JOHN VAREY

John Earl Varey
1922–1999

I

JOHN VAREY was one of the greatest of twentieth-century hispanists, and the history of the Spanish theatre as a major research area was in large measure his creation. Serious study of puppets and other popular entertainments in Spain was due to him. These and other aspects of his scholarship are assessed by Melveena McKendrick in the second part of this memoir.[1] Yet his scholarship—enough to fill a long and active life for most academics—is only half of the story. He founded a new department, with minimal resources, and built it so skilfully that within twenty-five years it was one of the top two or three in the country in research quality. He founded a publishing house that became one of the most important and influential publishers in its field anywhere in the world. He was Principal of Westfield College in the last years of its independent existence, and succeeded, to an extent that no one else could have managed, in preserving much of Westfield's quality in the eventual merger. He was one of the most energetic and dedicated members of the University of London's governing bodies. And at the age of twenty-two, before he

[1] See also the assessments by Charles Davis in *Golden Age Spanish Literature: Studies in Honour of John Varey by his Colleagues and Pupils*, ed. Charles Davis & Alan Deyermond (Dept of Spanish, Westfield College, 1991), pp. 23–8 (a bibliography of Varey's publications is on pp. 29–38) and by José María Ruano de la Haza in *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* (Glasgow), 77.1 (Jan. 2000: *Calderón 1600–1681: Quatercentenary Studies in Memory of John E. Varey*, ed. Ann L. Mackenzie), 25–31. A revised and amplified bibliography is provided by Charles Davis and Alan Deyermond in the latter volume, pp. 33–47.

Proceedings of the British Academy, **115**, 385–408.

had completed his degree, he had, as a navigator in Bomber Command, looked death in the face many times and not flinched.

John Varey was born on 26 August 1922 into a solidly middle-class, modestly prosperous Lancashire family where education and the life of the mind were valued: his father was a headmaster, his mother had been a teacher until her marriage. Like many such families, this one had reached a comfortable level thanks to the struggles of the preceding generations, a fact of which John was always conscious. His high intelligence and his appetite for knowledge were encouraged by his parents, and he spent eight years at Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School, Blackburn, before winning an Open Exhibition to Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He remained tenaciously, even fiercely, loyal to his native town and to its football team, and throughout his life would accept Saturday commitments only after consulting the Blackburn Rovers fixture list. Another childhood enthusiasm that stayed with him was puppets: he wrote his thesis on the subject, he staged puppet shows for his children's birthday parties, and he printed the family's Christmas cards with puppet designs.

He had considered reading English at university, and his Exhibition was in English and Spanish, but even before he arrived in Cambridge he was discouraged by the bitter factional quarrels that divided the Faculty of English, and he chose to read Spanish, at first with Italian and then alone. Yet his love of English literature persisted (perhaps all the more strongly because he never had to take a side in the quarrels), and it enriched his teaching and research in Spanish. And from the Cambridge of Leavis, Empson, and Richards he learned close reading, and his criticism combined attention to textual detail with a creative interpretation of imagery.

After a year as an undergraduate John joined the RAF, training in Canada before being commissioned as navigator in 1943 and serving in Bomber Command and then in Transport Command. To be a navigator in a bomber over Germany required not only technical skill of a high order but also a particularly durable sort of courage: on one occasion John looked up to find that another bomber was immediately above him, with its bomb-bays open. He was demobilised as Flight Lieutenant in December 1945, and returned to Cambridge the following term. It was in the war years that he renewed his friendship with Micky (officially Cicely Rainford) Virgo, whom he had known in childhood (their grandmothers had taught in the same school), and who in the early 1940s was working in the Bank of England. Friendship ripened into love, and John and Micky became unofficially engaged.

John received his BA degree in 1946 under war emergency regulations, and began his doctoral research in 1947. After a year of graduate work he was invited to give tutorial teaching for a number of colleges, and he and Micky could afford to marry. He enjoyed teaching and did it well, so he was in constant demand, though he was less successful in handling his press coverage: because he insisted on using the Cambridge term 'supervision' for a tutorial, a Blackburn newspaper published his photograph with the caption 'Local lad supervises five Cambridge colleges'.

The thesis, on 'Minor Dramatic Forms in Spain, with Special Reference to Puppets', required a great deal of work in Spanish libraries and archives, and it was in this period that John formed the habit of regular visits to the Madrid archives and of making use of every hour that they were open. His industry and his patience were inexhaustible: he once sprained his wrist by the constant turning over of thousands of pages of documents. A. E. Housman, writing a memoir of a Cambridge colleague over seventy years ago, said: 'A scholar who means to build himself a monument must spend much of his life in acquiring knowledge which for its own sake is not worth having and in reading books which do not in themselves deserve to be read.' Housman had no dealings with ancient account books and contracts, all in difficult handwriting, or he might have expressed himself even more strongly. John's boredom threshhold was extremely high, and as he made his way through the many irrelevant documents he was rewarded, time and again, by the finding of a document that filled a gap in his knowledge and shone light into a dark corner of theatrical history. It was in these first years that lasting friendships with Spanish scholars began—mostly with fellow-investigators of the Golden Age theatre, and mostly with the young (senior Spaniards were not then, with a few admirable exceptions, as inclined as they are today to welcome researchers from other countries). One such friendship was with the City Archivist of Madrid, who had a taste for the best hand-made shoes, and asked John to order him a pair in London. John pointed out that it was difficult to execute the commission unless the shoemaker was able to measure the customer's feet. 'I've thought of that', said the Archivist, 'and here is a plaster cast of my foot'. It was not easy for John to explain this unusual piece of luggage to a British Customs officer.

Having completed his thesis in the minimum time of three years, John assumed that his examiners would be equally prompt. They were not. The University had appointed as external examiner the man of letters Walter Starkie, then living in Madrid, and Starkie, never slow to see an opportunity, insisted on first-class travel. The University countered this ploy by

agreeing to a viva in Madrid, but the plan collapsed when the internal examiner refused, on political grounds, to set foot in Franco's Spain. The deadlock continued for a year, and in the end John was set a written viva (I believe this to be the only one in the history of British hispanism). This was academic comedy of the finest kind, more David Lodge than C. P. Snow (though one of the protagonists appears as Eustace Pilbrow in Snow's *The Masters*). John saw the humour of it in later years, but at the time the strain on a talented, energetic, and ambitious young man, already held back by war service, must have been hard to bear.

