

in which the outline of the body of a woman was superimposed on a continent—can be used as a base from which to see just what exciting innovation was possible on the comic stage. Jaffe-Berg has identified an area of research in the performance conventions of the *commedia dell'arte* that is still a mystery to us and has indicated a highly fertile way of working in it.

As can be seen from these three excellent studies, contemporary research on the *commedia dell'arte* is on the upswing. Schmitt, Kerr, and Jaffe-Berg have each made a significant contribution to our knowledge of *commedia*, identifying exciting themes for future examination and indicating fruitful ways of approaching them.

• • •

Remaking the Comedia: Spanish Classical Theater in Adaptation. Edited by Harley Erdman and Susan Paun de García. Monografias A. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: Boydell & Brewer Ltd. / Tamesis, 2015; pp. xx + 303, 15 illustrations. \$90 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S0040557416000727

Reviewed by John Slater, *University of California–Davis* and Rebeca Rubio, *University of California–Davis*

Costume dramas may still enchant television audiences, but as the editors of *Remaking the Comedia* point out, directors of Spanish Golden Age plays have had it with “museum piece[s]” (9). “Always seek newness” is the resounding call of this volume, nearly a manifesto on the way to stage *comedias* today (26). Harley Erdman and Susan Paun de García’s collection is a bracing work of polemic that combines an impassioned argument for the relevance of early modern Spanish drama with some very sensible notes of caution. Bringing together critics, literary historians, directors, dramaturgs, and translators, the volume achieves three notable goals: it analyzes recent performances of plays by seventeenth-century playwrights; provides abundant advice for directors and translators; and charts a course for the future of the Spanish *comedia* on English- and Spanish-language stages. The collection covers a range of subjects, from puppetry to cross-gender casting, and offers an important evaluation of the current state of the *comedia* in performance.

In order to combine as many voices and approaches as possible, *Remaking the Comedia* gathers together brief chapters by twenty-six authors. Their diversity of perspectives demonstrates that the life cycles of early modern Spanish plays have entered a new phase. Productions no longer reverentially commemorate departed playwrights; instead, the efforts of directors, critics, translators, and actors—coupled with the attention paid to this work by critics—are lending old plays new vitality. Spanish plays are gaining new vigor in the bodies of living actors.

The sense that the plays of Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, María de Zayas, and other playwrights have sprung to new life is reflected in Catherine Larson’s helpful chapter, “Terms and Concepts.” Larson adopts Julie Sanders’s idea that

the adaptation of plays is akin to biological evolution. Adaptation or *refundición*—a formerly disparaging term that the editors reclaim to good effect—is on the minds of almost all of the contributors. Of course, from an evolutionary standpoint, most mutations are not for fitness, and change is not necessarily improvement. To address this concern, Erdman and Paun de García select contributions that explore multiple dimensions of a limited number of successful adaptations. For example, Laurence Boswell recounts his direction of Lope's *The Dog in the Manger* in one chapter, while in another, David Johnston dispassionately analyzes successive drafts of his translation of the same play. Nearly all of the contributors agree that adaptation and not “fidelity”—a term that is used almost as contemptuously as “museum piece”—is crucial to the *comedia*'s longevity.

There are, however, significant points of disagreement among the contributors. One recurring question is just how much adaptation is warranted. Some contributors (e.g., Boswell) clearly believe that *comedias* continue to speak to audiences about love, heartache, and jealousy; the director's job is to render those messages comprehensible. Others (e.g., Gina Kaufmann and Karen Berman) contend that *comedias* speak best when they are turned to innovative ends. A few chapters go to improbable lengths to underscore differences between the seventeenth century and the twenty-first: readers are asked to believe that concepts such as monogamy (179) or jealousy (204) are incomprehensible today. This is part of a process of active othering of the seventeenth century through which some directors find the freedom to adapt (precisely the sort of truthful deceit of which Lope was fond). Disagreements among the contributors also indicate a lack of consensus about the capacities of the *comedia*: Can it do more than entertain?

The answer used to be a resounding “yes.” For centuries, literary historians characterized the plays of Calderón de la Barca as the great philosophical statements of the Spanish baroque. Lately, it has been the plays of Lope and not Calderón that have been produced most often, partly due to their lightness, charm, and eroticism. However, Erdman, Kaufmann, Berman, and others suggest ways in which works by Tirso and Zayas can be used to transgress the boundaries of audience expectation. Remarkably, in this volume's discussions of the capacities of the Spanish *comedia*, only Rick Davis and Robert E. Bayliss question the representation of Spain as a culturally monolithic nation-state (whether on the seventeenth- or twenty-first-century stages). In unfortunate instances, *comedias* have been used to reinforce folkloric idealizations of a Spain full of bullfighting and flamenco dancing. Jonathan Thacker calls these representations “domesticated” *comedias* that mystify as they entertain (97).

Bruce R. Burningham warns that complete domestication may never be possible: the native powers of a *comedia* cannot be entirely stripped or controlled in an adaptation. We may cut, rewrite, translate, or recast, but once the actors take the stage, *comedias* become living things that call to one another across time. In this instance, Burningham suggests that Amaya Curieses Iriarte's adaptation of *El caballero de Olmedo* invoked—perhaps inadvertently—the visual codes of Calderón's sacramental allegory, *El gran teatro del mundo*, turning tragedy into political hagiography. Despite Curieses's radical adaptation—which she describes

movingly in her own article—*El caballero de Olmedo* could not be abstracted from the early modern world of its creation. *Comedias* bring with them the capacity for new life, yet Burningham shows that they also harbor an old magic whose power has not been extinguished.

• • •

Passionate Playgoing in Early Modern England. By Allison P. Hobgood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014; pp. x + 236. \$99.99 cloth, \$80 e-book.

The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare. By Steven Mullaney. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2015; pp. x + 231, 1 illustration. \$35 cloth, \$35 e-book.

doi:10.1017/S0040557416000739

Reviewed by Tanya Pollard, *Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York*

What do we talk about when we talk about affect? Conversations about emotions, senses, and bodies are currently flourishing across disciplines and periods, but these terms signal different meanings, and reflect different investments, to different readers. Critics exploring affect in early modern theatre might agree that the stage represents a privileged site for conjoining bodies, minds, words, and feelings. We might also agree that open-air amphitheatres offered more sensory cues than our own darkened halls, and that early theatregoing habits gave audiences more active roles than our own social codes allow. Yet we draw different conclusions about what a given set of texts and circumstances can tell us about how, why, and to what ends plays moved their audiences.

Recent conversations about early modern emotions have taken their cues especially from the legacy of Galenic medicine, in which changeable liquid humors course through receptive bodies and animate them with feeling. Humoral readings vary in premises and goals, but typically share some common foundations—often historicist, materialist, and/or feminist. Recently, critics restless with this model have turned to varying forms of intellectual history, especially theological, to propose alternative accounts of how and why early moderns experienced emotions; just as evolving understandings of Greek medicine shaped conceptions of what people felt and how, so too did the shock waves that reverberated from the Protestant Reformation. In two recent books, Allison P. Hobgood and Steven Mullaney illustrate some important commonalities and distinctions between humoral and theological approaches to understanding emotions in early modern theatres, taking different routes to arrive at some strikingly similar ideas about the reciprocal affective exchanges through which the period's plays and audiences shaped each other.

In *Passionate Playgoing in Early Modern England*, Hobgood builds on studies of early modern humoral thought to explore “the feeling bodies of