

enough to endorse a theory I put forward a few years ago: that the prologues in the *Candelaio* refer to the various types used in classical comedy, and in particular to the classification of Donatus dating from the fourth century. In this connection he accepts that Bruno's polemical and parodistic intentions were openly anti-classical and anti-humanistic, and agrees that this was the significance of each prologue in the comedy's structure.

The fifth lecture contains interesting comments on the limitations of Bruno's assessment of Bernardino Telesio's methodology in the latter's criticism of Aristotle's physics. However, the lecture is mainly concerned with the close relationship between Bruno and the Scot Alexander Dickson, and Bruno's position in the controversy which in the late sixteenth century aroused the passion of English scholars of logic and mnemonics: the Ramists led by the Puritan William Perkins (a Cambridge theologian) and the anti-Ramists led by Dickson himself, whose *De umbra rationis* is largely derived from Bruno's *De umbris idearum*, especially in relation to the hermetic and magical element in both books. As far as the relationship between Bruno and Dickson is concerned, a hand-written note by Dickson in his copy of *De l'infinito* might suggest a parting of the ways, but this somewhat flimsy evidence is not supported by any other document.

The five lectures here collected give an insight into the militant philosopher, who having had direct experience of religious conflict in France and having been the butt of ideological fanaticism in Italy and Geneva, actively campaigned for religious tolerance during his stay in London, and hoisted the flag of the *politiques* on the other side of the Channel.

These essays serve as an admirable introduction, on philological, methodological, and critical grounds, to the author's forthcoming edition of the *Opere italiane*, to be published by UTET, and the first French edition of Bruno's work for *Les Belles Lettres*, publishing events awaited with keen anticipation by Bruno scholars worldwide.

ROYAL HOLLOWAY, LONDON

LIA BUONO HODGART

'*Tirant lo Blanch*', novela de historia y de ficción. By MARTÍN DE RIQUER. (Biblioteca general, 13) Barcelona: Sirmio. 1992. 269 pp.

In 1990, on the occasion of the fifth centenary of the *editio princeps* of Martorell's novel, Martín de Riquer, the leading scholar in this subject since the late 1940s, published a comprehensive *Aproximació al 'Tirant lo Blanch'* (Barcelona: Quaderns Crema), which was immediately (and I am inclined to think it should still be) regarded as the standard work of reference on *Tirant*. This new book, originally intended as a Spanish version of the *Aproximació*, has outgrown its initial purpose to become an in-depth study that aims to 'situar el *Tirant* en su inmediatea circunstancia' and prove that the main character is 'un fiel reflejo, libre de folklore y simbolismo, de lo que eran los caballeros a mediados del siglo xv' (p. 9). Working with a bias towards what has always been his favourite thesis, Riquer allows himself free rein to analyse extensively how contemporary life is reflected and distorted in the novel, though it should be noted that stress tends to be laid on recording rather than on interpreting the interplay between them.

Following the recent discovery of a batch of documents (Jesús Villalmanzo and Jaime Chiner, *La pluma y la espada* (València: Ajuntament, 1992)), Riquer is able to state confidently that *Tirant* was written between 1460 and 1464 by Martorell alone. He then goes to some lengths to establish the chronology of the plot between 1450 and 1461. The contemporaneity of the novel, obscured by its late printing date and a misleading colophon, is definitively rescued. In the rest of the book Riquer revisits a

variety of aspects which support his twofold purpose. Sometimes this involves new evidence, such as the brilliant identification of a Spanish minstrel in the court of Constantinople, which proves Martorell to have been well informed and more true-to-life than had been thought (pp. 165–66). Conversely, it is now clearer, for example, that the novelist playfully mystified historical facts for personal reasons (pages 21, 92, and 106 hint at Martorell's literary revenge against Alfons the Magnanimous). However, the dismissal of any room for pure fiction occasionally comes close too to an *a priori* judgement: one wonders why Carmesina and Plaerdemavida should not be fictitious and certainly very suggestive names (pp. 122–26). But, on the whole, hardly anyone could argue with the results of Riquer's positivism, which sheds light on a number of relevant literary issues as well. Chapter 10 reconstructs the writing process of the novel and also gives a clue to the interpretation of its ironic finale (pp. 174–76). Scholars familiar with Martorell's manipulation of literary sources (including his own writings) will find essential pages on *Guillem de Varoich* and *Tirant* (Chapter 2) as well as other stimulating analyses of this distinctive feature of the novel (for example, pp. 43–44, 66–67, 127–28, 182, 201–02).

It is in the nature of this book to leave loose ends whenever a positivistic interpretation cannot yet be provided (for example, pp. 105, 112–13). However, the beneficial effects of this caution, which judiciously pre-empts any form of non-historical criticism, should not be misleading. There is plenty of evidence in the book to fulfil its intention but not quite enough to complete the cultural portrait of a fifteenth-century knight. The splendid recreation of Martorell's world should pose questions that cannot be answered if not through a better understanding of his concept of fiction. Where did Martorell learn how to create out of such massive borrowing? Does the notion of verisimilitude suffice to account for all his playful interweaving of fake and authentic versions of reality? These and other similar questions deserve a forum, since Martorell's voracity as a reader (see *Aproximació*, pp. 184–92, for a brief summary) undoubtedly matched, if not exceeded, his ability to cannibalize other aspects of contemporary life.

QUEEN MARY AND WESTFIELD COLLEGE, LONDON

LLUÍS CABRÉ

*La primera versión de 'La vida es sueño', de Calderón.* Ed. by J. M. RUANO DE LA HAZA. (Publications of the *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies: Textual Research and Criticism*, 5) Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 1992. 354 pp. £27.50 (paperbound £11.95).

In the introduction J. M. Ruano de la Haza proposes two theses that structure editorial practice and create a theoretical framework for this critical edition of the first version of *La vida es sueño*. First, he establishes as the base text for his edition that version published in *Parte treinta, de comedias famosas de varios autores* (Zaragoza, 1636) (Z), and suggests that this early version was probably written before 1630. Based on textual evidence, he then speculates that Z was adapted for a specific performance outside of Madrid by the theatrical company that purchased the original (O) from Calderón. However, if Z reflects an adapted script or a copy of O prepared primarily for staging where the lateral mountain was missing, then the crucial issue becomes: to what extent does Z represent O or, put differently, how much of O does Z preserve? Secondly, the version of *Vida* that appeared in the *Primera parte* (Madrid, 1636) (M) represents a major rewriting of O, a *refundición* that, according to Ruano de la Haza, was intentionally prepared for a reading public. Unfortunately, he does not explore whether M could have been staged earlier than its publication in 1636 or examine whether Calderón was able to harmonize in the revised text the particular needs of readers with his own expectations for future performances of *Vida*.