There was some compensation even for that frustrating year: it meant another year in Cambridge, where he and Micky were very happy; he was appointed a full (though temporary) member of the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, he was invited to continue his tutorial teaching even after he left Cambridge, and he began to supervise his first research student, Norman Shergold, a fellow-enthusiast for the history of the theatre.[2] This teaching experience must have helped as much as his research when he applied for a Lectureship in Spanish at Westfield College in 1952. The post was, unusually, within the Department of French. Since 1948 Spanish had been taught for a few hours each week at Subsidiary level by a retired Lecturer from King's College, Janet Perry. This experiment was successful, and Denis Elcock, Professor of Romance Philology and Head of the Department of French, wanted to expand the teaching, eventually to Honours level. He had, however, no wish to see the creation of a Department of Spanish, and assumed that the new lecturer would know his place. There was a strong field of candidates, and John emerged victorious. Westfield was still a small college, and all of the students and most of the staff were women; the college was not wholly prepared for what it got. John was as successful a teacher in London as in Cambridge, and after two years the college recognised the growing demand and agreed not only to the introduction of Honours teaching but also to the foundation of a Department of Spanish.

The appointment to a lectureship had given John and Micky the opportunity to settle down to something like a normal family life, after years of a hand-to-mouth student existence. They lived for a time in a rented flat near the college, but were soon able to move to a spacious unfurnished flat on the campus. For the first time, they had all the space they needed, and they could offer to colleagues, students, and visitors from other universities the hospitality that soon became legendary. They could also afford to have

[2] Their collaboration is described in Melveena McKendrick's part of this memoir.

children, and their first son, Christopher, was born, but their happiness was short-lived: the healthy baby caught a rapidly fatal infection in the maternity hospital. It was a shattering blow, despite the support of the close-knit college community. The pain never quite disappeared, but it was soon alleviated by the birth of another son, then a daughter, and then a third son. The two boys, Nicholas and Michael, grew up to share their father's love of Spain, where they settled for many years, and the girl, Alison, continued the family's academic tradition by becoming a lecturer (though not in Spanish) at Napier University in Edinburgh. In 1959 a timely legacy enabled the family to move to a house in Platts Lane—semi-detached, but big enough for two post-war detached houses rolled into one. They were now ideally situated, two minutes' walk away from Hampstead Heath and five minutes' walk from college. John could indulge his taste for gardening and home improvements, and Micky cooked superb meals. Groups of students were regularly and frequently invited for coffee, and for many years there was an end-of-session buffet supper for undergraduate and graduate students and staff, and a Christmas supper for staff and graduate students. The food was magnificent, the wine unlimited (the most respectable undergraduate of his year was once found in the small hours, sleeping peacefully in a front garden half-way down the hill).

The Department of Spanish opened for business in October 1955 with John at its head, presiding over one assistant lecturer (myself) and no secretary—the college had one part-time secretary, who was able to devote half a day a week to each department except Spanish (too newly established to need secretarial help). We had three Honours students in our first intake, giving us a staff–student ratio of 1:1.5, but statistics, as so often, masked the truth, because between us we had to cover the whole range of language and literature courses, and it was exhausting. John taught half the language courses, Golden Age drama and prose, and modern literature (Latin-American literature had not yet been discovered in Britain). He was a good lecturer, but was at his best in individual tutorials and, after the reform of the London syllabus about 1960, in Special Subject seminars. He was good at language classes, but did not miss them when pressure of other teaching commitments led him to withdraw from them. He could not, on the other hand, have been easily parted from his Special Subject seminars on the novelist Galdós (see below, p. 407), and he continued to take History of the Theatre seminars even after his election as Principal in 1983 ended his other teaching.[3]

[3] In his last year as Head of Department he negotiated a research collaboration agreement with the equivalent department in the University of Valencia, leading to joint Westfield supervision

That, however, was far in the future when the department was launched. John was thirty-three when he became Head of Department, the age at which Constance Maynard became the founding Mistress of Westfield College in 1882.[4] It had been decided that a Readership in Spanish should be established, but although the post was advertised and interviews held, no appointment was made. This was in part because another ambitious young hispanist, Roy Jones of King's College, also applied, and the committee was unable to choose between them. This, which caused lasting distrust between John and Roy Jones, may not have been the whole story: I suspect that a more important factor was a feeling among some senior academics and administrators that John was in too much of a hurry and that he should be restrained. John was deeply hurt, though he tried not to show it—as I got to know him, I realised that a good deal of his nervous energy (and quite possibly of Micky's, too) went into maintaining his phlegmatic Lancashire exterior. Pressure from outside the college soon produced the right result, and John became a Reader in 1957. Six years later the title of Professor of Spanish was conferred, and in 1967 an established chair was created, and John was appointed to it. He remained the Head until he was elected Principal in 1983. The idea of a rotating, elective headship did not attract him: this was his department, he had created it out of nothing, and his energy and vision, together with the fact that he alone had risked his life in the war, gave him unrivalled authority. This had its drawbacks, but they were much outweighed by the advantages (among them, the vigour and tenacity with which he defended any colleague or student who was under threat from outside the department). It is significant that in the twenty-eight years of his reign only two members of staff left for other universities, whereas in the eighteen succeeding years nine have done so.

John had high ambitions for his department, and rightly so. In the first three years, the student intake was very small but of remarkable quality: out of eleven students, four won Firsts (this was in the years when Firsts were a rarity), and went on, under his supervision, to gain Ph.D.s. His early appointments to the staff were not uniformly successful, but in the mid-to-late 1960s three high-flyers were appointed: Ralph Penny (now Professor of Romance Philology), the Trinidadian Premraj Halkhoree,

of Valencia theses, visits by staff in both directions, and publication of a growing number of volumes by young Valencian scholars on the history of the city's theatre.

[4] See Catherine B. Firth, *Constance Louisa Maynard, Mistress of Westfield: A Family Portrait* (1949).

whom John regarded as the brightest of us all (he left after nine years for the University of Ottawa, and died of leukemia two years later), and the American Dorothy Severin (now Gilmour Professor of Spanish at Liverpool). It is difficult for someone who has spent his whole working life in a department to assess it objectively, but objectivity may be found in the record: this is the only department of Spanish to have been chosen by the Nuffield Foundation for its survey of innovatory teaching methods (1964), it is the only one to have won a New Blood post (Charles Davis was appointed in 1983 to work with John on the History of the Spanish Theatre Project), it is one of only two to have two FBAs at the same time (Oxford is the other), and its average Research Assessment Exercise scores place it equal first with Cambridge. Such achievements come from team work, but teams need leaders, and without John's leadership they would have been out of reach.

