

'Noticias del tratado de neutralidad entre el condado y ducado de Borgoña', a text written from the perspective of a Spanish subject in response to alleged lies spread by French polemicists. The analysis of the texts offered in this chapter is mostly descriptive and focused on their rhetoric strategies. The introductory study then concludes with a chronology of Saavedra's life and of Spanish and Swiss history from the thirteenth to the late nineteenth century.

The three texts by Saavedra are then presented with detailed and useful annotations. The 'Discurso de Lucerna' is offered in Italian and Spanish versions, both prepared by Saavedra. The spelling of the Spanish text of the 'Discurso', as well as that of the other two texts, has been modernized; the Italian text, however, is presented as it appears in the manuscript copy held by the Vatican Library preserving Saavedra's peculiar mix of Italian and Spanish. Finally, the text of the 'Noticias', based on the manuscript preserved at Besançon's Bibliothèques Municipales, is followed by a list of the variations between this and the copy held by the Biblioteca Nacional de España.

This edition of Saavedra Fajardo's Swiss texts, with the detailed introductory study by the editors, accurately highlights the important position occupied by Switzerland in relation to Spain's Central-European geopolitical interests in the seventeenth century. The texts also constitute an excellent example of the use of propaganda at an international scale, contributing to produce a more complex and sophisticated understanding of diplomacy, and the roles played by diplomats, in early modern Europe.

FRANCISCO A. EISSA-BARROSO

*University of Manchester.*



PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA, *El mayor encanto, amor*. Edición crítica de Alejandra Ulla Lorenzo. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert. 2013. 359 pp.

*El mayor encanto, amor* is one of the Calderón plays about which we know most, and one of his most interesting and controversial. His first mythological play, if we include collaborations, was *Polifemo y Circe* (1630), for which we have the autograph manuscript of his act (the third). Like *El mayor encanto*, *Polifemo* portrays Ulysses' encounter with Circe and Polyphemus, and Don Pedro used parts of it for *El mayor encanto* in 1635 (8–9). If we exclude collaborations, this play is his first attempt at a mythological subject, but his involvement with the topic lasted for decades: an HSA manuscript of Acts I and II matches an Act III in the BNE, and the BNE act, dated 1668, has an autograph revision of the ending (7, 74–75). This is almost certainly the 'manuscrito antiguo, con una escena que se halla suprimida en todas las ediciones', which La Barrera says belonged to Don Sancho Rayón (73).

If this were not interesting enough, the topic was allegedly proposed by the Countess of Olivares, giving rise to a series of suggestions by the stage-designer Cosimo Lotti, which in turn prompted one of the poet's few surviving autograph letters, in which he politely explained why adhering to the suggestions would produce an unperformable work. Although we have several documents relating to the play, Lotti's original vanished at some point in the nineteenth century, and his response to Calderón's reply, described by María Luisa Caturla in 1947, has also gone missing, despite Dr Ulla's efforts in the Archivo de Protocolos. The wording of Calderón's letter indicates that he was not dealing directly with Lotti; the chance that the intermediary was Olivares raises the possibility that among the 'numerosos documentos' seen by Caturla, there were some which might cast light on how the Count-Duke understood the play (13). Also lost is the *loa*, one (?) of the *entremeses* and the *fin de fiesta* (16–17).

Despite the considerable resources devoted to staging the spectacle, there was only one performance (29 July 1635), which has prompted some critics to suggest that objection was taken to the play's critical content. The play was performed again, however, but not, apparently, until 1668, when Calderón re-wrote the spectacular ending for a more modest performance, perhaps in a *corral*; Dr Ulla provides a transcript (83) and an illustration (85) of Don Pedro's changes. The re-writing is of great interest, but she has opted, quite properly, to aim to reproduce the 1635 text through the *Segunda parte* of 1637. Part 2 of the 'Introducción' deals with sources: the *Odyssey*, the *Metamorphoses*, the *Aeneid*, Lope's *La Circe*, Góngora's *Polifemo*, Ariosto, Boiardo, emblem books, etc.; if we add to these the literary references, the breadth of Calderón's reading may well astonish us.

The controversy concerns the interpretation of the play (Section 3, 29–33). Calderón knew that mythographers like Pérez de Moya saw Ulysses as representing Reason, and Circe, the passions, symbolized in the men she turned into animals, although Reason would ultimately overcome her. Ulysses, then, the successful warrior hero, could be a model for Philip IV, faced with a war against France. Lotti, however, had suggested a role for a giant representing the Buen Retiro. This was one of the suggestions the playwright modified, creating Brutamonte, Circe's giant slave, and linking the Retiro with Circe, if only in his own subconscious. The fact that Circe tries to entice Ulysses into 'el retiro / de mi palacio' (ll. 834–35) makes us wonder how he could write this with no thought of 'mi palacio del Retiro', and has prompted Meg Greer to suggest that this tells the king not to be bewitched by the temptations symbolized by his new palace, and, implicitly, by the palace's promoter, Circe (= Olivares). But would Olivares have let this pass? His likely reaction is the biggest problem faced by the 'direct criticism theory', and Dr Ulla suggests a middle way: not a mere spectacle, not direct criticism, but 'una advertencia general al rey' (38), in keeping with emblem literature and with the mythographers.

The largest preliminary section is the 'Estudio textual' (41–106). *Stemmata* on pp. 72 and 86 confirm that QC, the *Segunda parte* of 1637, is the correct choice for the textual basis; that on p. 86 shows that the 1668 manuscript, despite the lines in Calderón's hand, is two steps further from the original than QC is. One startling detail is that many well-known editions (including Hartzenbusch's, or the 1959 Aguilar edition) worked from Vera Tassis, who worked from Q (i.e. not QC), which had accidentally (?) omitted thirty-eight lines from Act I. This is not quite the only critical edition of *El mayor encanto*, but, with its extensive notes, which are comprehensively indexed, it is certainly the best available.

DON W. CRUICKSHANK

University College, Dublin.



JUAN GOMIS COLOMA, *Menudencias de imprenta: producción y circulación de la literatura popular (Valencia, siglo XVIII)*. Valencia: Institución Alfonso el Magnánimo. 2015. 557 pp.

La monografía que aquí reseñamos estudia, de forma extraordinaria, los mecanismos de producción y circulación de la literatura de cordel en la Valencia del siglo XVIII. El libro presenta una 'Introducción' en la que se repasa la bibliografía referida a la literatura popular así como las distintas líneas de trabajo y las disciplinas desde las que se ha atendido este género. Asimismo el autor recuerda al lector la ausencia de un estudio como el que él plantea para el caso de Valencia, a pesar del 'dinamismo tipográfico' de la ciudad durante la Ilustración. Se cierra esta primera sección introductoria con una presentación de la génesis de la obra y los cuatro capítulos de los que se compone.