

to the theater.

Most of all, she does not fall into the traps of the American critique and her quest is as scientific as can be, never driven by a desire to prove a preconceived idea or an ideology. However, while her concerns about not making broad assumptions are valuable, her remarkable work has given her the authority to make such statements. Nonetheless, even if this precise and insightful analysis of French theater of the seventeenth century deserved a more elevated conclusion, *L'usurpation du pouvoir* is truly the work of a dedicated researcher and a book that should be read by every scholar interested in seventeenth-century theater.

José De Acosta. *Peregrinación de Bartolomé Lorenzo. Récit d'aventures dans les Amériques au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Richard Lefebvre, ed. and trans. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval; Paris: Hermann, 2020. 204 pp. \$25/30€. Review by MARÍA HERNÁNDEZ, ROWAN UNIVERSITY.

Editing and translating literary works is both a challenging and valuable enterprise, especially when dealing with an overlooked text from the Spanish Golden Age. In this newest edition of José de Acosta's *Peregrinación de Bartolomé de Lorenzo*, Richard Lefebvre undertakes the ambitious project of offering his own edition of the sixteenth-century Spanish text followed by a new French translation. José de Acosta is a renowned figure in Hispanic studies for two significant texts, *De procuranda Indorum salute*, a treatise on missiology published in Latin in 1588, and *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*, a treatise on ethnography and morals, published in Spanish in 1590. In his introduction, Lefebvre proposes that, instead of being a minor work, the 1586 *Peregrinación*, should be viewed as part of a textual triad including the aforementioned, works. While, before 1980, *Peregrinación* was reproduced and received within the scope of the hagiographic tradition, scholars have since reevaluated *Peregrinación* and reframed its analysis through the Latin American postcolonial criticism lens; Lefebvre continues in this vein.

In Chapter 1, Lefebvre gives his readership a well-rounded biography of José de Acosta. A member of the Society of Jesus who taught in several Spanish and Portuguese Jesuit colleges, de Acosta studied philosophy and theology before being sent in 1571 as a missionary

to the ecclesiastical province of Peru, where he would spend fifteen years before returning to Spain in 1587, where he would die in 1600. In Chapter 2, Lefebvre examines the different versions of de Acosta's text, from the printed versions to the earlier manuscripts. He does so in an anachronous fashion that mimics the random order in which versions were discovered and published. Lefebvre states that the different editions and multiple variations might be due to the manuscript's submission to rewriting and editing specific to its religious setting within the Society of Jesus' *scriptoria*. José de Acosta's work begins with his dedicatory letter to Claudio Acquaviva, followed by Bartolomé de Lorenzo's peregrination narrative recollected and transcribed by de Acosta. The first printed edition of *Peregrinación* was published in 1666 among a collection of texts entitled *Varones ilustres en santidad, letras y zelo de la Compañía de Jesus* by Alonso Lopez de Andrade, a Jesuit historian and biographer. José de Acosta's original composite piece is embedded between Andrade's introduction and epilogue to fit within the baroque and hagiographic genres. Andrade does not give any information about the original manuscript or manuscripts he might have used when establishing his version of *Peregrinación*. Still, he discloses numerous modifications, decoupage, and the addition of titles made to the original. Andrade's version would be the standard edition until a different version by Cesareo Fernandez Duro was published in 1899.

This later version was established on another, probably earlier source than Andrade's: the transcription of a 1622 manuscript copy made by Juan Bautista Muñoz in 1798. While it was published later than Andrade's version, Lefebvre concurs with Lorenzo Rubio Gonzalez's idea that Fernandez Duro's 1899 version is based on a primitive version of the text, closer in time to José de Acosta's original. However, that version has not proved as popular or studied and remains somewhat forgotten, in favor of other versions, notably the one published in the twentieth century. In 1954, Francisco Mateos published *Obras del P. José de Acosta de la Compañía de Jesus*, which includes a version of *Peregrinación* based on a unique and unexplored manuscript in the Jesuits collection at the Spanish Royal Academy of History. Lefebvre describes the peculiarities of the Jesuits manuscript at length and compares it with Mateos's rendition. According to Lefebvre's comparison,

Mateos's edition presents considerable changes, additions, rewritings, and transcription errors. Regardless, Mateo's edition enjoyed both the most significant diffusion and exegetic production. Lefebvre also mentions Juan José Arrom's 1982 edition and Fausta Antonucci's 1993 Italian translation.