It is strange now to look back to the early days, when John saw his Westfield appointment as an interlude before he returned to Cambridge (though his commitment to the college was total). He would have been an excellent choice to succeed Edward M. Wilson as professor at Cambridge, and would have given that department a more active leadership than suited Wilson's temperament.[5] He wanted the job, planned his career to that end, and was badly disappointed when Roy Jones was chosen. When Jones died suddenly after only a year in the Cambridge chair, much of the fire had gone out of that particular ambition, and John saw that Westfield gave him more scope than Cambridge for what he wanted to do.

One of those things was the running of his own publishing house, Tamesis Books. He told people that he founded Tamesis because no other publisher would carry the burden of his series Fuentes para la Historia del Teatro Español, sources for the history of the Spanish theatre.[6] This was certainly true of British publishers, but a Spanish publisher could probably have been found. He told himself and those close to him that Tamesis would strengthen his claim to the Cambridge chair. There was some truth in both these stories, but I think there was a simpler explanation: he was attracted to the life of a publisher, he saw something that needed to be done, and he knew that he could do it. There were no businessmen in his immediate ancestry, but he would have been a good full-time businessman,

[5] See A. A. Parker & D. W. Cruickshank, 'Edward Meryon Wilson, 1906–1977', *PBA*, 68 (1982), 643–66.

[6] Never wholly sound on bibliographical method, he insisted on treating this as a multi-volume book, even though the Tamesis catalogue listed it as a series, and he was surprisingly ungrateful when it was given its correct bibliographical treatment.

and when he mixed with those who were he valued their praise more highly than that of fellow academics.

The first impetus for the foundation of Tamesis was a conversation between John and the Spanish publisher Germán Bleiberg. Encouraged by the great London foreign-language bookseller Frank Cutler, they took the irrevocable step, and in 1963 Tamesis Books came into being as a publishing house dedicated entirely to Hispanic studies, in which both young and established hispanists published monographs and editions.[7] At first with Bleiberg, later alone, he ran both the business and the editorial side for thirty years, corresponding voluminously with authors and reading the proofs of each volume. The list grew rapidly in size and prestige, and in 1975 the Real Academia Española awarded Tamesis the Nieto López Prize. On the debit side, Bleiberg, a poet who still suffered from the effects of years in Franco's prisons, for part of the time under sentence of death, had an idiosyncratic approach to business that imposed considerable strain on John, and in 1985 caused a financial crisis that might have brought about the collapse of Tamesis if Frank Cutler had not provided fresh capital out of his own pocket. In the mid-1990s the burden of running the company as well as the editorial side became too much even for John, and Tamesis, with over two hundred volumes published, became an imprint of Boydell and Brewer, but still under his editorial guidance. That arrangement continues today, with John's chosen successors in the editorial role.[8]

Within the college, John's energy and administrative skill made him the obvious candidate when the post of Dean of the Faculty of Arts was created in 1966. Some people, nervous that an overly energetic Dean might disturb the even tenor of their ways, adopted the slogan 'Vote No for Dean' (a little unfair to the other candidate). This election was a perfect example of democratic participation: every elector voted in a secret ballot, and a substantial majority voted for John. He held the office for a two-year term, and did not seek re-election because of his appointment

[7] See the brief account of the the history of Tamesis Books in *25 años de Támesis*, ed. A. D. Deyermond, J. E. Varey, & Charles Davis (Tamesis Books, 1989), pp. 5–7. The book contains assessments by scholars from Britain, Spain, and Canada of Tamesis's achievement in six areas of hispanism. For Frank Cutler, see my obituary in *The Independent* (2 August 1999), Review section, p. 6.

[8] The association with Boydell and Brewer was particularly fitting. Soon after the foundation of Tamesis, the Chaucerian scholar Derek Brewer, later to become Master of John's old college, Emmanuel, sought John's advice on his plan to launch a Tamesis equivalent for Middle English studies. The result was the publishing house of D. S. Brewer, which in due course merged with The Boydell Press.

as Vice-Principal. In both posts he was effective and far-sighted, but it was difficult for him to continue in college office under a Principal with whom he was increasingly at odds. He had welcomed the Principal's election and that of his predecessor because he had thought that they had the qualities needed to modernise and expand Westfield. In both cases he was rapidly disillusioned, and though one Principal was removed after three years, her successor stayed for seventeen.

John knew that he had something to contribute as an administrator, and from 1970 onwards it was at University level that he made that contribution, notably as Chairman of the Board of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures 1972–4, member of Senate and Academic Council from 1976, Chairman of the Academic Advisory Board in Language and Literature 1979–83, member of the University Court (the supreme financial committee) 1980–6, Chairman of Academic Council 1980–3, and, in retrospect the most important, Chairman of the Committee of Management of the Warburg Institute from 1978 until 1992. In that post he played a crucial part in the successful defence of the Warburg against attempts to raid its funds and undermine its autonomy. I regretted at the time that he had undertaken so much university work, and I regret it still. His work for the Warburg was supremely worth while, and in some other ways (for instance, as one of the Governors of Birkbeck College) he made a real difference, but in most of the other committee work he could not. The late 1970s and the 1980s were not years in which honest, hard, and skilful work ensured success. A combination of destructive government policies and a changed temper within the university (both in Senate House and in the larger colleges) meant that for much of the time John was swimming against the tide. The endurance that he had developed in his long hours in the Madrid archives, the ability to sit still and withstand boredom—qualities in which he rivalled the late Soviet Foreign Minister, the great Stone-Bottom Molotov (who earned his epithet by outlasting everyone else at meetings)—were later to be invaluable to him in college and university committees, but the number of university meetings drained even his formidable energy to no good purpose.

