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.

Similar in plan and composition to the Lope de Vega volume, the present work includes (as indicated by the title) a critical survey of scholarship, an annotated bibliography covering general editions of Calderón's plays and editions of individual works, and an annotated bibliography of general studies devoted to Calderón and of critical studies devoted to individual plays. A notable improvement of the Calderón volume over the *Lope de Vega Studies* is the inclusion of an index of editors and authors represented in the work (but book reviewers are omitted in the index).

As might well be expected in a work of collaborative enterprise (especially one in which the editors and compilers have never been able to meet as a group), there is some discrepancy – although commendably minimal – in the treatment of the material and the amount of space devoted to it. In the Critical Survey, for example, a few compilers have noted the exact number of entries corresponding to their assigned years; other compilers have not done so. One two-year period is represented by four pages of commentary; another receives less than half a page. The reader is at a loss to know whether the second period was simply less productive than the other or whether the second compiler was less loquacious than his colleague.

But these are trifling matters and they do not subtract substantially from the overall value of the book. Of greater importance is the fact that by and large the compilers, in both the Critical Survey and the Annotated Bibliographies, have distinguished between the major contributions to Calderonian scholarship and minor ones. And surely all students of the *comedia* should be heartened by the quantity and quality of the scholarship devoted to Calderón by leading Hispanists in several countries. One cannot fail to be impressed by the rich contributions of Calderonistas of English or Scottish origin (Edward Wilson, Alexander Parker, Bruce Wardropper, Albert Sloman, Peter Dunn, C. A. Jones, and others); nor can one fail to rejoice over the resurgence of the German school of Calderonian scholars under the leadership of Hans Flasche. It is also good to note to what extent Angel Valbuena Briones is carrying on the labours of his father, Don Angel Valbuena Prat, Dean of Calderonian scholars. And it is to be hoped that in the United States more young Hispanists will follow Everett Hesse in his dedication to Calderonian studies.

Indeed, the period 1951-69 has been a fruitful one with regard to Calderonian scholarship, but notwithstanding the many aspects of Calderón's theatre that have been so expertly explored – especially the *autos sacramentales* – one fact emerges clearly from a perusal of *Calderón de la Barca Studies*: we still need an up-to-date, definitive book on Calderón, one that comprehends and synthesizes the vast amount of material now available on him and his dramatic art. Several of the Calderonistas mentioned above are admirably qualified to write such a book – or it could be that there are younger Hispanists who are competent to undertake that important task. The tricentennial year of Calderón's death – 1981 – is not far off, but there is still time for some gifted scholar to commemorate his passing with the book that he deserves. Thanks to the editors and compilers of the present volume the task will be made easier.

RAYMOND R. MacCURDY, *The University of New Mexico*