the story of Román Ramírez; it also characterizes Román and it is an integral part of the content. Apart from the story of individual conflicts, we also sense something of the irreconcilable antagonism between Christianity and Islam under the surface.

Another point of view which I cannot entirely share is a remark on p. 51, concerning astrology, where some lines are cited from *El dueño de las estrellas* as "another proof of Alarcón's complete disbelief in the occult." This is doubtless a complex problem, but

condemnation of the occult does not imply *complete* disbelief. In the hierarchy of values, implicit in Alarcón's vision of the world, free will and reason, being God's special gift to man, occupy a predominant place, while astrology is relegated to a subservient, if not subversive, role. This does not, however, invalidate the potential effectiveness of the occult and I see no complete negation in the passage quoted nor in most of the theological opinions cited.

The possibility of conflict in the play is precisely based on two almost equally strong antagonistic forces. In this conflict free will triumphs, but it should be noted that sidereal influences, as in Calderón's *La vida es sueño*, are narrowly averted at the end by a supreme effort of will on the part of the protagonist. If – at least from within the artistic vision of the play – the influences of the stars were regarded as completely ineffective and non-existent, there would be no conflict and no tragedy.

Notwithstanding these debatable points, the book makes stimulating reading and underscores the significance of the occult in the Golden Age literary vision in general and in particular in Alarcón.

O. HEGYI, *University of Toronto*

Jack H. Parker and Arthur M. Fox, general editors. *Calderón de la Barca Studies, 1951-69. A Critical Survey and Annotated Bibliography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. Pp. xiii, 247. \$12.50.

Early in the 1950s members of the Comediantes, an informal, international group of persons interested in the Spanish *comedia*, began discussing the need for up-dated bibliographies of Lope de Vega, Calderón, and other major dramatists of the Golden Age. A call for volunteers was answered by several scholars whose efforts led to the publication in 1964 of *Lope de Vega Studies, 1937-1962. A Critical Survey and Annotated Bibliography*, published as a project of the Research Committee of Spanish Group Three of the Modern Language Association of America. Encouraged by the response to the Lope de Vega bibliography and by the demonstrated feasibility of their cooperative scholarship, the Research Committee soon began to make plans for a similar volume devoted to Calderón. However, since Warren T. McCready's invaluable *Bibliografía temática de estudios sobre el teatro español antiguo* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966) covers bibliographical material (editions and studies) published between 1850 and 1950 on the Spanish *comedia* and dramatists, including Calderón, it was decided to limit the Calderón volume to the years 1951-1969.

As was the case in the preparation of the Lope de Vega volume, compilers assumed the responsibility of assembling all the bibliographical data for a given one- or two-year period and of writing for inclusion in the Critical Survey a résumé of the scholarly activity corresponding to their assigned years. The fourteen compilers, representing various Canadian, American, and Mexican universities, include the following: J. C. Castañeda, A. M. Fox, D. L. Bastianutti, H. W. Hilborn, Carlos Ortigoza, K.-L. Selig, J. H. Parker, Margaret Falconer, Walter Poesse, R. W. Tyler, F. J. Hernández, R. L. Fiore, Richard Hildebrandt, and J. G. Renart.