That was also a time when the smaller colleges, including Westfield, were under constant threat. From 1981 onwards there was growing pressure from the government for what was called rationalisation in universities. Predatory eyes were cast on valuable land in London, and one small college after another vanished into the maw of a larger one. This was bad enough, but what was far worse was the fog of deceit in which the process

was enveloped. Those of us who were fighting to retain Westfield's independence knew that the best hope of saving the college lay in John Varey's leadership, and when the Principal decided to take early retirement in 1983, it did not take the electors long to invite John to succeed him. To our immense relief, he accepted, becoming Acting Principal in October 1983 and Principal on 1 January 1984. Sir Norman Lindop, then Chairman of the College Council, described his acceptance as 'an act of great courage, verging on the foolhardy'.[9]

Negotiations for a consortium with Bedford College, only a couple of miles from Westfield, had already foundered before John took office. He tried time after time to reach a solution that would preserve a residential teaching campus in Hampstead: there were successive negotiations with six colleges, but sometimes the other college withdrew, sometimes Westfield found the terms unacceptable. At least twice, John was encouraged by the university to pursue negotiations that were, when they looked like succeeding, vetoed. These betrayals wore down even John's stamina, and when one of them coincided with stress of a different kind, the crisis in the affairs of Tamesis Books (see p. 392, above), the strain proved too much, triggering angina. A heart bypass operation followed, and John was out of action for several months in late 1985 and early 1986 (the college was left in the safe hands of the Senior Vice-Principal, the distinguished medieval historian Henry Loyn, FBA).

By 1987 our options had run out, and the choice was between absorption into King's College and a genuine merger with Queen Mary College. Many colleagues favoured the former, but John knew that only the latter offered the chance of preserving most of what mattered in Westfield and would lead to the creation of a new college that blended the traditions and preserved the strengths of its component parts. With skill and patience, he secured acceptable terms, and persuaded Council to accept them. In the autumn of 1989 the merger took effect, Queen Mary and Westfield College was born, and John retired from the Principalship and returned to full-time research.

In early 1989 the college constituted the History of the Theatre Research Project as an autonomous unit within the Department of Hispanic Studies, appointing John as Director and Charles Davis as Associate Director. This increasingly international enterprise (the Fuentes series expanded rapidly in the last decade of John's life, taking in volumes by Spanish scholars on the theatrical history of their home

[9] Foreword to *Golden Age Spanish Literature* (see n. 1, above), p. 9.

towns and cities, and has now reached volume 35) was adopted as a British Academy Research Project in 1995 and recognised by the Union Académique Internationale the following year, and it attracted major grants from the Academy and the Leverhulme Trust. John's collaboration with Norman Shergold was not always easy, despite Shergold's remarkable quality as a researcher (it was his suspension of work on the project while he prepared his *History of the Spanish Stage*, 1967, that led John to begin publishing his work on Galdós: see p. 407, below). The collaboration with Charles Davis, by contrast, was steady, cordial, and increasingly productive. Another aspect of the project was John's leading role in the campaign to restore the seventeenth-century theatre hidden under a cinema in the main square of Alcalá de Henares (an undertaking akin to the restoration of the Globe Theatre—he built links between the two). He and the young Spanish scholars who discovered the theatre had to struggle with entrenched bureaucracy, and even as he went into hospital for the last time he was planning the next steps in the campaign. It aroused in him, at the end of his life, the same passion for the tangible reality of the theatre that had made puppets his schoolboy hobby.

From the late 1970s onwards, honours were heaped on John Varey: President of the Association of Hispanists of Great Britain and Ireland 1979, Ilustre Hijo de Madrid 1980, Cambridge Litt.D. 1981, Corresponding Fellow of the Real Academia Española 1981, Fellow of the British Academy 1985 (he served as Chairman of the Modern Literature section), the first foreign Honorary Member of the Instituto de Estudios Madrileños 1988, and a doctorate *honoris causa* of the University of Valencia 1989. The award of that doctorate was preceded by a three-day international congress held in his honour, and its Proceedings form one of the three Festschriften that marked his retirement.[10] A fourth book is a tribute to his memory (see n. 1, above). A few months after his death, the department of Spanish Literature at the University of Valencia named a new seminar room the Sala John Varey.[11]

[10] *Comedias y comediantes: estudios sobre el teatro clásico español: Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre Teatro y Prácticas Escénicas en los siglos XVI y XVII, organizado por el Departamento de Filología Española de la Universitat de València, celebrado en la Facultat de Filologia, los días 9, 10 y 11 de mayo de 1989*, ed. Manuel V. Diago & Teresa Ferrer, Collecció Oberta (València: Departament de Filologia Espanyola, Universitat de València, 1991). The other two are *El mundo del teatro español en su Siglo de Oro: ensayos dedicados a John E. Varey*, ed. J. M. Ruano de la Haza, Ottawa Hispanic Studies, 3 (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1989) and *Golden Age Spanish Literature* (1991; see n. 1, above).

[11] This was the second topographical tribute: several years earlier, one of the new canal-side halls of residence at Queen Mary and Westfield College was named Varey House.

John's nominal retirement lasted nearly ten years. The angina that had struck him in the mid-1980s was under control and did not hinder his work. It was only in the last three of those ten years that ill-health began to be an impediment, as cancer stalked him and finally caught him. But his visits to Spain continued until nearly the end, and his research and the direction of his project went on, under increasing hardship, into the last month of his life. He died on 28 March 1999, ten months after he and Micky had celebrated their golden wedding on a glorious late spring day.

John Varey built for the future. He found able collaborators and encouraged his successors. The institutions that he founded—his department, the History of the Spanish Theatre Research Project and its Fuentes series, Colección Támesis—are set to grow and play their part in twenty-first-century hispanism.

II

It is difficult to overestimate the monumental importance of John Varey's work, not least because the work itself is monumental in size and scope. An academic who much more than pulled his weight in terms of teaching and administration, his prodigious energy and stamina allowed him at the same time to pursue a scholarly vision reminiscent of the vast projects of nineteenth-century gentlemen scholars with little else to do. And a brilliant entrepreneurial streak unusual amongst academics in the past, and unmatched even in today's managerial academic world, enabled him to make that vision a reality. The launching of the Tamesis imprint (see above, pp. 391–2) not only provided international hispanism with a publishing outlet of prime quality, but guaranteed John Varey the vehicle he needed to disseminate the results of both his own and his collaborative researches. As a result he became one of the most prolific and successful academic collaborators there can ever have been in the arts and humanities. Over the years he published in collaboration with seven different colleagues not only sixteen volumes of documents and studies relating to the history of the Spanish theatre, with seven more in preparation at the time of his death, but also a nineteen-volume facsimile edition of the *primera parte* of the plays of Calderón and editions of three plays by other dramatists. In the interstices of these team activities, he published five single-authored books with Tamesis and other presses, and one hundred and twenty-three critical and scholarly articles and essays, very largely on the early theatre (some again in collaboration) but also on the nineteenth-century novelist Benito Pérez Galdós.