In Chapter 3, which is the longest and most inviting in the book after the edition and the translation themselves, Lefebvre conducts a critical synthesis of different scholarly analyses of *Peregrinación* followed by his interpretation within seven subparts. In the first subpart, Lefebvre reveals how the factuality of Bartolomé Lorenzo's narrative is authorized by de Acosta's dedicatory letter's content, strengthening the veracity of the peregrination's relation. This *enchâssement*, specific to the epistolary genre and favored by the Jesuits, relies on the dynamic between the dedicatory letter and the narration that follows. However, José de Acosta's text is atypical and combines several literary genres: biography, hagiography, adventure romance, and fiction. By doing so, it fits within the principles of Counter-Reformation's art that combines Christian edification and the approval gained through "les machinations de l'art romanesque" (42). In the second subpart, Lefebvre examines the Greek and Christian sources of the peregrination as a literary genre and inscribes de Acosta's *Peregrinación* in the continuity of Ignacio de Loyola's autobiography. In the third subpart, Lefebvre explores the narrator's voice that subtly treads between objectivity and fictionalization through José de Acosta, who participates in the *romanesque* construction and the fictionalization process. In the fourth subpart, Lefebvre analyzes the allegorical and spiritual interpretations of the *Peregrinación*, which lean on literal and figurative readings of the text. In the fifth subpart, Lefebvre pays attention to realism and ideology in social representation and concludes that the omission of *mestizos* and other stereotyped racial representations reveals the author's biased ideology and social background. In the sixth subpart, Lefebvre discusses Bartolomé Lorenzo's transformation from merchant to pilgrim through successive interventions of Providence. Finally, in the seventh and last subpart of chapter 3, Lefebvre closes his study by examining the Jesuit intertext and comparing the numerous similarities between *A Pilgrim's Journey: The Autobiography of Ignatius of Loyola* and *Peregrinación*. Nonetheless, Lefebvre suggests that de

Acosta's text presents its distinct particularities, such as its atypical protagonist, which positions José de Acosta's unique *romanesque* production outside of the narrative conventions of the time.

In Chapter 4, Lefebvre justifies the establishment of his version of the text. Referring back to Chapter 2, in which he describes the several editions and versions of the printed texts and manuscripts, Lefebvre explains why he chooses to present a Spanish edition based on the manuscript of the Jesuits collection at the Spanish Royal Academy of History. He first bases his decision on the notion of authorship in the context of publishing edification stories within the Jesuit organization (94). Secondly, Lefebvre chooses to inscribe his edition in the continuity of the exegetic tradition based on Mateos's 1954 edition in *Obras*. Although Lefebvre's edition includes one hundred and ninety-three footnotes identifying different variations found in the other printed and manuscript editions, he argues that his version is neither a critical nor a synoptical edition but, rather, an accessible Spanish version to possible French readers interested in reading the text in its original language. Lefebvre's version in Chapter 5 reads as seamlessly as possible, considering that he respected the original disposition and punctuation of the text. In Chapter 6, Lefebvre gives brief remarks about his French translation, which follows in Chapter 7, and completes his work. Lefebvre argues that his translation does not aim to reproduce José de Acosta's original writing style due to its complex style, lack of modern punctuation, and use of tenses specific to sixteenth-century Spanish. Instead of José de Acosta's parataxis, Lefebvre chooses short sentences instead. In his French translation, Lefebvre decides to keep some words in their original languages, such as *arcabuco* (Arawak), *curaca* (Quechua), or *corregidor* (Spanish), and in italics when they do not have a direct French translation. The seventy-nine informative footnotes allow readers to familiarize themselves with toponyms, historical figures, and natural elements. In his translation, Lefebvre does a great job of recreating Bartolomé Lorenzo's rhythmic adventures, everyday language, and the hyperbolic tone so dear to the Spanish original.

Reading the Spanish version and the French translation back-to-back is a pleasant and effortless experience for neophytes, bilinguals, and researchers alike. With this new edition of José de Acosta's *Peregrina-*

*nación de Bartolomé Lorenzo* followed by a first-time French translation, Lefebvre's double-edged task is as effective as it is noteworthy. He delivers a much-needed new Spanish edition combined with an invaluable French translation in a functional and accessible format, opening the door for a continuing and renewed exegetical tradition around José de Acosta's work.

Coline Piot. *Rire et comédie: Émergence d'un nouveau discours sur les effets du théâtre au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Genève: Droz, 2020. 488 pp. \$74.40/62.00 CHF. Review by PEADAR KAVANAGH, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

We generally presume, begins Coline Piot, that comedy and laughter go hand in hand, when, in fact, this association was definitively established in writings on theater in the late seventeenth century. Since the five-act plays of Molière have been praised for their morally corrective laughter, and as these pieces have been consecrated as models for comedy in literary history, common opinion in and beyond France now holds laughter as an essential feature of comedy in general. Perceiving the disagreement between early modern commentary on comic theater and this prevailing assumption, Piot sets out to demonstrate how the marriage between comedy and laughter was made in non-theoretical writings, why theorists of the theater eventually came to recognize this union, and how the modern French perception of comedy as laughter was formed through this evolution of dramatic criticism in the seventeenth century. Following a general shift in the attention from the composition of plays to their effects on spectators, a new discourse emerged that designated laughter as an essential feature of the comic genre. When, in the 1660s, this laughter assimilated a morally corrective function, the modern notion of “classic” comedy in France was founded—high comic theater is supposed to reprove vices with laughter. Piot's clear interpretation of the vast field of writings on the comic in early modern France sustains a larger movement of studies on affect in theater, after Jacques Rancière's *Spectateur émancipé* [*Emancipated Spectator*] (2008), determined not only to “repenser le théâtre à partir de la salle [to rethink theater from the