Christiane Pérez González

Bilingualität auf der Jesuitenbühne. Latein und Volkssprache im spanischen Schultheater des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Symbolische Kommunikation und gesellschaftliche Wertesysteme (Schriftenreihe des Sonderforschungsbereichs 496) – Band 45. Münster: Rhema, 2014. Pp. 419. Hb, 52 Euros.

Amid the recent spate of work on early modern Jesuit theatre comes this important new contribution from Christiane Pérez González. The subject on this occasion is the Latin and vernacular bilingualism in the Jesuit-authored institutional drama of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain. Spain is particularly—indeed, uniquely—suited to this line of inquiry, for, alone among European countries, Jesuit playwrights there allowed the vernacular to infiltrate, and swiftly to dominate, their drama at a relatively early stage, at the expense of Latin and, crucially, in the face of explicit policy from Rome prescribing Latin-only theatrical enterprises for the order. Spain's exceptionality in this respect, however, seems to have been previously unrecognized scholars of European Jesuit drama show no awareness of Spain's peculiar linguistic situation, while those (mostly Spanish) academics who are aware of its early modern dramatic bilingualism do not appear to have realized its uniqueness. Consequently, the explanatory models used by the latter to account for the phenomenon do not, as Pérez González convincingly demonstrates, stand up to scrutiny when considered afresh from the pan-European perspective.

Pérez González analyzes the phenomenon of the "Hispanisierung der Texte" (260) in the context of the contemporaneous efflorescence of Spanish drama during the so-called *Siglo de Oro*, and of the prestige which consequently accrued to the vernacular—particularly in its celebrated lyric forms—significantly earlier than in other countries. The result, she argues, is that Jesuit playwrights in Spain alone found themselves in the exceptional position of having not one, but two languages of high culture at their disposal. It is against this unique background of linguistic choice that Pérez González then seeks to interrogate the motives behind individual playwrights' approaches to this *Sprachmischung*, with particular reference—among other things—to type scenes, stock characters, marked contexts, communicative or emotive import, and aesthetic concerns. To this end, an impressive amount of primary material is covered, much of it either *bislang nahezu* [almost completely] or even *völlig unerforscht* [entirely unstudied], and certainly one of the book's major merits is the sheer volume of hitherto unavailable material with which it presents the reader. Indeed, with its extensive plot summaries and ample contextual information, it practically outdoes itself and becomes something of a reference work on early modern Spanish drama in its own right.

A cornerstone of Pérez González's analysis is the extended case study of one such work in particular, the anonymous *Tragoedia Jeptaea*. A full transcription of the play (though sadly—contrary to the book's usual practice—with no translation) is provided in the Appendix, thus affording the reader a welcome opportunity to gain a sense of what this sort of full-length bilingual drama is actually like. The analytical categories derived from the *Tragoedia Jeptaea* are then re-deployed in the numerous further case studies, presenting the works of the six most prominent exponents of early modern bilingual Spanish Jesuit drama, along with various other—often anonymous—pieces. This mammoth case study chapter (93–256) is followed, lastly, by a series of more synoptic sections (257–347), in which the emergent themes are discussed. These synoptic sections are certainly the book's intellectual core and, while it is understood that the initial presentation of the evidence on a case-by-case basis is perhaps inevitable, this particular reviewer would—like the seventeenth-century Spanish audience preferring more Spanish than Latin—have likewise preferred a rather recalibrated ratio of case study to synthetic analysis.

It is also worth pausing to remark upon the implicit oppositions which structure the exposition throughout: not only Spain versus the rest of Europe, as discussed, but also, within Spain, Castile versus Andalusia, with sometimes quite extensive parallels drawn between the latter regions, as if comparison of the two were a self-evidently important aim of the investigation. Given that this is a book about language use *im spanischen Schultheater*—the scholastic drama of Spain—it is not at all clear what has happened to the other regions of that nation (other than brief appearances at 193–98 and 251–52). Particularly striking is the absence of Catalonia, where the Society has always had such a strong presence, and—to turn Pérez González's own argument against her for a moment—whose own language likewise has an important cultural pedigree. Note, however, that although the title announces Latin and “the vernacular,” the focus—with the exception of the most fleeting appearances of the Leonese dialect of Sayagués (215–16, 295)—is exclusively on Castilian Spanish. Even the sole exception to the silence surrounding Catalonia, at 248–51—which by that stage only serves to emphasize just how Catalonia-free the preceding three-quarters of the book have been—is to a drama in Latin and Castilian. I confess I do not know that (m)any examples of bilingual Jesuit plays in Latin and Catalan or, say, Basque actually exist—but I had been hoping to find out. The other structural opposition (Spain–Europe), meanwhile, is also potentially problematic, or at least limiting, insofar as it directs attention away from another area with which illuminating parallels could surely have been drawn: Hispanophone America. Given that Pérez González argues that it was in effect the particular nature of the Spanish language itself—insofar as it

emerged as a vehicle of high literary culture at a comparatively early stage and was a source of great pride to its lettered elite—which led to the uniquely bilingual profile of Spanish Jesuit drama, would it not have been instructive to consider how this translated into other Spanish-speaking territories? Examination of the relevant variables (presence of Spanish language, agency of Spanish Jesuits, dictates from Spain and from Rome, and so on) in the Hispano-American context would be a useful way of testing some of the book's conclusions, enabling an even more fine-grained understanding of the interaction between Latin and vernacular in Jesuit-run, Spanish-speaking environments. It must be recognized, however, that the work involved in marshaling the evidence for peninsular Spain has been consuming enough; and it goes without saying that Pérez González's volume will be an exceptionally useful resource for anyone endeavoring to conduct the aforementioned sort of comparative work in future.

At the molecular level, I am pleased to say that the unfortunately high incidence of duplications and triplications in the first chapter ("Abfassung," 17n21; "La una fue que que se representó," 21n40; "vorgestelltte," 23; "Transskription," 25) does not extend throughout the rest of the book, and overall the German text is quite polished. Rather more erratic is the Spanish, which—even allowing for the naturally variable orthography in the early modern passages (though I have some queries here as well)—contains a not inconsiderable number of infelicities, including in the names of important people, places, and institutions. It is a shame, for instance, to keep seeing "Real Academia" for "Real Academia" (11, 34, 193), or "Zúñiga" rendered variously as "Zuñiga" (227), "Zuñiga" (340), and even "Zuñigo" (239, 340). Accents—more usually the omission thereof—are certainly the greatest problem, closely followed by instances of what appear to be the effects of German autocorrect, e.g. "den" for "del" (38n91), "Regals" for "Reglas" (273n562). A fuller list of *errata* could be supplied to the author upon request.

These, however, are all relatively minor quibbles in what is clearly a monumental labor of documentation, of hitherto unessayed analysis, and also quite manifestly—as the author herself acknowledges in the foreword—of love. In an Anglophone journal I might be expected to conclude by asking whether I hope the book will be translated into English. If anything, I hope that it will be made available in Spanish, for it is a valuable contribution not merely to Jesuit studies but, arguably even more so, *zur Hispanistik*.

Maya Feile Tomes

King's College, Cambridge

mcf37@cam.ac.uk

DOI 10.1163/22141332-00202007-11