If the size of this output is humbling, the significance of the enterprise that dominates it is immeasurable. Whereas critical theories come and go, and the fate of even the most influential criticism is eventually to be relegated to the status of historical curiosity, Varey's contribution to early modern Spanish theatre studies is the rock on which future scholars and critics will have to build. That corpus of indispensable scholarship will always be there, informing the way *comediantes* think and write about the plays. As a commercial, popular theatre the Spanish drama was shaped by the circumstances of its production—the playhouses and their management, performances, audiences, the organisation of the theatrical world, court entertainments, religious festivities. This detailed picture of how the circumstances in which the plays were written influenced what was written and how it was written, is precisely what John Varey, aided by his collaborators, set out to provide with the systematic publication and analysis of the huge cache of documentary sources that lay untapped in Spanish collections. It involved a life-time of archive research, meticulous editing and proofreading, planning on a grand scale, skilful organisation and fund-raising. It also involved, as we have seen, the setting up of a press which he proceeded to turn into a major publisher of Spanish criticism and scholarship, in the activities of which he took a pivotal role. I can vouch for this because, when the typescript of a book of mine that Tamesis was publishing was returned to me for correction three months before John died, when he was already gravely ill, I was astonished and touched to discover that it had been painstakingly edited by John himself. In other words, he was a remarkable man, a scholar equally at home with arcane detail and the large design, an initiator and energiser who anticipated by many years the project scholarship now so much in favour with funding bodies, yet who with apparent enjoyment continued to toil away himself at the coal-face of scholarly endeavour.

To go back to his first major publication is to see all these qualities already in place. The book of his doctoral thesis, *Historia de los títeres en España (desde sus orígenes hasta mediados del siglo XVIII)*, published in 1957, filled a crucial gap in the history of puppetry until the advent of the pseudo-scientific entertainments of modern times (magic lantern, Chinese shadows, optical illusions, and so on). It was a difficult undertaking because, as its author said, 'the births and deaths of puppets are not recorded and they do not sign documents, and puppeteers are even more elusive than their creations', but the work succeeds very well indeed in its declared aim of providing Maese Pedro, the puppeteer who confounds Don Quixote in Part II of Cervantes's novel, with a historical context. It

is rich in range and detail, dealing not only with puppets themselves—then an adult entertainment—but with allied entertainments as well, such as mechanical figures and scenes, acrobats and conjurers, carnival figures, jugglers, and tumblers. It looks at performances in streets, playhouses and palaces, at their repertoire both religious and secular, at their medieval and classical sources, at their parodic function, and at the way in which puppet themes introduce into literature the idea of humankind itself as a puppet. Already evident here is the love of documentary detail, the pleasure in scholarly archaeology, and the fascination with popular theatrical forms, with production and performance, which were to lead on to the major enterprise of recording playhouse, street, and palace theatre as a whole. Evident, too, in appendices, notes, bibliographies, illustrations, and index is the exhaustive scholarship essential to his subsequent activities. Clearly present as well, though, are the intellectual ebullience, the dry wit and the shrewd eye for significant detail which characterise his writings, and which succeed in making this book, for all its unpromising title, an entertaining read.

Varey's work on puppets did not end with the *Historia*. In its prologue he promised to complete his study by publishing the sources for the period after 1758, the *Historia*'s cut-off point because that year saw the appearance of the newspaper *Diario de Madrid* and a consequentially enormous rise in the available information regarding theatrical performances. Varey kept that promise fifteen years later in 1972 with the publication of *Los títeres y otras diversiones populares de Madrid, 1758–1840: estudios y documentos*. Here he adopted a different approach. The documentation he discovered proved so interesting in its administrative, commercial, and scenographic detail that instead of plucking out the material that captured his attention as he had done before, he decided to be inclusive, reproducing verbatim the important parts of the documents and summarising or omitting only routine or formulaic elements. He added an introduction to provide a general analysis of the material and place the documents in their social and administrative context, and multiple indices to help the reader access material in different ways. It was a model he had already started using in his publication, at this stage with Norman Shergold, of material relating to the mainstream theatre.

As it turned out, so extensive were the sources for this second stage in the history of the puppets and other entertainments that the details provided by the *Diario de Madrid* itself had to wait another twenty-three years until 1995, when they eventually saw the light of day in *Cartelera de los títeres 1758–1840*. The material Varey extracted is, in the case of each

document entry, structured in the form of impresario, venue, dates, times, admission fees, and programme, and cross-referenced where appropriate both to other document entries and to *Los títeres*. With its analytical introduction, its multiple indices and appendices, its plates of announcements, and its maps of Madrid, it offers a detailed panorama of popular entertainments in Madrid during the second half of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, against the background of evolution from the Enlightenment to the rise of liberalism. The seminal work initiated when he was a research student was at last complete.

By the time the first puppet book was published in 1957, Varey had already published ten articles. Some of these were spin-offs from his doctoral work on the puppet theatre itself, but almost immediately this continuing interest began to widen out into other areas of early modern Spanish theatre and festivities. The year of his first article, on the modern Spanish puppet theatre in 1951, also saw the birth, with a joint article on three unedited drawings of the old playhouses in Madrid, of his long and fruitful collaboration with Norman Shergold, who would himself in due course write a magisterial book on the history of the Spanish stage. Together they were to produce seventeen articles, two editions of seventeenth-century plays, and twelve volumes in Tamesis's series of documentary sources, Fuentes para la Historia del Teatro en España, five of these with the collaboration of Charles Davis, who as well as being himself a theatre specialist became Varey's computer guru. Some of their joint articles eventually fed into the documentary sources they published together, but many of them still make their own crucial additions to the sum of our knowledge of the theatre and its world in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain. Varey's other articles—a number of which were written with other collaborators—cover a wide range of subjects: puppets in different places and times, play dates, playhouses, scenography, staging and audience, texts in performance, actors and costume, public spectacle and court ceremonial, memory theatres, the theatre's socio-economic context, *comedia* criticism, interpretative and elucidatory essays on both seventeenth-century plays and the nineteenth-century novels of Galdós, thirty-six articles for the *Oxford Companion to the Theatre*, the revision of 220 articles on Spanish literature and the writing of 35 new ones for *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of World Literature*, and even an article on university entrance requirements.

