

discerning and sympathetic ones (310–11): thus, *La gitanilla*, which merely hints at the need for social change, is placed first, and ‘la novela siamesa’ formed by the *Casamiento* and *Coloquio*, ‘donde realiza su llamamiento a la rebelión, (310), last.

In the *Novelas*, Parodi argues, *all* the characters associated with the aristocracy are portrayed negatively (321): in *La gitanilla* alone, they are shown to be ‘no fiables’, ‘tacaños y embaucadores’ (84), ‘sinvergüenzas’, ‘mentirosos’ (85), ‘envidiosos’, ‘egoístas’, ‘vanidosos’ (86), ‘prevaricadores y corruptos’ (87). Commoners, in contrast, ‘no pueden aparecer [...] como elementos negativos’ (314). The difficulty with attributing such a rigidly Manichaean vision to Cervantes is that it can only be sustained by ignoring the stylistic subtleties, the play with tone and generic convention and, not least, the irony, for which he is rightly celebrated. Thus, for example, Parodi cites Andrés’ reference (in *La gitanilla*) to the gypsies’ ‘“tan loables estatutos”’ (84), and the use (in *Rinconete*) of an ‘abundante vocabulario eclesiástico’ (257) to characterize Monipodio’s *cofradía*, to argue that *aduar* and *cofradía* represent the ‘modelo de sociedad que Cervantes defiende y fomenta’ (315). On other occasions, insufficient evidence is adduced (or available) to support the argument, while contrary evidence is ignored: for example, while the phrasing of the passages (in *El licenciado Vidriera*) about Tomás’ religious activities is said to reveal his resentfulness at his family’s forced conversion to Catholicism (215), the question of why, when entirely alone in Italy, he engages (clearly voluntarily) in such activities is not addressed.

Generally, it is notable that this study makes little reference to Cervantes’ other works, the *Persiles*, for example, being conspicuous by its absence. In the final chapter, however, Parodi does claim that the *Novelas* were written to correct ‘un error’ (321) in *Don Quijote*, Part 1, whose social critique, he believes, was weakened by its sympathetic portrayal of the *cristianoviejo*, Sancho Panza, while Part 2 was a ‘caso particular por haber nacido como respuesta al *Quijote* de Avellaneda’ (321)—a statement which is both unclear and inaccurate. Engagement with scholarship on the *Novelas* is similarly limited, as witnessed by the extensive stretches of text without footnotes (e.g., 94–128, 143–70) and the relatively sparse list of secondary sources (323–26). There is no index.

Parodi is most convincing when dealing with the documentary evidence relating to Cervantes’ social and racial origins, and there may be some merit in his observations about the *Novelas*’ patterning of ‘personajes axiales’. On the whole, however, this bracingly written study, based on what looks like an ideologically driven, ‘closed’ reading of the *Novelas ejemplares*, offers a reductive vision of Cervantes’ thought and artistry that many will find more provocative than persuasive.

STEPHEN BOYD

*University College Cork.*

PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA, *Un castigo en tres venganzas*. Edición crítica de Margaret Rich Greer y Francisco Sáez Raposo. Madrid: Iberoamericana/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert. 2018. 225 pp.

As we learn from the editors’ ‘Estudio textual’ (29–76), *Un castigo en tres venganzas* was printed in *Parte veynte y ocho de comedias de varios autores (Diferentes 28 for short)* (Huesca: Pedro Blusón, 1634) with the correct attribution to Calderón, unlike two other plays of his in the volume, but with the title *De un castigo, tres venganzas*; preliminary documents are dated 6 April and 27 October 1633. The surviving manuscript (British Library Ms Add. 33472) has been assigned to the period 1628–1632, and the editors tentatively opt for a composition date of around 1628. This allows us to imagine that Pérez de Montalbán’s *De un castigo dos venganzas*, which has been dated to 1625–1626, came first, followed by Calderón’s, then by Lope’s *El castigo sin venganza* (1631). It is worth noting, though, that while we have a 1630 performance record for Pérez de Montalbán’s play (not to mention publication in 1632), there are no recorded early

performances for Calderón's play; the editors provide a list of similar titles (21), culminating (?) in Juan de Ayala's *Cinco venganzas en una* (printed in *Comedias escogidas XLIV*, 1678).

As we can see from the *stemma* (73), there are three versions of the text which are at a similar remove from the original: *Diferentes* (D28), the manuscript (Ms) and the unauthorized 'Barcelona' *Quinta parte* of Calderón (1677, B). The textual evidence suggests that when Vera Tassis included this play in his edition of Calderón's *Novena parte* (1691), he went to a considerable amount of trouble with the text, consulting B and M (M is the Madrid edition of the *Quinta parte*, also of 1677), Ms and possibly D28, but there is no evidence for his consulting earlier (and now lost) versions; as usual, he also introduced readings of his own devising. There are ten *sueltas*, but all derive from D28 or Vera Tassis, and are of no help to editors, although all of them were examined, just in case.

The editors are a little apologetic for producing an 'eclectic' edition, but it is hard to see what else they could have done: D28 may be the *princeps*, and arguably closest to the original, but it has numerous errors, which can be repaired from Ms and B. There is one possible problem which the surviving texts are unable to clarify: the female protagonist, Flor, has no speech in the closing scene, and might seem not even to be present, which would certainly not be normal in such a play. One copyist, identified in Professor Greer's *Manos teatrales* project as Francisco de Rojas (a priest, not the dramatist) even added a short scene in the manuscript to bring her on. The editors consign these lines to the notes, no doubt correctly, and argue that she is present (204n). When the Duke grants Federico's request for her hand ('Yo, de mi parte, lo otorgo' [l. 2843]), she can come forward and offer it to him.