

realidad es un condado. El resultado final, en cualquier caso, es sumamente meritorio, y constituye un eslabón fundamental en nuestra comprensión de la pieza.

ENRIQUE GARCÍA SANTO-TOMÁS

*University of Michigan.*



PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA, *El príncipe constante*. Edición crítica de Isabel Hernando Morata. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert. 2015. 318 pp.

*El príncipe constante*, first printed in the author's *Primera parte* (1636), can fairly be described as a problem play. The most obvious problem involves the text: we wonder how a young author, publishing the first collection of his plays, could be so apparently uncaring about the correctness of the text of this one, especially since it is possible to argue that he revised some of the plays in the *Primera parte* for publication (e.g., *La vida es sueño*). The problem is exacerbated by the number of early witnesses (a dozen), among them a manuscript (MS 15159, Biblioteca Nacional) which varies considerably from the text printed in 1636.

There are other important aspects of this play: shortly before it was premiered, Calderón became involved in a quarrel with the court preacher, Hortensio Paravicino, and added some lines which could be taken to mock the preacher's notoriously flowery oratory. Tampering with a text after approval by the censor was an offence, and Paravicino's importance (in his own eyes, at least), as well as his furious reaction, meant that the matter was examined by the president of the Council of Castile, Cardinal Trejo y Paniagua. Thanks to his investigation, we know that the play must have been written in late 1628/early 1629, that it was performed by the company of Bartolomé Romero between late April and early May of the latter year, and that Calderón's payment for the text was 800 reales. Other significant aspects involve sources, the main two being Manuel de Faria y Sousa's *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (1628) and the play entitled *La fortuna adversa del infante don Fernando de Portugal*, which has been attributed to Lope and to Tárrega; lesser sources include the Góngora ballad 'Entre los sueltos caballos', and Virgil's *Aeneid*. Finally, other aspects which deserve investigation are the themes (neostoicism, melancholy, maurophilia).

For a long time it seemed that the only possible basis for an edition of *El príncipe constante* was the *Primera parte* of 1636, the princeps, despite the obvious textual defects. In 1961 Edward Wilson examined the manuscript, but concluded that it was an 'early rehash'. Much more recently, however, it has been argued that the manuscript represents an authentic Calderonian version. Dr Hernando has settled this argument by doing what no other editor of the play managed to do: examine all surviving early versions of the text. One of these is an ostensibly unpromising *suelta* (designated EFB), bound in a volume claiming to be *Comedias escogidas VI* ('Madrid, 1654') and held in Freiburg University Library. The title-page of the volume has been visibly tampered with, and several of the other *sueeltas* in the volume can be dated to the 1670s; one in particular carries the imprint of the heirs of Juan Sanz, Madrid (i.e., it dates from around 1726–1728). The most likely date for the printing of the *suelta* of *El príncipe constante* is the third quarter of the seventeenth century. However, although the *suelta* could be almost forty years later than the *Primera parte*, it derives from an original which had a branch of the textual tree all to itself (stemma, 62): it preserves proper names used by Faria y Sousa, and is the only early text to offer sense in line 177, where the *Primera parte* has the meaningless 'está a la boca / del Preto Eurelio': 'está a la boca / del Freto Herculo', cf. Faria y Sousa's 'está situada a la boca del Freto Hercúleo' (the Strait of Gibraltar). This is particularly significant, since 'freto' is a hispanization of the Latin 'fretum', and not a Spanish word at all.

Once it has been established that readings unique to EFB are likely to be correct, other readings peculiar to it can be adopted with more confidence: indeed, it becomes the basis for the edition, as well as helping to show that MS 15159 has no Calderonian authority and is of little use in establishing a critical edition (75). What is established is an important but daunting principle: when editing a text, we cannot neglect any *suelta*, even those ostensibly later than the princeps.

The longest section of the introduction is devoted to the ‘Estudio textual’ (which includes a brief examination of editions from the eighteenth century to the present day), but there are shorter ones on the date of the play, sources, themes, structure, space, time, reception of the play and metre. There are forty-seven pages of variants, and an index of annotated words. It is particularly pleasing to note that there are twelve illustrations of early versions of the text (47–49). This is the best edition of the play that we have.

DON W. CRUICKSHANK

University College Dublin.



***Remaking the ‘Comedia’: Spanish Classical Theater in Adaptation.*** Edited by Harley Erdman and Susan Paun de García. Woodbridge: Tamesis. 2015. xix + 303 pp.

Este volumen es un pormenorizado estudio de lo que implica la refundición y la adaptación—ambos términos interpretados en su sentido más amplio—de la comedia del Siglo de Oro a nivel transnacional en la última centuria. El conjunto de ensayos demuestra que no se puede hablar de adaptación y puesta en escena de la comedia desde una perspectiva unidimensional sino como un proceso fluido, en constante renovación y experimentación. El libro está dividido en cuatro secciones tituladas respectivamente ‘Theorizing’, ‘Surveying’, ‘Spotlighting’ y ‘Shifting’, las cuales cubren una amplia gama de temáticas y de ejemplos concretos que otorgan al libro una naturaleza caleidoscópica.

En los cuatro primeros artículos que componen la sección de ‘Theorizing’, Catherine Larson y Susan L. Fischer dan una definición teórica del proceso de adaptación y subrayan la importancia de la traducción como parte de dicho proceso. Alejandro González Puche y Laurence Boswell, por su parte, narran su experiencia personal como directores al adaptar la comedia para la escena colombiana, china o inglesa y el reto de trabajar con actores de distintas nacionalidades. La sección dedicada a ‘Surveying’ se centra en ilustrar una serie de tendencias y apropiaciones del teatro barroco que demuestra su continua revitalización desde las tablas. Charles Victor Ganelin habla de las refundiciones decimonónicas y del vacío intelectual existente alrededor del tema. Duncan Wheeler estudia la experiencia de Pepe Estruch, director teatral exiliado y cuyo primer contacto con los clásicos tuvo lugar en un campo de niños refugiados de origen vasco en Inglaterra. Robert E. Bayliss arguye cómo la comedia opera a varios niveles interrelacionados—el local, el nacional y el global. Jason Yancey subraya la importancia del Festival del Chamizal (El Paso, Texas) en la propagación de la comedia dentro del contexto estadounidense. Valerie Hegstrom y Amy Williamsen pasan revista a las distintas puestas en escena de obras por escritoras del siglo XVII. Y, finalmente, Jonathan Thacker se centra en el análisis de tres comedias producidas específicamente para los escenarios ingleses—*Madness in Valencia*, *The Dog in the Manger* y *Peribáñez* y arguye cómo las modificaciones que ‘piden’ estas obras a la hora de adaptarse a escenarios internacionales tienden a crear propuestas innovadoras.

La sección titulada ‘Spotlighting’ analiza las refundiciones de comedias concretas. David Johnston reflexiona sobre los factores en los que se basa la traducción y la naturaleza inestable de ésta. El resto de los autores de esta sección—Amaya Curieses Iriarte, Bruce