Most of Varey's work constitutes what is now patronisingly referred to by those of a more theoretical bent as positivist scholarship, but in its implications, reach, and impact it is much more than that. Varey was not

just an outstanding theatre historian but a pioneer of the concept of the theatrical identity of drama, of the idea of the play-text as something fashioned to be simultaneously experienced through the eyes and the ears by a present audience, of the theatre itself as part of a rich and varied dramatic life that embraced religious drama in the streets, palace festivities, royal entrances and progresses, and other public celebrations. He realised that every aspect of the text in context and in performance contributed to its identity, to the way in which it communicated and the way in which it was received, and he effectively dedicated his career to providing the peritextual information needed to understand in its every aspect the theatre to which the plays belong. And some of his best criticism, represented by a number of his articles, skilfully exemplifies how the study of such things as the use of space and time, of scenic levels, of connections between imagery and scenography, and between themes and staging, of staging problems, of night scenes, of the relationship between play and audience, of stage directions, of costume, of visual impact generally, illuminates our reading of the plays. The entire way in which we think about the theatre and its individual plays has, almost without our realising it, been irreversibly changed by Varey's work and the example he has set.

In 1987 he published a collection of twenty-two of his articles under the title *Cosmovisión y escenografía: el teatro español en el siglo de oro* (Madrid: Castalia) which epitomises the way in which his research and writing bridge the dramatic and the theatrical. The over-arching themes are ideology and staging and the relationship between the two. Varey took the view that the staging built into a play-text served to emphasise ideas and images contained by the text and therefore to transmit messages and control the audience's response, and twelve of the articles in the collection are devoted to exploring this convergence. The other ten articles employ close textual analysis to expatiate upon the cosmic vision which for him shaped the thinking of the playwrights and their age: 'To a certain extent the *comedia* may be thought of as a ritual act which reinforces the fundamental beliefs of society'.[12] These fundamental beliefs for him were essentially those which constitute Tillyard's once enormously influential Elizabethan world picture of cosmic hierarchy and order, a picture now widely considered to give only a partial insight into the realities of early modern thought and values. While the essays are therefore perhaps less persuasive than they once were, the methodology they use retains its value. The text and its realisation in performance are to be seen not as

[12] 'Prefacio', in *Comovisión y escenografia*, p. 12.

separate exercises but as integral to a totalising theatrical identity. Varey's aim in mining texts for performance detail was, by his own claim, not archaeology but re-creation, and he justified his chronological method of examining a text by arguing that, since it was only by meticulously following the plot through that one could hope to recapture the unfolding effect the play had on its audience, description and interpretation were necessarily fused processes. His preferred procedure for textual exegesis might not suit everyone, but the fact that its inspiring principle—the indivisibility of the theatrical experience—can yield interpretations very different from Varey's own is a sign of that principle's strength not its weakness. And a great deal of what he has to say in these essays about seventeenth-century social and ideological issues is as sound, as well-judged and therefore as valuable as it was before we became less convinced by the idea of a monolithic early modern culture where everybody thought the same thoughts and playwrights did nothing but echo them.

Varey's view of a play as a text shaped both by its stage identity and by its social and ideological roots, as a constituent part not only of theatre but of the historical process, is seen in action in two of the play editions on which he collaborated, where text, staging, and ideas are all given their due weight. His edition with Shergold in 1954 of Tirso de Molina's *El burlador de Sevilla* had been a reader's edition for the Cambridge Plain Texts series, and there could not be a greater contrast between it and the edition they published with Jack Sage in 1970 of Juan Vélez de Guevara's two-act *zarzuela, Los celos hacen estrellas*, which was performed before the court in the *salón dorado* of the Alcázar Real on 22 December 1672 in celebration of the birthday of the Queen Mother, Mariana of Austria. This magnificent volume contains the texts, with variants and notes, of the play itself, the *loa* that preceded it, the *entremés* performed between the acts, and the *fin de fiesta* at the end. There is an extensive introduction on the manuscript and first edition, the playwright's life and work, Francisco Herrera el Mozo's water colours for the stage sets, the date of the first performance, the palace where it was held, the mythological text and its accompanying pieces, the composer, Juan Hidalgo, and the dynastic and literary relations between Spain and Austria which formed the play's wider context. Following the texts are a contemporary Spanish version of Vélez's Ovidian source, an essay by Varey on the iconographical portraits of the king's ancestors that looked down upon the scene as the royal family enjoyed the spectacle, another by Jack Sage on the *zarzuela* and Hidalgo's music, and an edition of the score also by Sage. Ample illustrations complete the ambitious enterprise—to recreate as completely as possible the

performance of a musical play at court in late-seventeenth-century Spain. No commercial press and few university presses would have touched it, but happily the existence of Tamesis made it possible.

It was Tamesis again, in its series Tamesis Texts, which ten years later published Varey's critical edition, in collaboration with J. M. Ruano, of Lope de Vega's *Peribáñez y el Comendador de Ocaña*. It is the perfect working text for specialists and students alike—rigorously edited, generously annotated, with a beautifully judged introduction, on dating, sources, structure, themes, ideology, imagery, staging, verse forms, and editorial matters, that is neither over-scholarly nor condescendingly reductive. Pepe Ruano's description of the way they worked together is very instructive: 'We divided the work between us. I did the text and endnotes and also wrote the bit entitled "The Present Edition" in the Introduction. He wrote the Introduction. Then, we exchanged our contributions and made comments on each other's work. He was, as always, very generous when commenting on my contribution and graciously accepted the very few comments I dared to make on his. I then travelled to London, stayed in the Principal's residence in Kidderpore for a couple of days and in the evenings went to his house, sat with him in his office and with an open bottle of his best Rioja close at hand we both went painstakingly over every end-note and practically every line in the text, until my eyelids began to close (something that happened much sooner to me than to him) and I took my leave, while he said that he still had a couple more things to do before he retired.' Jack Sage had similarly found Varey 'unfailingly fair, conscientious, humorous, far-seeing and discreetly commanding'.

John Varey's other foray into the arena of *comedia* editions was a very different undertaking. This was the nineteen-volume facsimile edition, prepared by himself and Don Cruickshank and published in 1973, of the first editions of all nine *partes* of Calderón's full-length plays, and, in the case of the first five *partes*, of the reprints which appeared during his lifetime. Our knowledge of the relationship of the editions to one another is due to the work carried out in the field by Edward Wilson and Don Cruickshank, and the first volume of the series, which was edited by Cruickshank, is devoted to textual criticism of Calderón's *comedias* by these two scholars. The last volume, edited by Varey, reprinted thirteen essays by different *comedia* specialists to illustrate the various ways in which Anglo-American scholarship had sought to evaluate the theatre of Calderón over the previous thirty-five years. These book-end volumes are still immensely useful to students and scholars in collecting together

significant writings previously scattered in time and place, but the scholarly contribution of the seventeen middle volumes is fundamental. As Varey pointed out, all the original volumes are rare; one is unique. No single library has a complete set and even leading libraries usually have no more than half of the twelve volumes printed before 1681. The facsimile edition therefore made available the material necessary for a textual study of all those works which appeared in the collective volumes of Calderón's plays in the course of the seventeenth century. Copies were selected from libraries in the UK, Italy, the USA, Canada, France, Germany, and Spain, and reprinted in their entirety, with, in the case of any deficiencies, the appropriate pages from another copy printed as an appendix. By Varey's insistence, Cruickshank's name appeared first on the title pages of the series because he did most of the organisational work for the facsimile, but the enterprise was Varey's idea in the first place, he handled all the negotiations with the publisher, took an equal part in discussions about practical details, and double proofread volumes 1 and 19. According to Don Cruickshank, the correspondence between them on the project 'More than anything . . . shows his constant readiness to help and advise and to be informed—as if he had nothing else to worry about but this one project.'

At the time this enterprise was underway Varey certainly had more than enough to occupy him, since it was the early seventies that saw the launch of the Fuentes series. The second two of his own three books on popular entertainments (*Los títeres* and *Cartelera*) would be published in the series in 1972 and 1995 respectively, but the first of the collaborative efforts appeared in 1971. Although the first volume of the series to be published, it was volume 3 in the master publication plan, into which volumes were slotted as and when they appeared. Thereafter volumes appeared in 1972, 1973, 1975, 1979, 1982, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1995, with three volumes in 1997. Five further numbered volumes are in preparation—numbers 35, 30, 14, 32, and 31—along with two more which have not yet been allocated a number. The first six collaborative volumes were produced with Norman Shergold. In 1961 Shergold and Varey together had published *Los autos sacramentales en Madrid en la época de Calderón* (Madrid: Ediciones de Literatura Española), a collection of documents with accompanying study relating to the Corpus Christi plays performed in Madrid between 1637 and 1681; they had already in two previous articles studied the period down to 1637. Organised as the *autos* were by the Madrid city council, a hoard of documents had survived in the city archives which had been only very partially studied

and certainly not reproduced in anything like the quantity and detail to be found here. Their book opened up the world of the seventeenth-century religious theatre as no work had done before, providing information not merely on the development of the *autos* themselves but on every aspect of the festivities—their organisation and administration, the logistics of performance in the streets, the movable carts and the platform that formed the stage, the processions and their progress, the giants and carnival dragons, the audiences from high to low, the actors, the dancing, the costumes, the costs, and payments; nothing is omitted. Plans, illustrations, and analytical indices were provided to help the reader and to bring to life a world that time had largely forgotten. This work published by the two scholars in Spain provided the format, and no doubt to a large extent the inspiration, for the Fuentes series itself. It also provided the format for the way in which the collaborators appeared on the title pages in the series, the order reflecting authorial input (often generously interpreted by Varey), now Varey and Shergold, now Shergold and Varey, later on Varey and Davis or Davis and Varey—a procedure that I know from my own experience induces severe editorial neurosis in those producing references and bibliographies in which these works appear, but scrupulously fair.

Between 1971 and 1979 four volumes of studies and documents entitled *Teatros y comedias* were published (the first three by Varey and Shergold, the fourth by Shergold and Varey), covering the period 1600 to 1699. In 1986 a fifth volume was published, this time by Shergold, Varey, and Davis, covering the years between 1699 and 1719, and in 1994 there appeared a sixth volume by Varey, Shergold, and Davis, taking this particular enterprise down to 1745. As well as providing information about plays, performances, actors and actresses, theatre closures on the occasion of royal deaths, accounts, entry fees, legal wrangles, and so on, over a period of a century and a half, these volumes as they move forward also trace larger patterns: the attempts at social and moral regulation of the theatre and the theatrical world, the policing of performances to maintain law and order, the diminishing role of the charitable brotherhoods, the eventual transfer of administrative responsibliity to the municipal authorities; and the growth of the court theatre. It was entirely appropriate in the light of these later developments that after the first four volumes the next one, *Representaciones palaciegas 1603–1699* (1982), by Shergold and Varey, should be on the palace theatre itself between 1603 and 1699. The documents offer a fascinating insight into the importance of the theatre in the life of the court, how the court influenced theatrical life, and how

the court theatre, into which the public was admitted after the court itself had over several days seen the performance, gradually eroded activities in the public playhouses. They also give an instant and vivid picture of a different theatrical world, with their detailed costings, their emphasis on elaborate costumes, scenery, and stage effects, and their constant preoccupation with expenditure on wax—scarcely necessary for afternoon performances in public playhouses open to the air. In 1997, the last volume to be published in the series before John Varey died was a companion volume, albeit with a wider date-spread, on the palace theatre by Margaret Rich Greer and Varey, *El teatro palaciego 1586–1707*. It was planned as the second of a total of four on the court theatre down to the middle of the eighteenth century. The focus in this one is financial and administrative, with costume accounts detailed enough to warrant an appendix on early modern textiles and accessories, and so pressing a concern with protocol, jurisdiction, and precedence that another appendix is provided on official court etiquette. It not only takes us behind the scenes of court life, however, but in the detail it gives us of some of the performances it greatly enhances our understanding of how the court operated, how the play-texts familiar to us translated to the proscenium stage, and how the resulting extravagant display functioned—albeit not without financial strain—as an exercise in self-aggrandisement and self-delusion as Spain's credibility as a powerful and wealthy nation waned.

Whereas the volumes in the Fuentes series mentioned thus far are inclusive in their reproduction of documents relating to theatres and performances over a period of time from 1586 to 1745, others focus more directly on particular aspects of the early modern Spanish theatre. *Comedias en Madrid 1603–1709* (1989) by Varey, Shergold, and Davis, is an alphabetical list (cross-referenced with other Fuentes volumes) of plays, performances, and printings which imposes order on some part of the confusion created by the composition, staging, and publication, often unauthorised, of a vast number of plays many of which have been lost and many of which are referred to in the records by different or adulterated titles. *Genealogía, orígen y noticias de los comediantes de España* (1985), by Shergold and Varey, is a compilation of information about hundreds of actors and actresses which makes fascinating and amusing reading. The remaining four volumes published before Varey died—*Los arriendos de los corrales de Madrid, 1587–1719* (1987, Varey, Shergold, and Davis); *Los libros de cuentas de los corrales de comedias de Madrid, 1706–1719* (1992, Varey and Davis); *Los corrales de comedias y los hospitales de Madrid 1574–1615* (1997, Davis and Varey), and its continuation

Los corrales de comedias y los hospitales de Madrid 1615–1849 (1997, Varey and Davis)—all concentrate on financing and administration: the leasing of playhouses, the accounts books, and the changing relationship between the playhouses and the charitable hospitals, whose dependence on the playhouses' proceeds served for many years to protect the theatre from its enemies.

The seven volumes of the Fuentes series in preparation at the time of John Varey's death are a varied group: two volumes on theatrical activity in the Madrid region, a reconstruction of one of the two Madrid playhouses, the Corral de la Cruz, two volumes on the lateral boxes in the Corral de la Cruz and the Corral del Príncipe respectively, an edition of a late eighteenth-century collection of chronological records concerning the origins of the Spanish theatre, and the third volume of the promised four on the court theatre. When completed, the collaborative Fuentes volumes which John Varey masterminded and directed, and in the research, writing, and editing of which he played such a vital part, will number twenty-one. Together with his three works on popular entertainments, his book with Shergold on the *autos sacramentales*, his many articles on theatre and ceremonial, and a collection of document-based essays he co-edited with Luciano García Lorenzo on various aspects of the theatres and theatrical life, *Teatros y vida teatral en el siglo de oro a través de las fuentes documentales* (Tamesis, 1991), the series stands as an enduring memorial to the man, his vision, and his energy. It is a corpus of work based on what García Lorenzo has called in the introduction to that volume (p. 7), 'el ingrato, poco brillante, pero absolutamente necesario trabajo llevado a cabo en archivos [y] bibliotecas', the thankless, unglamorous, but absolutely vital work carried out in archives and libraries that is so essential to our reconstruction and understanding of the past. It has transformed the face of theatre history in Spain. It has added invaluable weight and detail to our knowledge of the workings of the extraordinary theatre that for over a century dominated the cultural life of the nation, creating for its people myths that simultaneously reflected and fashioned its sense of collective identity, and in the process it has provided students of the *comedia* with material and tools they need to pursue their various scholarly and critical goals. What sits there, now so accessible, so ordered, so accurate between the covers of the study-and-documents books—all, with the exception of the book on the *autos sacramentales*, in the Fuentes series—represents a lifetime of arduous work on mountains of documents in the archives of Spain which only John Varey's own rigorous methods made possible. Infinite care was

second nature to him, and he and his collaborators copied to one another, scrutinised and deliberated painstakingly over absolutely everything they discovered and wrote. Both initial transcriptions and typed-up documents were checked against the originals, and proofs were in due course checked word for word against the typescript. Varey himself kept the project moving, did the world-wide scanning for relevant material or developments, and with his gift for drawing threads together synthesised the accumulated mass of diverse notes into a comprehensive account. This long-drawn-out process largely accounts for the way in which the preparatory work for the different volumes necessarily overlapped and for the order in which the volumes were published. At the same time it was John Varey's guarantee of the absolute reliability of the end result of a procedure which, certainly in its repeated enactments, would have been too daunting for most of us. Placed within the greater picture of Varey's many other scholarly enterprises and professional responsibilities, it offers persuasive support for Sheldon's theory of human types, with John as the archetypal mesomorph.

While it is clearly on the basis of his huge and multifaceted contribution to Spanish theatre studies that John Varey's reputation stands and will survive, it would be a mistake to underestimate the value of his lasting interest in the nineteenth-century novelist Galdós. He was the editor of an important compilation (*Galdós Studies*, Tamesis, 1970), and the author of a perceptive Critical Guide to one of Galdós's best known novels, *Doña Perfecta* (Grant and Cutler, 1971) and of several articles, the most influential of which, 'Nuestro buen Thiers' (*Anales Galdosianos*, 1, 1966), sparked off examination of the many identifications with real-life political and cultural figures elaborated by Galdós in his fiction. Viewed alongside the weight of his major work, the Galdós publications inevitably take on the appearance of a personal passion indulged from time to time in the interstices of the real business of his research life. But they are an eloquent testimony to a mind of great scholarly range and extraordinary intellectual energy and enthusiasm—which could take unexpected forms. One of the funniest lectures I have had the pleasure of listening to was one John gave at the Association of Hispanists many years ago, when he spoke for an hour on the subject of trains in the nineteenth-century Spanish novel. Alas, he never published it as far as I know.

Reassuring as it might be for lesser mortals to cite this rare example of Varey's scholarship not leading to publication, his legacy is a Herculean record of pioneering published research of enduring value. His work deserves to rank with that of other giants in their different fields—Joseph

Needham's work on Chinese science, Philip Grierson's work on medieval coins, or Tony Wrigley's work on English demography. Like John Varey's their reputations are founded largely on multi-volume works of collaborative scholarship. Like theirs, his pioneering scholarship will be refined and augmented, but it can never be ignored.

Part I ALAN DEYERMOND
Fellow of the Academy
Part II MELVEENA McKENDRICK
Fellow of the Academy

Note to Part I. Most of the information in Part I of this memoir derives from my own observation and from what John Varey and other witnesses told me over the years. Mrs Micky Varey has generously filled gaps in my knowledge and has commented on a first draft.

In parts of this memoir I have drawn on what I wrote in the introductions to the 1991 Festschrift and the 2000 memorial volume. I am grateful to the editor of the latter volume and to the publishers of both for allowing me to do so. (A.D.D.)

Note to Part II. I am grateful to Don Cruickshank, Margaret Greer, J. M. Ruano de la Haza, and Jack Sage for the insights they have given me into John Varey's working methods and personal qualities as a collaborator, and to Geoffrey Ribbans for allowing me to draw on his expertise in Galdós studies. (M. McK.)